clubs for enlisted men, post exchanges and other service-connected recreation areas should be prohibited from serving and selling alcoholic drinks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

771. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 50 people in Pendleton, Lapel, Fortville, and McCordsville, Ind.; in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

772. Also, petition of 75 members of the Friends Church of Amboy, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

773. Also, petition of 51 members of the South Kokomo, Ind., W. C. T. U.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

774. Also, petition of 57 people in Macy, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

775. Also petitions of 301 residents of the city of Anderson, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Saturday, June 21, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face. We come asking not that Thou wouldst give heed to the faltering petitions our lips frame, but that Thou wilt bend Thy ear to the crying of our deep needs. We bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused, where good and evil, the petty and the great are so entwined. May the eternal immensities shame our little thoughts and ways. May the vision of what we might be convict us of what we are. In this great day of Thy testing, when mankind faces the blessing or the curse, life or death, may we not miss the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 25, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 25, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Col. Julia O. Flikke and Col. Florence A. Blanchfield; and

S. 3019. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear; and

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.

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

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; and

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7860) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. BOSONE, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6245. An act to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II";

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally;

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; and

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

THIRD SPECIAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in accordance with section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

This report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covers the 2-year period ending March 31, 1952. The first special report on the Fund and Bank was submitted in May 1948 and the second such report was submitted in May 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 151)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $1,200,000, for the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1953 (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INCOME CREDIT TO CERTAIN NONRESIDENT ALIENS FOR CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, was exercised in behalf of such aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the applications for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Iwao Inaba or Harry Iwao Inaba alias Harry I. Kida from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on September 14, 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing certain names from a report transmitted to the Senate, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of additional judges when permanently disabled judges fail to retire (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the establishment of a national cemetery for New England, to be located in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Md. LODGE) on June 25, 1952, p. 7952, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Shirley Rose, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the deletion of all reference to Federal workers' leave in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A paper in the nature of a petition adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, of Rockville Centre, Long Island, N. Y., relating to the Government's foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the representatives of 14 Latvian organizations, of Chicago, Ill., expressing their unqualified loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Cablegrams and letter in the nature of memorials from Jose A. Balseiro, San Juan, Pedro Ruberte Robles, of Penuelas, Juan Arroyo, of Sabana Grande, Armando Mignucci Caler, of Yauco, Rodriguez Menandez, of Yauco, and Blanca E. Colberg, of Cabo Rojo, all of Puerto Rico, remonstrating against the adoption of the amendment of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to the Puerto Rican Constitution; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, San Francisco, Calif., signed by Earl W. Jimerson, president, and Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, praying that the President's veto of the McCarran-Walter immigration bill be sustained; ordered to lie on the table.

CONSERVATION PROBLEMS—RESOLUTIONS OF SEVENTEENTH CONSERVATION CONGRESS, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions on conservation problems, which were adopted by the Wisconsin Conservation Congress at its Statewide meeting in the capital of my State earlier this month and as forwarded by Emery A. Premeau, congress secretary.

This splendid grassroots body of conservation-minded civic leaders consists of three delegates from each of the 71 counties in my State. I have previously spoken on the Senate floor of the very fine work done by this group which has set a fine standard for other conservation groups throughout the Nation.

I am delighted that my State has pioneered in seeking to preserve the great outdoor heritage which we and earlier generations have often so recklessly squandered in times past.

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

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Whereas the existing wet lands of the Nation constitute a resource of great value through their contribution to water and soil conservation and their support of habitat vital to many important wildlife species; and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has demonstrated that, if necessary, lands now in food and fiber production can produce under proper management much more than they do at present; and

Whereas that Department provides technical assistance and payments to landowners to promote drainage of wet lands which destroy large and irreplaceable tangible and intangible values; and

Whereas the new Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service told the National Farm Institute at Des Moines on February 15, 1952, that "along the east coast and Gulf States there are at least 10,000,000 acres of swampland that could be drained and put into production" and "on hundreds of thousands of farms throughout the country there are corners or patches of idle wet land, often several acres in size, that could be drained": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Seventeenth Conservation Congress, in convention assembled at Madison this 2d day of June 1952—

1. That there should be initiated a program that will eliminate or curtail drainage subsidies now in effect, and that will inaugurate a system of subsidies for the restoration and maintenance of marshlands and pot-hole areas throughout the country;

2. That the agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture and the United State Department of the Interior cooperate in an objective appraisal of the various values of the wet lands in the Nation;

3. That the United States Department of Agriculture discontinue the encouragement of private drainage of natural swamp, marsh, open water, and seasonally flooded areas not now in cultivation, through provision of technical assistance and financial aid, until a national policy is established regarding these wet lands and water areas.

4. That the Wisconsin Conservation Commission and Department continue to study this problem and take such action as is necessary to protect the public interest, especially in respect to continued cooperation on the State level, whenever possible, with those branches of the United States Department of Agriculture most concerned, the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration, and with the Natural Resources Council of America and other interested national conservation agencies.

5. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Natural Resources Council of America, the Natural Resources Committee of Wisconsin, to each Congressman and Senator from Wisconsin, and to the Wisconsin Conservation Commission.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
LARRY WHIFFEN, *Chairman.*

Resolution 10

Whereas under present Federal laws the Federal Forest Service does not have money available for the development and maintenance of recreational facilities in the national forests; and

Whereas the International Association of Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners has recommended a proposal whereby 10 percent of the national-forest receipts be set aside for recreational and wildlife administration; and

Whereas at the present time lack of funds in the Federal Forest Service has resulted in expense to the Wisconsin conservation program, which has found it necessary to expend funds for recreational purposes in the Federal forests; and

Whereas bill H. R. 565, by Congressman TACKETT, contains such a proposal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Seventeenth Conservation Congress, in convention assembled at Madison this 2d of June 1952, That it does hereby support the principles involved in bill H. R. 565 and recommends its passage; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Congressmen and Senators from Wisconsin and to the appropriate committee of Congress before which the bill will be heard.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
LARRY WHIFFEN, *Chairman.*

RESOLUTIONS OF BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce recently adopted three constructive resolutions dealing with some of the most difficult problems that face the Congress.

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

There being no objection, two of the resolutions were referred and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION ON REDUCTION OF THE 1953 FEDERAL BUDGET ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

"Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce has consistently advocated all proper measures for a reduction in the Federal budget and has urged the elimination of all nonessential governmental expenditures, and the adoption of the Hoover recommendations for Federal economy; and

"Whereas in an open letter to Congress, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recently submitted definite and concrete recommendations for reduction of the Federal budget to the extent of $14,400,000,000; these recommendations showing how and where, and to what extent savings should be made in expenses for operating various Government departments and functions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce strongly endorses the recommendations of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for a reduction of $14,400,000,000 in the Federal budget for the year 1953; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to (1), all Members of Congress; and (2), the members of the association of commerce and to chambers of commerce and trade organizations throughout the State."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION ON NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation which would authorize the development of the Niagara River Power Project by the Federal Government or the State of New York; and there is also pending in the Congress, legislation which would grant to private enterprise the right to develop and transmit the electric energy to be produced; and

"Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce is now on record, through action taken by its board of directors, as opposed to any legislation or the appropriation of any funds for unnecessary socialistic experiments, the direct or indirect use of which would put the Government in competition with its own citizens or would further the nationalization of the electric power business or any other industry; and

"Whereas private enterprise has the resources, the willingness and the ability necessary to efficiently construct and operate the Niagara Power Development Project: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce approves and strongly urges the passage of the pending Capehart-Miller bill (S. 2021–H. R. 3146) designed to permit the Niagara River power development by private industry and that the board is opposed to and strongly urges the defeat of the pending Lehman-Roosevelt bill (S. 517–H. R. 1642) advocating Federal development and control and the Ives-Cole bill (S. 1963–H. R. 5099) proposing that a public agency, the Power Authority of the State of New York, undertake the Niagara Power Development; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to (1) all members of Congress and (2) the members of the Association of Commerce and to chambers of commerce and trade organizations throughout the State."

The third resolution presented by Mr. O'CONOR, relating to Federal expenditures for State and local projects, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2584. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1835).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 3367. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of the State of Georgia, of certain land in said county; without amendment (Rept. No. 1836).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2702. A bill to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel; with amendments (Rept. No. 1827); and

S. 3145. A bill to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code, to provide the United States Coast Guard with broader authority with respect to the apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and prisoners; without amendment (Rept. No. 1826).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7313. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1828).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6245. A bill to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829);

H. R. 6845. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830);

H. R. 7255. A bill to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans); without amendment (Rept. No. 1831);

H. R. 7594. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1832);

H. R. 8270. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1833); and

H. R. 8271. A bill to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 1834).

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

H. R. 1558. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838);

H. R. 5327. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1839); and

H. R. 7305. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1840).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2470. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1841); and

H. R. 4197. A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend

section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, T. H., the status of Hawaiian home lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1842).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2236. A bill to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1843);

H. R. 5917. A bill to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 1844);

H. R. 6681. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1845);

H. R. 7009. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott; without amendment (Rept. No. 1846);

H. R. 7301. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1847); and

H. R. 7303. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1848).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 7806. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; without amendment (Rept. No. 1849).

By Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 5850. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1850); and

H. R. 7641. A bill to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 1851).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1393. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1855);

S. 2262. A bill to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period; without amendment (Rept. No. 1856);

H. R. 4021. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950); without amendment (Rept. No. 1859);

H. R. 6769. A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section; without amendment (Rept. No. 1857); and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox, a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1852).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to create a Commission on Labor-Management Relations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1853).

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 2570. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; with amendments (Rept. No. 1858).

PRODUCTION OF VITAL STEEL AND STEEL PRODUCTS DURING CURRENT EMERGENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original bill to promote the production of vital steel and steel products during the current emergency, and I submit a report (No. 1854) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3407) to promote the production of vital steel and steel products during the current emergency, reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

STUDY OF ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION — REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, the resolution (S. Res. 332), reported by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 9, 1952, and I submit a report (No. 1825) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

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

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 1, line 10, after the word "Senate", to strike out "at the earliest practicable date" and insert "not later than January 31, 1953"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "assistants", to insert a semicolon and "and with the consent of the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate to contract for such facilities, services, and information"; and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make an investigation and study of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of determining what changes should be made in order to promote maximum efficiency in such organization and operations.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than January 31, 1953.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants; and with the consent of the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate to contract for such facilities, services, and information as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 335), reported by Mr. MCKELLAR from the Committee on Appropriations on June 16, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress $15,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, Senate Resolution 162, agreed to June 29, 1951, and Senate Resolution 204, agreed to September 27, 1951.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 337), reported by Mr. MAYBANK from the Committee on Banking and Currency on June 24, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, as increased by Senate Resolution 192, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to August 23, 1951.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE ACTIVITIES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 338), reported by Mr. ELLENDER from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on June 25, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, investigating Commodity Credit Corporation activities, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 256, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 24, 1952, is hereby extended to August 31, 1952.

ZETTA ELLEN ROLLINS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Zetta Ellen Rollins. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 339) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Zetta Ellen Rollins, widow of William Edward Rollins, an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BOOKS FOR THE ADULT BLIND

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 7231) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind." I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

MARINE CORPS WAR MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 418) to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242). I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The joint resolution changes the title of the Marine Corps League, Inc., to the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution. The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 1, line 6, to strike out "and by striking out 'District of Columbia' and inserting 'District of Columbia or immediate vicinity'."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 26, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II;

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; and

S. 2214. An act to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3396. A bill for the relief of August Alcsuti and Vilma Kann Alcsuti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. LODGE):

S. 3397. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felici; and

S. 3398. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Frisoni and Gloria Frisoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3399. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3400. A bill for the relief of Edward Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3401. A bill for the relief of certain Chinese children; and

S. 3402. A bill for the relief of certain parties liable for the breach of bonds posted in the case of Zelmonas Lebjusas and Yehudith Lebjusas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 3403. A bill to reinstate Oscar Haefer with the rank of first lieutenant and to authorize his retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3404. A bill for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 3405. A bill for the relief of James Piedrafite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3406. A bill for the relief of Paulus Youhanna Benjamen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3407. A bill to promote the production of vital steel and steel products during the current emergency; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION IN RELATION TO POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, RESETTLEMENT, AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a bipartisan commission, on the Hoover Commission model, to study and review our laws and policy on immigration, their basic assumptions and their relationship to population, to employment, to our economic and cultural growth, to integration of immigrants and aliens into our national life, to our foreign policy and to our national security. The commission would also study the machinery of government designed to deal with and integrate immigration policy and these other factors.

I prepared a statement which I intended to make at the time of the introduction of the joint resolution, but not wishing to take the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 169) to establish a Commission on Immigration in Relation to Population, Employment, Resettlement, and Foreign Policy, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

This commission would further study the relationship between our immigration laws and our institution of civil liberties—the basic relationship between our Bill of Rights and immigration, not only as the courts interpreted that relationship in the past, but also from the point of view of what the desirable relationship should be.

We have introduced this resolution pursuant to the recommendations made by the President of the United States in his message of disapproval of H. R. 5678, the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill. The President said in his message as follows:

"These conclusions point to an underlying condition which deserves the most careful study. Should we not undertake a reassessment of our immigration policies and practices in the light of the conditions that face us in the second half of the twentieth century? The great popular interest which this bill has created, and the criticism which it has stirred up, demand an affirmative answer. I hope the Congress will agree to a careful reexamination of this entire matter.

"To assist in this complex task, I suggest the creation of a representative commission of outstanding Americans to examine the basic assumptions of our immigration policy, the quota system and all that goes with it, the effect of our present immigration and nationality laws, their administration, and the ways in which they can be brought into line with our national ideals and our foreign policy.

"Such a commission should, I believe, be established by the Congress. Its membership should be bipartisan and divided equally among persons from private life and persons from public life. I suggest that four members be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission should be given sufficient funds to employ a staff and it should have adequate powers to hold hearings, take testimony, and obtain information. It should make a report to the President and to the Congress within a year from the time of its creation."

We have broadened our resolution to include factors beyond those specifically mentioned by the President. The duties of the Commission as defined in the resolution we are submitting are to make a full and complete study and evaluation of—

1. Population trends and manpower needs of United States economy with respect to immigration.
2. Impact of immigration on economic and cultural development in the United States.
3. Effect of immigration on employment and labor force.
4. Basic assumptions of United States immigration law, including national-origins quota system.
5. Relationship between immigration policy and foreign policy.
6. Relationship between immigration and national security.
7. Operations and basic approaches of law and present governmental machinery for dealing with immigration.
8. Governmental machinery for promoting integration and resettlement of immigrants.
9. Basic rights of immigrants and aliens.
10. Naturalization, nationality, and the status of naturalized citizens.
11. Effect of our present immigration and nationality laws, and their administration, upon our domestic and foreign policies, and ways in which they can be brought into line with our national ideals and our foreign policy.

We believe that these matters require and warrant study and review from this new and broad-gage perspective.

For too long this subject has been considered a narrow and parochial one rather than one intimately and inextricably connected with the very heartbeat of the Nation, with its economic life, its traditions, its basic constitutional concepts and the entire fabric of our foreign policy. The study of this subject must be removed from the narrow and traditional framework within which it has been, up to now, pursued.

The detailed and intensive study given to immigration law by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee under the authority of Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress was an exhaustive one within its own limits. But that study accepted as one of its limits, as one of its assumptions, the national origins quota system which we believe should be reviewed and reexamined on its own merits in its relationship to the broad and predominating factors already mentioned.

We believe this resolution to be of the highest importance. We believe it should be reported out and acted upon in the course of the next few days, before this Congress adjourns.

We believe that this resolution can be appropriately referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to the Judiciary Committee. All three have a direct interest in this study. All three should have an opportunity to make a recommendation to the Senate. We respectfully submit these views to the President of the Senate for his consideration in referring this resolution.

The Hoover Commission has established a pattern for high-minded and bipartisan studies of this kind. That pattern should be followed in the present instance. This study can no longer be delayed. The controversy aroused by the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill shows the need of such a broad gage study. The people of this Nation, the national security, and the national need fully justify it.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN CANADA

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the association, and to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses to be present at such meeting. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $4,500 for each of the delegations and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

DELEGATES TO MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 341), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint not more than four Members of the Senate to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the association, and to designate the chairman of the delegation to be present at such meeting. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegation and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this resolution shall not exceed $4,500 and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation.

INVESTIGATION OF DUPLICATION OF RESEARCH WORK BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES OR PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution authorizing an investigation of the research activities of the Federal Government.

The attached table, furnished by the Bureau of the Budget, indicates that research activities of the Government during the 1953 fiscal year involves 17 Government departments and agencies. Appropriations requested for the coming fiscal year for research activities total more than $2,225,000,000.

The resolution I am submitting authorizes an investigation to determine the extent to which these research activities overlap and the extent to which they are unnecessary.

I hope the resolution will receive prompt consideration since this study is one that could well be made during the interim between sessions.

I ask unanimous consent that the table, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, showing appropriation requests for research be printed in the record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 340) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining to what extent appropriations for the departments and agencies of the executive department of the Government are being used to carry on any type of research work which is also being carried on by another such department or agency or by any governmental or private organization, or which is in the opinion of the committee not a necessary and proper function of any such department or agency. The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $_____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The table presented by Mr. FERGUSON is as follows:

TABLE I-A.—*Research and development operations, excluding construction of facilities*

[In thousands]

	Obligations			Expenditures		
	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate
BY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY						
Atomic Energy Commission	$164,281	$210,895	$198,193	$123,109	$170,835	$206,825
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,042	1,593	2,910	43	791	2,100
Federal Communications Commission	206	190	215	193	180	201
Federal Security Agency	36,881	39,675	42,699	36,462	40,759	42,050
Housing and Home Finance Agency	706	200	340	379	381	376

TABLE I-A.—*Research and development operations, excluding construction of facilities*—Con.

[In thousands]

	Obligations			Expenditures		
	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate	1951 actual	1952 estimate	1953 estimate
BY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY—Con.						
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	45,428	50,675	54,364	44,305	49,438	51,530
National Science Foundation	151	2,150	9,735	74	1,100	3,350
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,167	8,840	8,675	6,167	8,840	8,675
Smithsonian Institution	268	267	267	255	254	253
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,183	17,168	17,388	2,038	1,993	2,264
Veterans' Administration	5,071	4,513	5,100	4,585	4,579	4,781
Department of Agriculture	50,944	51,389	52,548	49,782	51,672	51,918
Department of Commerce	12,310	11,920	12,759	12,936	17,214	13,257
Department of Defense, military functions:						
Department of the Air Force	415,608	613,046	679,000	319,739	433,000	545,000
Department of the Army	330,806	478,164	505,637	194,815	313,000	404,000
Department of the Navy	507,222	598,624	655,649	403,726	474,000	571,000
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,905	82,315	62,006	1,830	11,900	42,000
Total, military functions	(1,255,541)	(1,772,149)	(1,902,292)	(920,110)	(1,231,900)	(1,562,000)
Department of Defense, civil functions	2,300	2,000	2,000	2,300	2,000	2,000
Department of the Interior	32,102	34,475	36,873	30,203	33,579	34,619
Department of State	537	63	1,500	472	85	1,243
Treasury Department	528	503	653	374	599	453
Total research and development operations	1,630,736	2,208,665	2,348,511	1,233,787	1,616,199	1,987,895

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK BY DEPARTMENTS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6245. An act to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8271. An act to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred postmasters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Statement by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, Maritime Administrator, regarding the steamship *United States*.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address delivered by himself at the Baltic States freedom rally, Town Hall, New York, N. Y., Sunday, June 15, 1952.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Tribute by Ambassador Rene Lepervanche, representative of Venezuela on the Council of the Organization of American States, commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Henry Clay, and a response by Ambassador John C. Dreier, United States representative on the Council, delivered at Washington, D. C., June 25, 1952.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Interim report of the special grand jury impaneled by Judge John W. Holland in the United States District Court of Miami, Fla., March 5, 1952, for the investigation of crime and other matters.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Report by the Religious Liberty Committee to the State convention of the Knights of Columbus at Springfield, Ill., on May 26, 27, 1952.

By Mr. NIXON:

Editorials and news articles on a motion picture entitled "Walk East on Beacon."

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Peace and the U. N.," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in the Wall Street Journal of June 26, 1952.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bennett	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hill	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Magnuson	Tobey
Eastland	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McCarran	Welker
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Monroney	
Hayden	Mundt	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of

Colorado, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SEATON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the explanation by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] of the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, debate upon amendments to that bill be limited as follows: 1 hour on any amendment involving the Voice of America, and 1 hour in the case of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], with the time to be divided equally, and controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Nevada, in the event he is opposed to the amendment, or if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the distinguished minority leader or any other Senator whom he may designate, and that debate on all other amendments be limited to 30 minutes, or 15 minutes to a side, with the time to be controlled in the same manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I was not in the Chamber when the distinguished majority leader began his request. It is my intention to submit an amendment to the first committee amendment, so as to reduce the appropriation for the overseas branch of the Foreign Service. I would ask that for my amendment the same allotment of time be made as in the case of the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the amendment the Senator from Illinois has in mind and the amendment the Senator from South Dakota has in mind are almost identical.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois wish to have 1 hour allowed for debate on his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps the Senator from South Dakota and I can jointly sponsor an amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to obtain an agreement, I shall include provision for 1 hour for debate on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that, with the exceptions noted, the limitation of 30 minutes will apply to debate on all other amendments.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wishes to have 10 minutes——

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator from Arizona included in his request permission for the Senator from Delaware to speak?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; I meant to say that the proposed limitation would apply after the Senator from Delaware spoke.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may I have 3 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what the request is.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall restate it: I ask unanimous consent, first, that there be a morning hour, during which Senators may be permitted to transact routine business without debate, except that 3 minutes be allowed the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and 10 minutes be allowed the Senator from Delaware; that thereafter, following the opening statement by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, there be a limitation on debate on all amendments, as follows: One hour on any amendment involving the Voice of America; 1 hour on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; and I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wishes to have 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from South Dakota and I have consolidated our amendments, and we shall offer a joint amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Very well. Then I include in the request a provision that 1 hour be allowed on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Illinois; and that the time be divided equally, with 30 minutes to each side, to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], on the other side, if he is opposed to the amendment; or if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the distinguished minority leader or some other Senator whom he may designate; that debate on all other amendments be limited to 30 minutes in total, or 15 minutes to a side, with the time to be controlled in the same manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona include in the request a provision in regard to motions and appeals?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; that motions and appeals be treated in the same manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that in view of the fact that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I are consolidating our amendments, and for that reason it will be necessary to request the allowance of another hour, could not we have 40 minutes to a side on our amendment, in order that both of us may make our presentations?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I hope that an hour will be sufficient; but if the Senator from South Dakota insists upon it, I shall include in the request a provision for 40 minutes to a side on that amendment.

Mr. CASE. I believe that is proper, in view of the original request.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Reserving the right to object, I may say that some of my colleagues and I intend to present an amendment to provide an appropriation for the detection, apprehension, and deportation of wetbacks, which, in my opinion, is an important subject, and I would ask that we be given an hour on that, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I also include in my request, an hour on that amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. We may not need an hour.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Is that 1 hour, with the time equally divided?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It is 1 hour, with the time divided, 30 minutes to a side, to be controlled in the same manner as previously stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object can the majority leader tell me what his estimate is as to the time it will now take, if this unanimous-consent request is agreed to, to complete the consideration of this particular appropriation bill?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is what might be called the "$64 question." But I would say we ought to conclude the consideration of this bill by 3 or 4 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. What is the Senator's program, after that?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We wanted to take up House bill 7800, which is the social-security bill, if possible.

Mr. MORSE. Under the suggested unanimous-consent agreement, how much time would be available on amendments other than those to which 1 hour is allotted? Would the limitation be 30 minutes on all other amendments, 15 minutes to a side?

Mr. MCFARLAND. On amendments other than those pertaining to the Voice of America, the amendment of the Senators from South Dakota and Illinois, and the amendment of the Senator from New York, 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have certain comments I intend to make before the day is over, and some evidence that I wish to present to the Senate.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I assure the Senator he will have time, after we finish this bill.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit——

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to serve notice now that I have certain evidence that I want to submit to the Senate before the day is over, regarding what I consider to be the absolutely unwarranted conduct on the part of the Passport Division of the State Department in the handling of certain cases, such as the Linus Pauling case and the Owen Lattimore case. I cannot put myself in a position where a unanimous-consent agreement would prevent my presenting that evidence to the Senate and to the country today, with a thorough discussion of the problem, because it deals with certain basic questions of American lib-

erty and freedom. It deals with whether we are to protect innocent people from the kind of abuse of power that is being exercised by the Passport Division of the State Department. Therefore, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

TAX CASE OF WILLIAM RHODES DAVIS AND HIS AFFILIATED COMPANIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss how a $38,000,000 tax case was settled for $850,000 after the taxpayer had fired his other lawyers and hired William M. Boyle, Jr., former Democratic bigwig, and Daniel J. Hanlon, former Treasury Department official.

As of December 31, 1947, there were proposed tax assessments amounting to $38,149,741.60 pending against William Rhodes Davis and his affiliated companies—the Davis & Co., Inc.; W. R. Davis, Inc.; and Gibraltar Securities, Ltd.; official address care of James Lee Kauffman, 55 Liberty Street, New York City.

These assessments, representing deficiencies in the years 1936 to 1941, against William R. Davis and his companies had all been pending since early 1942 with the exception of the $9,000,000 assessment against the Gibraltar Securities, Ltd., which assessment was made in 1946.

Mr. Davis, through his affiliated companies, operated a big international oil brokerage business. His organization is reported to have been the owners of one of the largest oil refineries in Germany prior to World War II, and it was this group which was credited with having supplied Germany with a large part of her accumulated oil reserve prior to the outbreak of the war.

Mr. Davis had negotiated in the 1930's a brokerage agreement with the Mexican Government, whereby he obtained his supply from the confiscated oil fields in Mexico.

In the early stages of World War II, two of his tankers, the Mexican ship *Charles Racine* and the Mexican ship *Petter*, loaded with petroleum, were captured in restricted waters while attempting to run the British blockade.

The Davis & Co. had been claiming from the Government of Great Britain as compensation for this confiscated oil approximately $500,000 out of which would be deducted the lawyers' fees.

The Davis & Co. claimed that the oil was en route to a neutral country whereas the British Government claimed that the two tankers were captured in restricted waters while attempting to run the blockade.

This disputed claim for whatever it might be worth after the lawyers' fees had been paid, was assigned to the United States Government along with the $850,000 offer as full settlement of all their tax obligations totaling over $38,000,000.

Mr. Davis died August 2, 1941, while this multi-million-dollar tax case was in the process of investigation, and James Lee Kauffman, an attorney in New York City, who had been representing the companies, was appointed executor of the estate.

For the next several years this $38,000,000 tax claim remained in dispute, during which time the estate of William R. Davis and the various companies were represented before the Treasury Department by James L. Kauffman and other attorneys. However, no settlement could be agreed upon.

On August 6, 1945, following 3 years of unsuccessful negotiations, Mr. Kauffman, acting for the Davis estate and the Davis companies, canceled all powers of attorney which had been extended to their lawyers.

Three days later new powers of attorney were filed with the Treasury Department, naming William M. Boyle, Jr., and Daniel J. Hanlon as associate attorneys with Mr. Kauffman, thereby turning this $38,000,000 tax case over to Mr. Boyle and his partner.

Reading from "Who's Who," Mr. President, we find Mr. Boyle described as follows:

> Assistant Counsel, Truman's War Investigating Committee, 1941. Secretary and later executive assistant to Senator Harry S. Truman, 1942–1944.
>
> Served in supervisory capacity in his presidential campaign, 1948; executive vice chairman, Democratic National Committee, 1944 and 1945, and from February to August 1949.

Quoting further, Mr. President, from a United Press radio report, from Kansas City, Mo., we find Mr. Boyle described as follows:

> He's no newcomer to the ways of Washington. He went there years ago to serve as a special investigator for the Senator Truman committee. At that time an old Missouri pal named Harry Vaughn was Mr. Truman's secretary. When Vaughn went into the Army, Boyle became the Senator's secretary.
>
> Then he was named as executive assistant to Robert E. Hannegan in the 1944 Presidential campaign. After that he opened a law office in Washington. Like Mr. Truman, he went to the old Kansas City School of Law, from which he was graduated in 1926.

It should be noted that less than 3 months before, or shortly after landing his former boss in the White House, Mr. Boyle had taken his first major plunge into private law practice by opening an office in Washington.

During the succeeding months, while Mr. Boyle was gaining national recognition both as a powerful political figure as well as an influential Washington attorney, renewed negotiations to compromise this tax case for a few cents on the dollar were instituted.

Participating in these negotiations and in the final determination of the terms, the Government was represented by Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue; Daniel A. Bolich, who at that time was serving as special agent in charge in the New York office; and Charles Oliphant, the then chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Upon the recommendations of these three Government officials—Nunan, Bolich, and Oliphant—this $38,000,000 tax case was settled on March 15, 1948, for $850,000 plus the contested claim against the British Government, or less than 3 percent of the original proposed assessment.

One of the most interesting phases in this settlement is a statement made by Charles Oliphant, chief counsel of the Treasury Department, concurred in by Dan Bolich, in which he expressed "substantial doubts as to the ability of the Government to sustain the liabilities in an amount exceeding the sum herein offered by the taxpayers."

Significantly, all three of these once prominent tax officials who recommended this favorable compromise are today suffering from a severe case of "overexposure."

Joseph Nunan, who as Commissioner of Internal Revenue participated in the final determination of the compromise offer, is now being questioned by the Federal grand jury in New York regarding alleged acceptances of bribes while serving as a top Government tax official.

Dan Bolich, who during these negotiations was working in New York City as a special agent in charge, was promoted shortly thereafter to the position of Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington.

Soon after the tax scandal broke in 1951, Mr. Bolich was removed from that position as a part of the clean-up program. He too left the Government service for a more healthy climate.

Charles Oliphant, who signed this report as chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, resigned in a great fanfare of charges that he was being unjustly smeared and hurriedly departed from the Government service leaving many important questions unanswered regarding his close connection with certain recognized tax fixers.

This compromise tax case was approved by the Treasury Department under the same Secretary of Treasury, John W. Snyder, who for the past 6 years has nonchalantly been sitting on the lid of all the corruption which has recently been exposed in the Treasury Department.

This is only one of the scores of large tax cases which have been compromised for an insignificant fraction by the Treasury Department during the past several years.

No doubt many of these compromises can be fully justified; however, in the light of the laxity which has been exposed as existing in the Treasury Department at the upper level, all these cases should be reexamined.

Frankly, I see no reason why all compromise settlements should not automatically be publicized. There are but two important reasons why any tax case is properly reduced: First, the Government may recognize an error in the agent's computations; or, second, the taxpayer may be insolvent.

In this particular case I have made no effort to examine it from the standpoint of determining the accuracy of the Government's claims; however, if Mr.

Oliphant, Mr. Nunan, and Mr. Bolich were correct in their statements that they were recommending acceptance of this less-than-3-percent offer because they did not feel that in a showdown the Government could actually prove that the taxpayer owed an amount greater than that which was being offered in compromise, then the Government should have voluntarily reduced its claim accordingly.

For the Government to claim a $38,000,000 assessment against this taxpayer, thereby forcing him to hire expensive lawyers, when actually it did not think he owed anywhere near that amount, would constitute nothing short of blackmail.

If at any time the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington reviews a tax case which has been prepared by the agents in the field and the Review Board determines that the agents have overassessed the taxpayer, there is no reason for the Government's not telling the taxpayer that it has made an error and that it is reducing his liability accordingly.

On the other hand, if the taxpayer did owe the amount claimed, the settlement for less-than-3-percent is something which cannot be explained to the millions of other taxpayers who are being compelled to pay their tax obligations to the last dime.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. It seems like a boil on the neck of the body politic. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree.

Every American taxpayer must be guaranteed that the Government will recognize his right to have his tax case considered solely on its merits and not on the basis of whom he employs as an attorney or accountant. Under no circumstances can we condone a situation where any taxpayer can get the idea that he can have his tax claims successfully compromised for a few cents on the dollar, provided he will pay off the right attorney who has the required political connections.

The manner in which certain formerly obscure lawyers suddenly achieve widespread recognition as experts in the handling of problems relating to the Federal Government arouses strong suspicion that their extraordinary success is due to their administration connections and their ability to peddle such influence.

The reprehensible manner in which this practice of recognized "influence peddling" has been condoned and protected during the recent years by this "Cozy Deal" administration is something which the average American citizen cannot understand and will not forget.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to a consideration of H. R. 7289, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, I should like to make an explanatory statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield? I dislike to disturb his speech, but I must leave the floor to attend a committee meeting.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a question relative to section 208 of the bill which is now before the Senate. The question I had in mind was with reference to this section being in accordance with Senate bill 18 which was passed by the Senate, as I recall, last Saturday. As I understand the section would not apply to States east of the Mississippi where the doctrine of riparian rights prevails. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Let me say to the Senator, since he has to leave the floor, that I have had a conference within the past few minutes with the Senators from California, and I have partially agreed that I would accept their suggested amendment, together with the language of Senate bill 18, and take it to conference. The language of the amendment of the Senators from California, offered in the committee, was to be taken in place of the House provision.

I have agreed to take the amendment to the conference and we will work something out in the conference.

Mr. HILL. It is not the idea, is it, that the bill or any amendment to it would apply in any way to States east of the Mississippi, where the doctrine of riparian rights applies?

Mr. McCARRAN. Where the doctrine of riparian rights is in force, it would not apply.

Mr. HILL. It would not apply. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee had before it for consideration this year budget estimates for the fiscal year 1953 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, of almost a $1,250,000,000. With a deficit confronting this Nation of billions of dollars, we have passed the point where we can continue to pour out our fiscal and material resources in a never-ending stream without exerting maximum effort to reduce the total of Federal expenditures.

Economizing is not pleasant, but economy in Government must be achieved, or this country will collapse internally; and if that happens, our enemies abroad will have accomplished their purposes beyond their fondest hopes. With these thoughts in mind, the committee has considered each item on its merits and has effected sizable reductions in the budget estimates submitted to the Congress.

The bill as recommended by the committee is 18.3 percent under the budget and point 1 percent under the House. The total amount, recommended for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, is $1,015,016,735, which is $228,120,074 under the budget, and $1,906,996 under the House.

The committee recommends the elimination of the Jensen amendment and the substitution therefor of the Ferguson amendment on personal services, and the Ferguson-Byrd amendment on travel and the transportation of things. The committee further recommends that the same agencies exempted from the operation of these two amendments last year be exempted this year, with the addition of the field office service, and operational personnel of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, and the construction personnel of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. Where these two amendments have been applied the funds have been adjusted accordingly.

For the Department of State the recommendation of the committee is $214,338,730, which is 32.6 percent under the budget and point 7 percent under the House. The recommendation represents a reduction of $104,069,280 under the budget, and $1,649,652 under the House.

For the Department of Justice the recommendation of the committee is $184, 523,000, which is 2.8 percent under the budget and 0.2 percent over the House. The recommendation represents a reduction of $5,384,000 under the budget, and is $464,000 over the House.

For the Department of Commerce the recommendation of the committee is $588,606,305, which is 16.7 percent under the budget, and 0.1 percent under the House. The recommendation represents a reduction of $118,516,194 under the budget, and $963,194 under the House.

For the Judiciary the recommendation of the committee is $27,548,700, which is 0.5 percent under the budget, and 0.8 percent over the House. The recommendation represents a reduction of $150,600 under the budget, and $241,850 over the House.

Mr. President, I should like now to call the attention of the Senate to various items in the bill. For salaries and expenses, Department of State, the committee recommends $77,392,306, an increase of $1,392,306. The amount recommended is a reduction below the going rate for 1952 of $557,694. $946,000 of the increase is necessary because of the additional responsibilities involved in opening an embassy and consulates in Japan in fiscal year 1953, which expenditure was not required in fiscal year 1952. In connection with this appropriation item the committee is also recommending language put in by the House requiring that $20,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of State be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

For contributions to international organizations, the committee has restored a cut made by the House in the amount of $2,561,586, and is recommending a total for this item of $30,484,749, which amount is $1,961 below the budget estimate. This reduction was volunteered

by the Department and represents a reduction in the estimate for the International Hydrographic Office. The committee has stricken an amendment inserted by the House which would limit all contributions to international organizations to 33⅓ percent. The committee is in complete agreement with the House in this respect, but believes that some leeway must be given, because in the case of many of the organizations, they are about to start the third quarter of their fiscal year. Therefore, the committee has approved a substitute amendment which was included in the law for fiscal 1952, with the change to provide that after fiscal year 1953, no United States representative to any international organization shall make any commitment in excess of 33⅓ percent, which organization's United States contribution is contained in this bill. As is also provided in the House amendment, the committee recommends that inter-American organizations be exempt from the operation of this amendment. Mr. President, for international information and education activities, the committee is recommending the amount allowed by the House, $86,575,000 which is the same amount as allowed this year. The committee believes that a good job can be done with this amount.

The subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held long and exhaustive hearings on this item, and it was their considered judgment, concurred in by the full committee, that the amount recommended would allow this program to go forward at about the same rate as this year.

As the Senate knows, Dr. Wilson Compton has recently become the Administrator of the International Information Administration. The committee has been very much impressed by Dr. Compton. He has been forthright with the committee, and has his feet very much on the ground. Dr. Compton is a man with a broad background and a fine record of sound administration. We, in no way, wish to hinder Dr. Compton, but we do believe that this program must be slowed a little, until such time as Dr. Compton has had an opportunity to complete an internal reorganization in which he is now engaged. It was most refreshing to see that Dr. Compton is interested in facts, not glittering generalities. I, for one, have great hopes for this program under the able leadership of this fine Administrator.

Mr. President, I know that the argument will be made that we should appropriate more money for this item. However, I believe that if the proponents of such a move will stop and consider the situation for a moment, they will agree that an effective job can be done with the amount recommended. For too long a time, the efficiency of this program was justified by the amount of money asked for. It seemed to be a magic formula, that by appropriating more and more money, more and more efficiency resulted. Unfortunately, such did not prove to be the case. I, for one, believe that after Dr. Compton has been in this program for a year he will have it operating as a smoothly operating, effective, propaganda weapon, so that he can concentrate on that objective, and not be sidetracked with having to expand his activities at the same time. I hope that the committee recommendation will be agreed to.

Mr. President, on June 17 there appeared an item in the local press relative to a plan to appoint two Foreign Service officers to the staffs of two of the State governors. The subcommittee immediately called before it representatives of the Department of State and went into this matter. The justification given was that this was a part of the program to re-Americanize Foreign Service officers. The committee is in complete agreement with that objective, but does not believe that the talents of Foreign Service officers can best be utilized by assigning them to the staffs of governors. Accordingly, the committee is recommending a limitation in the bill which will prohibit funds appropriated in this bill from being used for these purposes.

Mr. President, the subcommittee heard a great deal of testimony relative to a very clever propaganda campaign to sell the people of this country, and particularly the school children, on the doctrine of one world government and world citizenship. The subcommittee held three hearings on this matter, one hearing in which the witness making the charge was heard, one hearing in which officials of the State Department were heard in rebuttal, and one hearing in which both sides were present. It seems that there is a group in UNESCO, a United Nations organization, as well as some thinking in the Department of State of the belief that our objective should be to set up one world government and have only one kind of citizenship—world citizenship. The committee had presented to it documentary proof of this insidious campaign. They feel that international cooperation is one thing, but that for us to stand idly by and appropriate funds to be used to destroy this country as a political entity is quite another. Accordingly they recommend a limitation in the bill which provides that none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay our contribution to any international organization which promotes the doctrine of one world government and world citizenship, nor shall any of the funds be used for promoting this doctrine. This limitation then not only applies to UNESCO and any other international organization in which we hold membership, but also applies to any activity in this respect that may be carried on by the State Department.

Mr. President, the committee is recommending the deletion of a rider put in by the House, the so-called Vatican amendment. The committee feels that religious issues should not be interjected into an appropriation bill.

For the Department of Justice, Mr. President, the committee recommends a total of $31,500,000, an increase of $464,000 over the House, but $5,384,000 under the budget. Two hundred and eighty thousand dollars of this increase is for general legal activites, and is primarily for the Criminal Division. This Division's workload has increased tremendously. One hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional United States marshals in Alaska. As the Senate knows, law enforcement in Alaska falls in the main on Federal officials. This problem is becoming increasingly severe and additional help is badly needed. The remaining amount of the increase, $84,000, is to complete a Federal jail in Anchorage, Alaska. The Department, under the instructions of the Congress, has tried to build this jail for $400,000. They have been unable to do so, even after reducing their plans to the bare minimum. The additional amount is required, and the committee recommends approval.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. How much is it proposed to spend on the Anchorage, Alaska, jail?

Mr. McCARRAN. A total of $484,000.

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator will permit me to make a brief observation, I have seen and inspected the present jail at Anchorage, Alaska. When I inspected this jail it was at midwintertime. It was thoroughly obsolete and outdated. I venture the opinion that at no place in the United States or in its Territories is there a more terrible place for the incarceration of prisoners than at Anchorage. Certainly if any appropriation was ever well founded, it is this one. Anchorage is a thriving, growing city. The process of justice will be greatly aided by the erection and maintenance of a good jail in Anchorage.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. I may add that the jail is frightfully overcrowded at the present time. It is in deplorable condition. The new jail cannot be built for $400,000. The Department estimates that $484,000 will be sufficient to build it, and has recommended such an appropriation. The committee is recommending the additional $84,000.

Mr. President, for the Department of Commerce the committee is recommending the inclusion of two new items. The first item is the census of governments and the amount recommended is $806,841. As the Senate knows, this census was provided for in a law passed by the Congress. It is to be taken every 5 years. Last year the Congress denied any funds and this is the second request. There is widespread interest in the item and the committee has allowed one-half of the requested amount, which will allow the Bureau of the Census to get started on this important piece of work.

The second item is $1,383,074 for transport aircraft development. This money is to be used to do research on the flight characteristics of commercial jet transports and to also determine what changes are necessary in airport specifications in order to accommodate this new type of aircraft. This research by the CAA will in no way duplicate that being carried on by the Air Force or any other defense agency. As Senators know, the flight characteristics and safety factors of commercial planes is entirely different from those which are found in military aircraft. The United States is

far behind foreign countries in this field and at the moment we are entirely dependent on other countries for a supply of commercial type jet transports. The committee strongly recommends that this item be approved.

For the judiciary, Mr. President, the committee recommends a total of $27,548,700, an increase of $241,850 over the House, but $150,600 under the budget; $91,850 of this increase is to restore a House cut which would eliminate some 52 deputy clerks throughout the country and impose a severe hardship on those wishing to do business with the Federal courts. Many Senators are interested in this item. The balance of the increase, or $150,000, is for the United States judicial system in the District of Columbia. This amount is badly needed if Federal courts and Federal judicial agencies in the District are to operate at the required efficiency. The Federal courts in the District have an extremely heavy workload and it has been necessary for the Congress to increase the number of judges in the District from time to time. The amount recommended will provide the supporting personnel, so that the increased number of judges will be able to carry out their assigned tasks.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to pay my compliments and respects to the members of the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and to thank them for their very fine assistance and the hard work that each of them has done on this bill. I also, at this time, wish to pay my respects and thank the full committee for the confidence they have expressed in the recommendations of the subcommittee. I wish also to pay my respects to the two fine young men sitting beside me who labored with me day and night for many, many weeks in preparing and perfecting the bill.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Salaries and expenses," on page 3, line 25, after the word "advance", to strike out "$76,000,000" and insert "$77,392,306."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is a substitute for the committee amendment just stated.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CASE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel reasonably certain that if we can obtain a unanimous-consent agreement regarding this bill, we can complete action on the bill early this afternoon. I have talked to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I believe he will be willing to consent now to the unanimous-consent agreement which I proposed a little while ago.

In order that all Senators may be informed, I shall restate the proposed agreement. I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation on debate on all amendments to the bill, as follows: On the amendment proposed jointly by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], 1 hour and 20 minutes in total, with the time to be divided equally; on any amendment involving the Voice of America, 1 hour; on the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and any other Senators who may join him in sponsoring the amendment, 1 hour; that in the case of all other amendments, debate be limited to 30 minutes; and, as I previously stated, that the time on the amendments be equally divided, and be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], in the event he is opposed to the amendment; or in the event he is in favor of the amendment, then by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the request include a provision in regard to the germaneness of amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. Amendments will have to be germane, for the bill is an appropriation bill.

I do not suppose Senators will care very much about any particular limitation in regard to debate on the bill itself, after the amendments are disposed of; but let us propose a limitation of 30 minutes on the bill, or 15 minutes to a side, with the time to be controlled in the same manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And with motions to be treated in the same manner?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; both motions and appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I simply wish to announce that during the debate on the bill I shall ask for time to make a few remarks, not to exceed 15 minutes in length, on certain problems connected with recent developments concerning the Passport Division of the State Department. If I am unable to secure that time, I now serve notice that I shall offer an amendment to the bill for the purpose of obtaining the necessary time to discuss the Passport Division matter.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask a question: In view of what my distinguished colleague from Oregon has said, would it be possible to agree to provide as much as 1 hour to a side, let us say, for debate on the bill, so that the Senator from Oregon will have the 15 minutes he will need?

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, debate on the bill will come at the end of debate on the amendments. The Senator from Idaho does not mean to suggest that 1 hour to a side for debate on the bill itself be allowed, does he?

Mr. WELKER. I understand that the Senator from Oregon wishes to speak for 15 minutes, and certainly 15 minutes should be allowed for debate on the bill itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, let us allow a total of 1 hour for debate on the bill itself. I am willing to modify the proposed agreement in that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator from Arizona proposing that there be 1 hour to a side for debate on the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; 1 hour on the bill, 30 minutes to each side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask a question: When the majority leader referred to amendments in regard to the Voice of America, he meant to include the entire section dealing with education, and so forth, did he not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy the Senator from Arizona has extended to me. I really do not believe it will be necessary to increase the time for debate on the bill itself, because I believe sufficient time will be available for my purpose during the debate on the amendments. If not, I can offer an amendment, proceed to debate it, and then withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$77,392,306" and insert "$72,936,907."

In the committee amendment on page 64, it is proposed to strike out line 16 and to renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

In the committee amendment on page 65, it is proposed to strike out line 24 and to renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the amendment is offered by both the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Illinois. Is this the amendment on which there is a limitation on debate of 1 hour and 20 minutes?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. The amendment is offered jointly by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself.

Mr. President, the briefest way to describe this amendment is to say that it seeks to apply the Ferguson amendment to the Foreign Service of the State Department.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, there is an exemption, so far as the Foreign Service is concerned, from the limitation of 90 percent on budget estimates.

This amendment would strike out that exemption and would reduce the total appropriations for the Domestic and Foreign Service of the State Department from $76,000,000, as passed by the House, to $72,936,907.

The committee voted to increase the amount allowed by the House of Representatives from $76,000,000 to $77,392,306.

Mr. President, my interest in the astounding growth of the Foreign Service of the State Department stems from reading an item to the effect that our newly reopened Embassy in Japan, is to start with a personnel of 214 Americans and 257 non-Americans, or a total of 471; while at the time our Embassy in Japan was closed, in 1941, it had only 82 American employees.

In other words an increase of nearly 300 percent is proposed.

Because of that astounding fact, I endeavored to secure from the State Department statistics regarding the growth of our representation in various countries. The remarks I shall make are based upon what I have discovered in connection with that study.

Let me state for the benefit of Senators who are on the floor at this time that this astounding growth in the Foreign Service has been observed by others than myself. Disinterested people working in the field have noted it and are commenting on the adverse effects of this overstaffing.

For instance, we find in the New York Times of as recent a date as June 20, 1952, that Mr. Michael L. Hoffman, a special correspondent of the New York Times, in writing from Bonn, Germany, began his dispatch of June 19 with the following statement:

> The United States Government's influence as a promoter of European economic cooperation has suffered a marked decline lately among top-level Western Europeon officials.

And the reason Mr. Hoffman gives for the decline of our influence abroad is as follows—and I quote directly from Mr. Hoffman's dispatch, as printed in the New York Times on June 20:

> There are so many American officials dealing at so many levels with European governments on so many different aspects of economic policy that very often one branch of the United States Government does not even know what another is doing in a European capital.

Mr. Hoffman reports that one official recently said:

> We don't mind having Ambassador So-and-So visit us, but we do mind his bringing his whole court along.

Mr. Hoffman goes on to say:

> When fifteen or twenty United States officials, including men of ambassadorial rank, generals, and ministers, descend on a small European capital they all have to be entertained, often by officials who can barely make ends meet on low European salaries. They all have to be "briefed" and they all have to meet the important people in the local administration—all of whom have plenty of work of their own to do.
>
> IMPEDIMENT TO OBJECTIVES
>
> The European officials on whom these burdens fall are convinced that overelaboration of American operations in Europe is both hurting American-European relations and impeding the advance toward commonly held objectives.

So, Mr. President, I have offered this amendment, which would seek to apply to the Foreign Service of the State Department the same 90 percent limitation on Budget estimates that is proposed by the Ferguson amendment for the domestic activities and operations of the State Department.

I congratulate the committee on the amendments it has proposed in general to the State Department title of the bill for they represent, in the main, a reduction below the Budget estimate and also impressive cuts below this year's appropriation and the amounts allowed by the House committee and the House, with the particular exception of the Foreign Service. It is difficult for me to understand how or why the committee failed to make a corresponding reduction in that item.

In the case of the domestic staff of the State Department the committee's report points out that, by the application of the Ferguson amendment, the current rate of employment would be reduced by 383 positions.

In the case of the Foreign Service, however, the budget estimate contemplated 8,548 employees on a full-year basis, and the committee has recommended a reduction of only $25,000 and the elimination of only two employees from the request, the two employees who have been referred to in the Senate as ambassadors to the States. Why the committee should cut the domestic service by 383 employees—which I applaud—and then recommend an increase of 25 positions in the Foreign Service, in the face of the evidence that the Foreign Service is cluttered up with so many employees as to interfere with the attainment of our objectives abroad, I am unable to understand.

We must recognize, of course, that the comparison with the 1952 appropriations includes a supplemental appropriation for this year; and I hope that the committee has impressed upon the State Department the necessity of so operating that no deficiency bill will be necessary next year.

The core of the State Department's work and funds is represented by the item "Salaries and expenses," and it is to that item and the committee amendments which affect it that I am directing my attention. On the other items, I believe the committee has made reductions and other economizing proposals, such as the limitation on American contributions to international organizations, which will be applauded by everyone interested in efficiency and economy. Investigations which I have been making during the past month or more have convinced me that at least the recommended 10 percent domestic cut is in order. Specifically, I believe the Intelligence area, the Bureau of Economic Affairs, the Bureau of Public Affairs and the Bureau of United Nations affairs all can stand sizable reductions in staff, and it is my hope that the reduction will be applied in those areas.

But I am sorry that the committee did not see fit to apply the Ferguson amendment—the 10-percent cut—to the much larger and equally overstaffed Foreign Service.

On April 4, Representative BONNER, in discussing this subject in the House of Representatives, said:

> During the hearings of the Committee on Expenditures in the Philippines, I asked the Ambassador how many employees were in the American Embassy, both citizens of the United States and Filipinos. His answer was 1,200. I could not believe it, so I asked him to check the figures * * * he came back finally with an answer of 1,200. * * * Not only that, but in other cases wherever we visited, we repeatedly saw a surplus of employees, and we heard it stated time after time that there was an unnecessary amount of civil service or other employees attached to our foreign Embassies.

I began to look into this situation further and was amazed to learn that we send almost five times as many people to 15 of the foreign governments who maintain large Embassies here as they send to us. We employ, according to the New York Times of June 18, some 10,609 persons in those countries—48 percent of them Americans, the others locals—while those governments are represented here by a total of only 2,359 persons. So the State Department employs five times as many persons to conduct its business in those 15 countries as they find necessary in order to transact their business in the United States.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Normally it is believed that the productivity of American workers is greater than the productivity of foreign workers. But would the figures the Senator from South Dakota has given indicate that the productivity of American diplomats is somewhat less than the productivity of foreign diplomats?

Mr. CASE. That, at least, must be the estimate of the productivity of our workers by the State Department itself.

Mr. President, the New York Times, on June 18, carried a United Press statement which began with this startling sentence:

> The United States maintains almost 5 times as many persons in 15 selected foreign countries as their respective governments send here.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

> DIPLOMATIC STAFFS IN LANDS OVERSEAS
>
> WASHINGTON.—The United States maintains almost 5 times as many persons in 15 selected foreign countries as their respective governments send here.
>
> In a State Department listing, the size of the staffs of 15 of the largest foreign Embassies here were compared with that of the

American Embassies in those countries. The findings indicated the growth of the worldwide influence and responsibility of the United States.

These countries were included in the list: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, United Kingdom and the U. S. S. R.

A breakdown in part shows that this country employs 10,609 persons in those 15 countries, including colonial possessions. Of that number, foreigners make up more than half of the United States overseas staff. Americans total 4,995 or 48 percent, while nonnationals total 5,614 or 52 percent.

In turn, these foreign countries employ 2,359 persons in Washington, but prefer to send their own nationals to fill the Embassy staffs. United States citizens number only 224 or just under 10 percent of the total.

In Moscow, Russian employees at the American Embassy outnumber American citizens 94 to 58, for a total of 152, while in Washington the Soviet employs no Americans and 129 of their own nationals.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I recognize that our foreign relations are more complex than they used to be. But one would think that this growing complexity would be reflected in larger representations to the United States as well as from the United States.

For nearly 2 months, I have been trying to get some information and meaningful figures from the Department on this situation. I haven't had much luck, but what I have been given may surprise you. After waiting 4 weeks for a reply, on May 27 I was given a list of State Department employees in certain overseas posts that shows the tremendous growth in our representation abroad.

Let me give a few examples.

In England, in 1940, we had 37 officer personnel; in 1945, at the conclusion of the war, we had 69; and in 1952, we had 169. In other words, with all the intricate and complex relationships we had with England during the war, the State Department, during that period had an officer personnel of only 69 in 1945, whereas, in 1952, in the postwar period, the number grew to 169. The total State Department personnel in England grew from 215 in 1940 to 472 in 1945, and to 732 in 1952.

Think of it, Mr. President, from a personnel in 1945, of 472, to 732 in 1952, Those are not my figures. They are not casual figures. They are the figures supplied to me, perhaps somewhat reluctantly, but supplied, nevertheless, by the State Department.

In Argentina, in 1940, we had officer personnel of only 22; in 1945, that had grown to 36; and in 1952, it had grown to 41. State Department personnel in Argentina in 1940 numbered 68; in 1945, 137; and in 1952, 215. What possible explanation is there, Mr. President, for that increase in personnel in Argentina from 68 in 1940 to 215 in 1952?

In Mexico in 1940, our officer personnel numbered only 73; today it numbers 109. All State Department personnel in Mexico numbered 209 in 1940, and it numbers 542 in 1952. What possible explanation can there be for an increase from 209 in 1940 to 542 in 1952?

In Belgium, in 1940, our affairs were handled by 8 officers and a total of 33 State Department personnel. At the end of 1945, our Embassy in Belgium had 25 officers, compared with 8, 5 years before; 96 in total personnel, compared with 38 in 1940. But today, in Belgium, we have 42 officers, compared with 8 in 1940, and a total of 266 for all State Department personnel in 1952, compared with 38 in 1940.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do these figures include the mutual security personnel?

Mr. CASE. They are figures from the State Department. They do not include mutual security personnel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in my remarks at this point an exchange of letters with the Department setting forth these and other figures for various countries which tell the story of our vastly expanded overseas representation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1952.*

Mr. EDWIN N. MONTAGUE,
Director, Office of Personnel,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONTAGUE: Will you kindly supply me with the figures showing the persons on duty for the State Department as of March 15, or some close-by calendar date for the years 1935, 1940, 1945, 1950, and 1952 in the countries of Argentina, Belgium, Cuba, England, France, Iceland, India, Iran, Japan, and Mexico. Also, in the capital cities of each of those countries for the same dates.

Thanking you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 27, 1952.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please refer to your letter of May 1, 1952, in which you requested certain employment figures for the years 1935, 1940, 1945, 1950, and 1952.

The number of American employees of the Department in the countries and capitals you mentioned are shown in the attached table I for the years 1950 and 1952. Considerable research in files which have been retired to storage would be required to extract comparable data for the earlier years. Figures are available, however, of the number of personnel, other than clerical and custodial employees at each post for all the years in which you are interested. These are a reliable indication of the general increase in strength, and are shown in table II. All figures are as of approximately April 1.

In general, this growth in the Department's personnel requirements abroad reflects the increased leadership and responsibilities of the United States in world affairs. It includes personnel to carry out new programs such as those of the International Information Administration and the Technical Cooperation Administration, and to provide administrative services abroad to other United States agencies such as the Mutual Security Administration.

In some of the countries listed, the increase in strength has been proportionately greater that for the Foreign Service as a whole due to changes in world conditions. You will note for example, that in New Delhi, now the capital of an independent India, we had no representation before the war, but maintain a sizable mission there today.

It is hoped that this information will be useful to you, and if I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to write.

Sincerely yours.

E. N. MONTAGUE,
Director of Personnel.

TABLE I.—*Number of Foreign Service employees, selected posts (includes all American personnel)*

Country or capital	April 1950	April 1952
Argentina	83	86
Buenos Aires	83	86
Belgium	79	94
Brussels	66	79
Cuba	77	89
Habana	72	85
England	248	277
London	230	261
France	340	438
Paris	298	388
Iceland	21	23
Reykiavik	21	23
India	98	200
New Delhi	47	118
Iran	50	131
Tehran	45	115
Japan	96	218
Tokyo	61	165
Mexico	270	282
Mexico City	155	171

TABLE II.—*Number of Foreign Service employees, selected posts (officer personnel only)*

Country or capital	1935	1940	1945	1950	1952
Argentina	17	22	36	47	41
Buenos Aires	17	22	36	47	41
Belgium	14	8	25	35	42
Brussels	8	4	16	26	33
Cuba	19	25	36	38	42
Habana	16	22	32	34	38
England	37	45	69	122	169
London	22	33	58	106	155
France	53	53	69	142	207
Paris	35	33	53	110	176
Iceland	0	1	5	7	8
Reykjavik	0	1	5	7	8
India	12	16	24	64	91
New Delhi	0	0	7	33	45
Iran	3	7	15	29	53
Tehran	3	7	15	24	46
Japan	24	29	0	49	74
Tokyo	13	20	0	31	53
Mexico	58	73	109	111	109
Mexico City	18	22	54	58	62

JUNE 4, 1952.

Mr. E. N. MONTAGUE,
Director of Personnel,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONTAGUE: Thank you for your letter of May 27, replying to mine of May 1. As you will see by referring to my letter of May 1, I asked for "figures showing the persons on duty for the State Department" in the various countries and for the years listed. You kindly furnished me with the number of Americans working at the various posts for two of the five specified years and the number of officer personnel at the various posts for each of the 5 years.

What I should like to have is the total number of employees, American and non-American, for each of the specified countries for as many of the specified years or other years as possible.

Because the State Department appropriation bill will be before the Senate for consideration shortly, I must ask that this information be supplied as quickly as possible. Thank you.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 13, 1952.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: Please refer to your letter of June 4, 1952, in which you requested additional information concerning the number of State Department employees in certain countries.

We have compiled for your use employment figures for the years 1940, 1945, 1950, and 1952. These include all persons on the Department's rolls in any capacity and without distinction as to nationality or the appropriation from which they are paid. In 1940 and 1945 all these employees were paid from Department's own appropriation. In 1950 and 1952 the rolls include personnel engaged for new postwar programs which have their own appropriations. As mentioned in my previous letter, these include such things as the information and point 4 programs and administrative support personnel for the Mutual Security Administration. These operations, together with the leading role of the United States in world affairs, have increased substantially the personnel requirements of the Department.

I hope this information will meet your needs, even though it is not possible to supply you with similar data for any year prior to 1940. Files of that period have been retired, and only the information on officer strength previously furnished remains available.

If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to write.

Sincerely yours,

E. N. MONTAGUE,
Director of Personnel.

Personnel on duty for State Department, selected posts

Country or capital	July 1940	July 1945	April 1950	April 1952
Argentina	68	137	212	215
Buenos Aires	68	137	212	215
Belgium	38	96	251	266
Brussels	15	69	198	211
Cuba	73	153	150	162
Habana	66	128	139	152
England	215	472	703	732
London	166	389	615	646
France	185	413	1,006	1,104
Paris	132	318	852	942
Iceland	2	14	36	38
Reykjavik	2	14	36	38
India	68	162	785	887
New Delhi	0	52	291	362
Iran	29	75	274	355
Tehran	29	67	239	309
Japan	132	0	245	367
Tokyo	78	0	139	243
Mexico	209	443	530	542
Mexico City	35	235	317	333

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the persons to whom I am referring are State Department overseas personnel. Some of them do provide administrative services, liaison, and so forth, in connection with mutual security, but are not mutual security personnel which are covered in appropriations for the Mutual Security Administration. A total attack on this overseas representation will have to include examination of the mutual security bill when it comes before the Senate. But this is a good place to start.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to refer again to the dispatch of Michael L. Hoffman, written from Bonn, Germany, which was published in the New York Times on June 20, 1952:

There are so many American officials dealing at so many levels with European governments on so many different aspects of economic policy that very often one branch of the United States Government does not even know what another is doing in a European capital. Rightly or wrongly, Europeans who have to deal with United States agencies believe that a great deal of this activity is solely a result of the efforts on the part of various Americans to justify what are, on the whole, rather pleasant jobs. * * *

European officials on whom these burdens fall, the Times continues, are convinced that overelaboration of American operations in Europe is both hurting American-European relations and impeding the advance toward commonly held objectives.

Despite the tremendous postwar growth in our foreign representation, the committee recommends an increase in the appropriation of approximately $900,000, and 25 more positions. The justification for this increase is supposed to lie in the reopening of our embassy in Japan.

Mr. President, the mention of Japan brings out the astonishing fact that when we close an embassy in the Far East we do not take anyone off the payroll, and when we open an embassy we put on three times as many persons as were employed there before. When we were kicked out of China the State Department said, "We do not want to discharge all these people. We will simply use them somewhere else."

Representative CLEVENGER, on April 2, had this to say in the House with reference to what happened when we were kicked out of China:

When we discontinued the missions to China the request was made by the State Department to keep those people on the payroll and to assign them to the periphery areas around China that they might be there when we needed them. As far as I know, we have been paying them all; I have never seen any place where they have been removed; so I think possibly in view of what is going on in China, we might decide that they are not going to be needed right away in Communist China and use some of the money to pay the new personnel in Japan.

I do not know exactly where these personnel were put in the "periphery," but I would assume that we had representation in southeast Asia, the Philippines, with 1,200 employees, and elsewhere in the Far East, on the periphery, before these employees had to leave China. Why not now send them to Japan?

Even if more personnel are needed in reopening relations again with Japan, certainly we do not need nearly three times as many as we had before the war, despite our increased interest and responsibilities, and considering also the tremendous number of the military there.

Apparently the State Department wants 214 Americans and 257 non-Americans for the Japanese Embassy, a total of 471. Before the war we got along with 82 Americans for the State Department in all Japan. Even when we were governing the country, the State Department had 154 persons there, and now the request is for 60 more Americans, plus non-Americans. The explanations of what they will all do—which Senators may read at pages 123, 124, and pages just before and after, in the Senate hearings—are pretty nebulous.

It appears that the Department will maintain what amounts to a Department of Commerce for Japan, reporting and analyzing all phases of her economic life, including, to quote one witness, "whether or not it is going to be necessary for them to apply for loans." Evidently we cannot wait to find a new area for the beneficence of our taxpayers.

Mr. President, I wish every Member of Congress could have seen the play Call Me Madam. One foreign country was found whose representative had the courage to stand up and say, "We are going to solve our own problems, and we respectfully decline this loan." But they were told, "In return for your courtesy, we are not going to loan you only $100,000,000 but $200,000,000."

Apparently the State Department has adopted that philosophy, and now it is placing in Japan a large additional number of persons, "to determine whether or not it is going to be necessary for them to apply for loans," without waiting for Japan to say that loans are necessary.

The most common defense of the size of our Foreign Service, probably, is that it performs services for many agencies other than the State Department. That is true. But in the bill before us today what we are considering is the Service principally as it operates for the Department itself. For, in addition to the $52,000,000 we are here asked to provide for the State Department, the Foreign Service gets another $25,000,000 from other agencies to employ another 4,600 persons to perform "outside" services. I respectfully refer Senators to page 22 of the hearings.

The three amendments I propose, dealing with the Foreign Service, are simply an application of the Ferguson amendment, the 10-percent cut, to this area as it has been applied by the committee to the domestic area and to other items of the State Department's budget. One part refers to the dollars-and-cents figures.

I should like to ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the three amendments may be voted on as one, because they all pertain to the same objective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the three amendments will be voted on en bloc.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the figure of $72,936,907 which I propose to substitute for the committee figure was arrived at in this way: The Department asked, for the Foreign Service, $36,741,685 for personal services; $5,637,616 for travel and $2,174,687 for transportation of things. Those are the items the Ferguson amendment has been applied to on the domestic side, with one minor exception. The amendment usually is applied to transportation of things other than mail. I was unable to get that breakdown for the Foreign Service readily, in the short time we have had, so I have applied it to the entire "Transportation of things" item. Ten percent of the three items of Foreign Service budget estimates which I have cited is $4,455,399. Deducting that from the committee figure of $77,392,306 leaves us with a total of $72,936,907.

The Ferguson amendments to sections 604 and 605 are on pages 64 to 66 of

the bill. As reported by the committee, they exempt the Foreign Service. I would strike that exemption. Then I propose an actual application of the Ferguson formula to the figure at the bottom of page 3. This seems to be the way in which the committee itself proceeded where it has applied the Ferguson reduction. It really takes a double crack at it, but it does not double the cut, because the over-all provision merely would exempt the Foreign Service from the effects of the Ferguson rider.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks on these particular amendments, I should like to quote the incisive summary of the ills of our Foreign Service written by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his book, Economy in the National Government. After discussing domestic overstaffing, which, by the way, he believes requires more than a 10-percent reduction, he says this:

> There is much the same degree of overstaffing in the overseas branches of the Department of State. * * * Staffs are multiplied, the pace is leisurely, and useless paper work abounds in order to create a semblance of business. There is little doubt, therefore, that the Department of State is phlegmatic and fat. A reducing diet—supplemented by skillful, yet rigorous, surgical operations—would help to restore the Department to better health. This would save money for the taxpayers and increase the efficiency of the Department.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have proposed that the Ferguson amendment be applied to the Foreign Service of the State Department and that the exemptions applying to it be eliminated from the bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from South Dakota have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. CASE. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, in the offering of which I have joined. I offered an amendment similar to this to the appropriation bill last year, but it was defeated. I am very glad the Senator from South Dakota has taken up the matter this year, and I congratulate him upon the factual study which he has made.

I believe there is little doubt but that the Foreign Service of the State Department is overstaffed. The Senator from South Dakota has given a detailed analysis by embassies and countries. As I remember the rough, over-all figures, in about 1941 there were approximately 4,000 employees in all branches of the State Department. Now there are 4,500 at home, and 8,500 abroad, a total of 13,000. That figure is exclusive of the numbers in the information and education service, in which the total number is almost equal.

I think the Department of State is characterized by administrative elephantiasis and suffers administratively from overweight in much the same way that individuals suffer from overweight. I have recently been reading articles on the effects of obesity upon the health of individuals. Obesity is said to be the greatest single ailment from which the American population suffers at the present time. The fatter a person is, the greater is the strain upon his heart. Incidentally, obesity seems somewhat to slow up his mental processes, also. So doctors are trying to get the American people to go upon reducing diets, and become more like the Uncle Sam we used to picture. I think this is a very beneficial effort.

I am of the opinion that overweight has the same effect administratively upon a department that it has upon an individual. When one of the departments multiples the number of its employees, as the Department of State has done, the difficulties of the department increase in geometric ratio. In fact, we really should have a new Malthusian law of administrative application, namely, that as personnel increases arithmetically, administrative red tape increases geometrically.

It is the testimony of a great many diplomats that they are so busy filling out forms and approving housekeeping details for their personnel that they do not have much chance to think about or to frame policy. The department has a touching faith that the more people it can hire, the more readily it can solve problems. It believes in intellectual formations of mass depth. It treats the decision of policy as though it were an infantry organization. Of course, that is not a correct attitude.

Not only is thought inhibited, but the necessity for communication increases. Before a policy can be agreed upon, there must be horizontal consultation among persons in the same echelon of the administrative hierarchy, in order that plans may be formulated and then the plans must move vertically upward through the administrative hierarchy. So, although there is vertical consultation, it is also necessary to have transverse consultation between one echelon and its diagonal superior. Therefore, really the consultations describe the full 360 degrees of a circle and the personnel spend their time largely talking with one another, rather than in doing the business of the United States of America.

I believe we should begin to apply a reducing diet to the Department of State. We should begin to put the Department on more rigorous fare.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota. I have joined with him in the amendment, in this initial beginning to reduce administrative elephantiasis in the State Department, which would afford leaders of the State Department an opportunity to think a larger percentage of the time, and to increase the efficiency of this agency of the United States, and save money for the Government as well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 40 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. How much time remains on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. At the outset, I may say that the matter which has been brought forward by the able Senator from South Dakota and the able Senator from Illinois has been before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and before the full committee, as well. It should be remembered that in the Foreign Service there are many elements: the information program, the point 4 program, the mutual security and economic programs, the Department of Defense and mutual security military programs, plus military attachés and Marine guards. The personnel for all these activities are in the service which the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Illinois propose to reduce.

Mr. President, any attempt on the part of this body to reduce the funds proposed by the committee for the Foreign Service or other parts of the Department of State represents a most serious threat to the effective conduct of foreign relations of this country in a perilous period.

Your subcommittee, over a period of weeks, has held most exhaustive hearings on every phase of operation of the Department of State, including the Foreign Service. It was the considered judgment of the subcommittee, as unanimously approved by the full Appropriations Committee, that the over-all reduction of approximately $1,000,000 below the 1952 appropriation is the maximum reduction which could be accomplished by the Department and still retain adequate resources to accomplish the functions imposed upon the Department by the present world situation.

As my colleagues are aware, I have not been a consistent supporter of many phases of the foreign policy of the present administration. However, it is my firm conviction that in the Foreign Service Establishment of the Department of State—which serves not only the Department of State but all other departments of the Government having foreign operations—that we have a strong, commendable group of career representatives, the existence of which should not be jeopardized by arbitrary and forced attrition.

If the 10-percent reduction were to be made in the staff of the Foreign Service, it would represent approximately 850 positions in a total complement of approximately 8,500 serving in 75 countries in which over 300 posts are operating. It is interesting to note that over 160 of the Foreign Service posts have an existing staff of 25 employees or less. Thus, to apply any radical reduction in the number of employees would seriously restrict the staffs at a large number of posts which have a very limited number of employees at present.

I have referred to the career nature of the Foreign Service personnel structure. Not so many years ago the only persons who could afford to enter the Foreign Service Establishment of this country were those with private incomes or resources, and this factor rather seriously handicapped the Department in maintaining a well-balanced and well-rounded representation of the American

people in foreign lands. This situation no longer exists and today it may be said that the Foreign Service is truly representative of the average intelligent American citizen, drawn from all States of the Union, educated in a representative group of our institutions of higher education, and fully indoctrinated with the zeal for the American and democratic way of life. The applicants for this service acquire years of specialized training in foreign affairs, including language specialization. Any reduction in the Service would not only be applied to those with fewer years of tenure but would disrupt the career structure upon which many young men of our country have planned their future.

Between 1946 and 1952 the Foreign Service has reduced its total positions from 10,455 to 8,694. At the same time it has been increasingly difficult, particularly in view of the demands of defense mobilization of both Government and industry, to recruit the number of applicants of suitable caliber to maintain an adequate staff. The number of applicants to take examinations to enter the career Foreign Service has fallen off by 50 percent—from 2,015 in 1948 to 1,090 in 1951. This downward trend in applicants has continued through the current year. If we were to disturb the career aspect of the service by arbitrary reduction in its total staff, recruiting in the future would undoubtedly be rendered more difficult by reason of the potential insecurity of the Service as a career.

As pointed out before, it is important to note that the Foreign Service represents all agencies of this Government.

I wish to repeat that, so that those who listen to me may understand. As pointed out before, it is important to note that the Foreign Service represents all agencies of this Government.

I come back to the agencies to which I referred at the outset, the information program, the point 4 program, the mutual security and economic programs, the Department of Defense, mutual security, and military programs, plus military attachés and marine guards. All these agencies are represented in the group which Senators would reduce arbitrarily by an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

This subject has been gone into at length over the years by the subcommittee hearing the appropriations in hand. Hearings have been held on it, and consideration has been given to the question of reduction. I invite the attention of the able Senators who sponsor this amendment to the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has not supported by his vote all these agencies abroad. However, the agencies have been established by law. They must be staffed, and the staffs must be paid.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the able chairman of the committee that I respect his position with respect to the authorizing legislation in connection with many of these programs. That is why I thought his feelings would not be too badly hurt if we tried to bring a little more order into the allowances for personal services.

Is it not a fact that there is a separate item in the bill for the informational and educational activities, namely, an item in the amount of $86,000,000? The amendment which the Senator from Illinois and I offer does not go to the informational and educational activities, the $86,000,000 figure. It is applied to the item for salaries and expenses.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; but the personnel representative of the total personnel in the embassies, and that total is what the Senator is driving at by his amendment.

Mr. CASE. The amendment which we have offered applies to the figure recommended by the committee of $77,392,000, but does not go to the international informational and educational activities, which constitute a separate item.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. To that extent it seems to me that the answer which the chairman has been giving, to the effect that we would be hurting the information program, is somewhat modified. That is a separate item.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the total personnel in the embassies is made up partly of personnel in all these agencies.

Mr. CASE. I will say to the able Senator that I asked the Department for some figures in that connection, and was given the following breakdown of the $86,000,000: $18,000,000-plus for domestic personal services; $17,088,356 for overseas personal services; $4,471,000 for travel; $2,874,000 for transportation of things. In other words, in the $86,000,000 item there is $17,088,356 for overseas personal services. That is why I felt that we were on solid ground in saying that we were not striking at the personal services in connection with the informational program.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that it would be difficult to conduct a propaganda campaign by keeping everyone in this country. Employees must go overseas to carry on that work.

Mr. CASE. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. If we want to abandon these programs, let us abandon them by repealing the statutes which created them. But inasmuch as they were created by statute, they must of necessity be staffed, and when they are staffed we must pay the staffs.

Mr. CASE. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. In the $86,000,000 figure there is $18,000,000 for domestic personal services and $17,000,000-plus for overseas personal services. Those are both in the $86,000,000 figure, which we are not touching at all. I grant that there must be some overseas personal service, but that is the other item, not touched by my amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that the information program cannot carry on the overseas service for the Foreign Service.

Mr. CASE. There are other parts of the Foreign Service, to be sure; but I thought the Senator's main objection to the amendment was that we might hurt the informational program.

Mr. McCARRAN. I fear that the Senator is being led astray by the very thing which perplexed the chairman of the subcommittee, a subject into which he went at length, not only this year but in years past, and into which he will go again next year. My leaning is toward the very thing which the Senator is driving at. I have voted, and will continue to vote, to reduce expenditures wherever they can be reduced. The point I am endeavoring to make is that we cannot destroy these agencies completely at one fell swoop. We must reduce as we can, while maintaining efficiency. That is my position. I say to the Senator, with all due respect, that if he imposes on the bill the amendment which he now sponsors, in my judgment he will cripple the service which has been established by statute.

As pointed out before, it is important to note that the Foreign Service represents all agencies of this Government, including the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, and, further, about 40 percent of its facilities are devoted to providing consular and other reporting services to United States citizens and private enterprise. Only 25 percent of its resources are devoted to international negotiations and the normal conduct of foreign affairs.

I request the support of my colleagues in sustaining the committee's recommendation in the funds provided for the Department of State, particularly the Foreign Service.

In conclusion I may say that the very thought which has been expressed by the able Senator from South Dakota and which has also been expressed rather picturesquely by the able Senator from Illinois, with reference to the overcorpulence of the State Department, has been considered by the subcommittee, by the chairman of the subcommittee, and worked into the bill as carefully as it was possible to do without destroying the effectiveness and efficiency of that which the statute requires we carry out.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show the number of personnel in the Foreign Service. We are at times misled by the number of persons who are connected with our embassies in foreign countries. We are inclined to think of all of them as being in the Foreign Service. I want to make sure that the RECORD shows the figures. I feel that there are too many persons in the various embassies, but that the Foreign Service should not be held accountable for many of those in the embassies. I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota answer that point a little later if he has the answer. For instance, my figures show 38 persons in the Embassy at Iceland.

As to how many of them are Foreign Service personnel I do not know. Many of them are there on special missions, but assigned to the Embassy. Several years ago when I visited Mexico City there were 380 persons in the Embassy and in various offices connected with the Embassy in Mexico City. How many of them were Foreign Service personnel is a different question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I draw the attention of the Senator to certain figures. I do not have the figures for Iceland before me, but I do have the figures for Mexico City. The total number of Americans in the Mexico City Embassy is 219.

Mr. FERGUSON. Two hundred and nineteen is the total as of today. I was speaking about 3 or 4 years ago, when I visited there.

Mr. McCARRAN. The figures I gave are as of this year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not have the figures for this year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of the 219, 126 are in the Foreign Service, 38 in Information Service, and 55 in point 4 service, making a total of 219.

What confuses those who look into the bill is the fact that there is an intermingling of agencies of the Government in its foreign embassies. They are all seated and centered in the embassies. We think that there are too many persons in personnel. As a matter of fact, they are there by reason of the fact that they represent different activities provided for by statute.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. With respect to Mexico City, the figures which the Senator from Nevada gave are the figures for this year. I was talking about the time when I visited the Embassy at Mexico City. Today the total number of Americans is 219, and the total number of local employees is 126. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Ninety-one of the number which the Senator has mentioned are with the Information Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that fact. The military and naval attachés and the marine guards are over and above that number?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; they are over and above that figure.

Mr. FERGUSON. The record should be clear that there are many persons assigned to embassies. A few months ago the Byrd committee, of which I am a member, showed in its report that 174,612 Americans were employed outside continental United States. I wondered whether the distinguished Senator from South Dakota or the distinguished Senator from Illinois was striking at that figure, rather than at the Foreign Service officers. Does the Senator from Nevada have the answer to that question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not quite catch the thought of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The total number of employees, rather than Foreign Service officers, is what I have in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from South Dakota, as I understand, has offered an amendment which affects only the Foreign Service officers.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not affect the number of employees outside the Foreign Service?

Mr. CASE. It affects those who are paid by State Department funds, not including the Information Service, because that is a separate item.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want the RECORD to be clear on that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has made answer as to two points. First, he fears the amendment might cripple the Information Service, and, secondly, that there are military attachés and other persons, associated with the State Department in some of the foreign posts, who might be affected by the amendment.

I have already pointed out that the funds for the Information Service are an entirely different and distinct appropriation and are accounted for elsewhere in the bill.

With respect to the services performed by other agencies, I should like to invite attention to the hearings at page 22, in which the distinguished chairman himself explored this point. The testimony which he developed there shows that the State Department gets an additional $25,643,000 through reimbursable funds from other agencies for their employees. I invite the attention of Senators to the hearings at pages 21 and 22, at which point the chairman of the committee made inquiries with reference to the $52,000,000 for the Foreign Service:

> Senator McCARRAN. And you receive $25,643,000 in addition to that paid in to you for additional service that you perform for other agencies.
>
> Mr. WILBER. It is slightly more than that, Mr. Chairman, but that is approximately right. There are some reimbursable items that are not included in the President's budget.

Mr. President, in other words, the services performed for other agencies are paid for out of the $25,000,000, or more, which is provided in other appropriations.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand that figure to refer to Foreign Service officers, or to other personnel?

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator from Michigan referring to the $25,000,000 or the $52,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. Are the Foreign Service officers paid out of other funds?

Mr. CASE. The Foreign Service officers are paid out of other funds only if they are on the reimbursable account of some other agency. Further along, on page 22 of the hearings the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked:

> Senator ELLENDER. Could you tell us how many more people that entails, in round numbers?
>
> Mr. WILBER. About 4,600 more people in total for all reimbursable services.

In other words, Mr. President, it comes down to what we are working for here; namely, a cut in the Foreign Service personnel. The chairman of the committee himself said that he had some reluctance in voting for some of these programs, but he said that, having been created, they must be staffed, and we should not cripple them or cut them too much.

I point out, Mr. President, that, after all, this is only a 10 percent cut. The committee itself recommends a 10 percent cut in the domestic services. Certainly the chairman will not say that a 10 percent cut on something that has grown so fantastically as the Foreign Service is a crippling cut.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota has addressed a question to me, I should like to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that between 1946 and 1952 the personnel of the Foreign Service was reduced from 10,455 to 8,694. We have been reducing the number of personnel in the Service right along.

To reduce it now, at one fell swoop, on the floor of the Senate, would be destructive; and I object to it.

The Senator from South Dakota forgets the number of agencies and services involved, as required by statutory provisions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, let me read from page 3 of the committee report. At that point the committee states that for the domestic staff the appropriations reported require a reduction to the extent of 383 employees. But the next sentence dealing with the Foreign Service says:

> For the Foreign Service, the budget estimate contemplated 8,548 employees on a full-year basis and an appropriation of $52,762,000. The committee recommends that $25,000 and two employees be cut from this estimate.

How can it be contended that a cut of only 2 employees from the budget estimate, on the basis of a total of 8,548 employees, is adequate?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Those two employees are the proposed ambassadors to Michigan and California, and the recommended reduction in the amount of $25,000 is to cover the pay proposed for those two employees. I make that statement in order to have the record show what the committee is attempting to do in that respect.

Mr. CASE. Certainly, and I am in sympathy with that reduction in the budget estimate. But the committee still ends up with an increase of 25 positions over 1952. Mr. President, we are asking only a 10 percent cut, and if this is a crippling amendment, the country can stand a few more like it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment is a reducing amendment. It is designed to reduce the administrative obesity of the Foreign Service, so that it may function more vigorously and may have a longer and more virile life. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE. Yes, and to improve the health of the economy of the country as a whole.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that the blanket cut or horizontal cut which would be made by this amendment would affect many embassies where there are less than 25 employees. The amendment, if adopted, would destroy the efficiency of many embassies, because of the nature of the cut, in that it would require that a total 841 employees be removed from the Foreign Service.

Again I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the futility of enacting legislation of this kind on the floor of the Senate, after the committee has given this bill weeks and weeks of study.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, of course I respect the hard work the committee does. The volume of hearings of 1,800 pages is eloquent testimony to the hard work the committee has done, and I myself know something about the work required by such long hearings on an appropriation bill.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, when the committee by its own report says it proposes to cut only two employees out of a total budget request of 8,548, and allows an increase of 25 positions over the current year, I submit that a reduction is in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that those two employees, as the Senator from Michigan has stated, are the two ambassadors to the respective States of Michigan and California, two officers who would be taken from the Foreign Service and sent to the State of California and to the State of Michigan. The Senator from Michigan does not want an ambassador to be sent to Michigan; he thinks he can get along without an ambassador; and I think he can, for he is a very good ambassador here, himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, for himself and the Senator from Illinois, to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 25, and also to the committee amendments on pages 64 and 65.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is rescinded and the proceedings under the call will be abandoned.

The question recurs on the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. By unanimous consent, the amendments will be voted on en bloc. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Seaton
Cain	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Case	Knowland	Taft
Cordon	Long	Thye
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Douglas	Martin	Welker
Duff	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Flanders	Moody	
Frear	Morse	

NAYS—36

Benton	Holland	Monroney
Clements	Humphrey	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Fulbright	Kilgore	Robertson
George	Lehman	Saltonstall
Gillette	Magnuson	Smathers
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McCarran	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	Tobey
Hill	McKellar	Underwood

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Chavez	Lodge
Brewster	Ecton	McMahon
Bridges	Kefauver	Russell
Byrd	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Langer	

So the amendments offered by Mr. CASE, for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS, were agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from S. Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of buildings abroad," on page 5, line 8, after the word "act", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contributions to international organizations," on page 6, line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out $27,923,163" and insert "$30,484,749."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 9, to strike out:

None of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof: *Provided, however,* That such limitation shall not apply to assessments to inter-American organizations

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No representative of the United States Government in any international organization after fiscal year 1953 shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations.

No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of such international organization.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missions to international organizations," on page 7, line 18, after the word "chauffeurs", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,321,112."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International contingencies," on page 8, line 23, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 11, line 3, after the word "further", to strike out "That construction shall not be started

on the Anzalduas diversion dam until" and insert "That the Anzalduas diversion dam shall not be operated for irrigation or water supply purposes in the United States unless"; and in line 9, after the word "allocated", to strike out "to irrigation or water supply purposes" and insert "to such purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "American sections, international commissions," on page 12, line 12, after the word "Commissions", to strike out "$525,000" and insert "$500,344."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$500,344", and insert in lieu thereof "$505,344, of which $45,000 shall be available for the American Section, International Joint Commission."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Kentucky, and I am willing to take his amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand the amendment specifically applies to hearings on the St. Lawrence waterway and Lake Ontario?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator from Nevada will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would add $5,000 for hearings on the Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence waterways.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that this item came up after the budget was prepared.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International information and educational activities," on page 15, line 14, after the figures "$86,575,000," to insert "of which sum, $200,000 shall be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My inquiry is whether it would be in order at this point to offer an amendment to substitute a different figure in lieu of $86,575,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that if he is seeking to amend a provision in the House bill and not a committee amendment to the bill, that can be done only at this time by unanimous consent, since we are considering presently only committee amendment to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That was the reason for my question. I shall refrain until we have concluded the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Department of State," on page 20, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 111. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salaries or other expenses of maintaining any foreign service post or mission, exclusive of consular posts, in any state or country prior to confirmation by the Senate of the appointment of the first chief of mission or other diplomatic representative to that state or country.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 111. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person assigned to or serving in any office of any of the several States of the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used (1) to pay the United States contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle or doctrine of one world government or world citizenship; (2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principle or doctrine of one world government or world citizenship.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the committee will be willing to modify the amendment incorporating section 112 in the bill by inserting the word "one" after the word "or" in the first line of page 21, and, similarly, in line 3, page 21, so that it would read "one world citizenship." I noticed that the distinguished chairman of the committee, in his speech explaining the bill, used the term "one world citizenship."

Mr. McCARRAN. I gladly accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the sake of legislative history I should like to point out that Webster's Unabridged Dictionary describes a citizen of the world as "a cosmopolitan."

I am sure it is not the intent of the committee to be opposed to cosmopolitanism, but merely to the principle or doctrine of one world government.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we do not wish any of the money appropriated in this bill to propagandize our people to become "citizens" in a one-world government.

I have followed closely the United Nations, UNESCO, other specialized agencies of the United Nations, as well as the United States National Commission for UNESCO, since they were organized. I do not find that they have in the past, or that they contemplate in future plans, the promotion of the political principles or political doctrines of one-world government or of world citizenship in the sense of advocating individual adherence in such one world government.

Consequently, in voting for the appropriation bill as reported to the Senate by the committee, I want to make it clear, in view of the reservations contained in section 112, that I do not wish to imply that any effort has been made, by the United Nations, or UNESCO, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO, to promote the principle or doctrine of one-world government, or to advocate citizenship in such a one-world government. I am confident that my distinguished colleagues would agree with me in this view.

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

The next amendment was on page 21, after line 3, to insert:

SEC. 113. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desired to say a few words about the amendment on page 21, line 4, which has just been stated. I do not intend to oppose the amendment, although I wish to make it clear that the adoption of the amendment does not constitute an expression on the part of the Senate that the United States should not participate in the International Materials Conference. That question has been decided by the Senate. The latest expression of the Senate on that issue was on June 11, when it adopted, by a vote of 46 to 31, an amendment which I proposed to the Defense Production Act.

It occurs to me that the question of whether we should participate in the International Materials Conference is a legislative question. I have made no particular investigation or study of what

should be the source of the fund for such participation and, therefore, I am not in a position to oppose the amendment at this time. I assume the conference committee on the appropriation bill will consider the question, just as the conference committee on the Defense Production Act will consider the legislative question as to what extent, if any, our Government should participate in the International Materials Conference.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope also the House in its action on the Defense Production Act will not retain the section the distinguished Senator had the Senate vote into the bill, or that the conference committee will drop it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to say, in response to the comments of the Senator from Michigan, that that particular question was debated in the Senate, as the Senator well knows. There were two votes on the question as a legislative matter, one on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and the other on my amendment.

It will be in conference, I understand, this afternoon, when the House completes its action on the Defense Production Act. It should be properly settled as a legislative matter. This amendment would certainly come very close to being legislation on an appropriation bill, because it involves broad public policy. I do not know whether the only funds available for participation in this conference would arise from this particular appropriation bill or not. I doubt it. I think it very likely that if we should participate, there may be other sources from which to pay for any participation. But that is another matter.

The question of whether or not we should have anything to do with an effort to distribute and allocate materials in short supply on an equitable basis seems to me to be a legislative question for Congress to decide, and I think it will be settled by the conference committee.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the matter was discussed in committee yesterday, my feeling was somewhat one of sympathy with the position of the Senator from Arkansas. As I understand, at the present time the House has adopted what corresponds to the Ferguson amendment in the Senate. The House has not considered the so-called Fulbright amendment. Therefore, the Fulbright amendment will be in conference, if it is not adopted by the House. If the amendment is not agreed to in conference, then the Ferguson amendment will be sustained by both Houses. If the pending amendment is agreed to, it will be in conference, and we can see, when the conference is held, the conferees will know the result of the conference on the price-control bill.

If the Fulbright amendment is inserted by the conference, then the pending amendment should come out of this bill. If the Fulbright amendment is not inserted, then this amendment is a perfectly proper amendment. That is the basis on which I, for one, voted for this committee amendment, or did not object to it, when it was considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I read the amendment, it would affect only the State Department appropriations. It would not settle the general question as to whether there should be participation. But I am not informed as to the final action of the House. It was my understanding that the amendment adopted by the House was not identical with the Ferguson amendment. I understood there was a difference. So the whole subject will be in conference. It seems to me very proper that this should be considered as a legislative matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To the best of my ability I have checked the language adopted by the House and the language adopted by the Senate. It is my understanding that the language contained in the House bill is identical with the language of the Ferguson amendment in the Senate bill. As I see it, the issue will be decided in conference. So there will be no harm at all in having this committee amendment either come out or stay in this bill, pending action of the conference on the defense production bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I have said, I am not opposing it. I merely wished to make clear my position. I am in no position to object. I do not think our Government should be prohibited from participating in the International Materials Conference. I do think it is a little unusual that we should undertake to settle a legislative matter by what is called a limitation on an appropriation bill.

From the point of view of legislative history, at least from my position, this amendment does not constitute a determination of the correctness of the policy of seeking to allocate materials in short supply among various friendly nations which are trying to coordinate their efforts in the struggle against communism.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with regard to this item, I state only my individual views. I do not propose to sanction the existence of some ad hoc agency not set up by statute, by making appropriations for it. I do not propose to be a party to that. I hope that if, as, and when the Congress sees fit, if ever it does see fit to set up such a commission, it will be done by legislative act, not merely by making appropriations.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to join in the statement made by the Senator from Nevada. He has stated the view of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment, on page 21, inserting section 113.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—salaries and expenses, general legal activities," on page 21, line 25, after "(31 U. S. C. 529)", to strike out "$9,750,000" and insert "$10,030,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," on page 22, line 15, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$13,750,000" and insert "$13,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and expenses," on page 24, line 15, after the word "incumbent", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place 20 positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings and facilities," on page 27, line 14, after the word "account", to strike out "$740,000" and insert "$824,000," and in line 21, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the limitation under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for construction of a complete Federal jail at Anchorage, Alaska, is increased from '$400,000' to '$484,000'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Department of Justice," at the top of page 31, to strike out:

SEC. 208. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States (1) against a State of the Union; or (2) against in excess of 2,500 defendants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 208. (a) Consent is hereby given to join the United States as a defendant in any suit (1) for the adjudication of rights to the use of water of a river system or other source, or (2) for the administration of such rights, where it appears that the United States is the owner of or is in the process of acquiring water rights by appropriation under State law, by purchase, by exchenge, or otherwise, and the United States is a necessary party to such suit. The United States, when a party to any such suit, shall (1) be deemed to have waived any right to plead that the State laws are inapplicable or that the United States is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty, and (2) shall be subject to the judgments, orders, and decrees of the court having jurisdiction, and may obtain review thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances: *Provided*, That no judgment for costs shall be entered against the United States in any such suit.

(b) Summons or other process in any such suit shall be served upon the Attorney General or his designated representative.

(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the joinder of the United States in any suit or controversy in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the right of States to the use of the water of any interstate stream.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senator from Nevada and suggested the possibility of taking to conference an amendment which I presented to the committee, so that in addition to the House language, which is being stricken out, and an amendment of the Senator from Nevada, which has been inserted, the additional language of an amendment which I submitted to him could be taken to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe I have a comprehensive grasp of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America versus Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, et al.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have a comprehensive grasp of this whole subject. The matter inserted by the committee, together with the matter offered now by the Senator from California, could well go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 32, line 15, after the figures "$1,000", to strike out "$1,850,000" and insert "$1,904,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 23, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$259,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 33, line 11, after the word "diem", to strike out "$6,975,000" and insert "$6,410,935."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 22, after the word "work", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,650,005."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 16, after the word "appropriation," to strike out "$1,450,000" and insert "$1,330,617."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 4, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$116,382."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 4, to insert:

Census of governments: For expenses necessary for taking, compiling, and publishing the 1952 census of governments as authorized by law, including personal services by contract or otherwise, at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and additional compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for field work under this appropriation; $806,841, to remain available until June 30, 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 36, line 9, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$106,470,000" and insert "$105,594,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "$13,091,499" and insert "$11,091,499."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 16, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$1,225,000" and insert "$1,162,972."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 7, after the numerals "1955", to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$19,821,154"; in line 15, after "(7)" to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,571,154"; and in line 19, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,571,154."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 9, after the word "uniforms", to strike out "$435,000" and insert "$433,594."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 22, to insert:

Transport aircraft development: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867), relating to the development of improved transport aircraft, including hire of aircraft; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $1,383,074, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 43, line 4, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$2,792,932."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 12, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$1,925,000" and insert "$1,965,00."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 19, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$5,750,000" and insert "$5,504,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 48, line 24, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,140,000" and insert "$1,351,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 2, after the word "for", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,156,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 11, after the word "frequency", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,910,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 49, line 23, after the word "only", to strike out "$27,000,000" and insert "$27,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—Salaries of clerks of courts," on page 54, line 4, after the word "assistants", to strike out "$4,900,000" and insert "$5,042,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Probation system," on page 54, line 8, after the numerals "3656", to strike out "$2,420,000" and insert "$2,445,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous salaries," on page 55, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$2,955,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 56, line 23, after "(34 Stat. 476)", to strike out "$837,200" and insert "$855,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, as heretofore amended by the amendment offered by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was, under the heading "Title VI—General provisions," on page 62, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within a Department provided for in this act;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to the employees of the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;

(e) to the employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(f) to the employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Civil Aeronautics Board;

(g) to the operational personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

(h) to the employees of the National Bureau of Standards;

(i) to the employees of the Judiciary Branch;

(j) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total provided for in this act, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time

during fiscal year 1953 this provision shall again become operative.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 604. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

(2) the Department of Justice.

(3) The Civil Aeronautics Administration.

(4) the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(5) the operational personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau.

(6) the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

(7) the Patent Office.

(8) the Judiciary Branch.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment, as heretofore amended by the amendment offered by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was, on page 65, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 605. (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be available to pay—

(1) for personal services of personnel above basic rates;

(2) for transportation of things (other than mail); or

(3) for travel of employees,

more than 90 percent of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

(2) the Department of Justice.

(3) the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

(4) the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(5) the operational personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau.

(6) the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

(7) the Patent Office.

(8) the Judiciary Branch.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 606. No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department or made available for expenditures by any corporation included in this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 48, line 22, after the words "plant equipment", it is proposed to insert "not to exceed $175,000 for construction and equipment of cafeteria facilities."

This amendment does not add any funds to the committee bill. The committee recommended the cafeteria facilities, and this language should be included in the paragraph as a limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stepped out of the Chamber for a moment. I wish to inquire about the amendment on page 31, section 208.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment on page 31 is Senate bill 18, which was approved by the Senate some days ago. To that has been added the amendment offered by the Senators from California [Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. NIXON]. The chairman of the subcommittee believes that this question can be settled in conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. What is that amendment, may I inquire?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment offered by the Senators from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(d) None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the *United States of America* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District*, a public service corporation of the State of California, et al.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a very restrictive provision applying to only one State. I do not believe that is the way to dispose of a lawsuit.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator from Arizona that the amendment offered by the Senator from California is not a substitute for the committee amendment. I simply accepted it as a part of the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. I have gone over the committee amendment. As the Senator knows, I withdraw my objection to it. I think it should have been enacted as a separate bill, but it has been considered by a legislative committee. Hearings have been held. For that reason I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate approved it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. The Senate did approve it. It has gone through the regular legislative process.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the Senator will insist that it be not changed in conference. That is the only danger in connection with such proposals. I hope the Senator will stand by the committee amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 59, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 404. When the buildings in Judiciary Square now occupied by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia are vacated by such courts, the Architect of the Capitol shall cease to perform any duties in connection with such buildings and any duties theretofore performed by him with respect to these buildings shall thereafter be performed by the General Services Administration. Such amounts of the appropriations herein provided for expenditure for such buildings by the Architect of the Capitol as may be unobligated at the time of transfer of duties shall be transferred by the Architect of the Capitol to the General Services Administration. The building now occupied by the district court shall, when funds are made available therefor, be renovated by General Services Administration for the use of the Tax Court of the United

States. The General Services Administration is authorized to prepare plans and specifications therefor, to be paid for out of such funds, under the direction and supervision of the Chief Judge of the Tax Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. Unfortunately I was detained at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee when the item on page 15, line 14, of $86,575,000 was acted upon. This is the item for the Voice of America. I wish to inquire whether there was included in that amount provision for the new duties to be imposed on the Department by reason of the fact that it has taken over the work which was done by the Army in Japan. That work involves a cost of some $5,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. It will have to be absorbed in this amount of money.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, that is also true with respect to the new Coast Guard cutter *Courier*. That cost will also have to be absorbed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Therefore the other work the Department has been doing must be curtailed in order to take on the new work.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is the House figure, just as the House approved it. The items referred to by the Senator will have to be absorbed in the $86,575,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I was concerned about was the question of taking over the work in Japan. Was that question considered by the House, and was the operation of the Coast Guard vessel which was recently put in commission considered by the House?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am unable to answer the question as to whether the House considered the work in Japan. The figure of $86,000,000 was the House figure, established on the floor of the House. Within that amount there must be absorbed the two items to which the Senator from Arizona has referred.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I inquire whether there is objection at this time to rescinding the order for the quorum call.

Mr. PASTORE. There is no objection on my part.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is submitted by me on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$86,575,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$88,556,516"; and in line 23, after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That $7,967,958 shall be available for the exchange of persons."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding this amendment. First, I ask unanimous consent that a somewhat longer statement in explanation of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAM UNDER H. R. 7289, AS REPORTED BY APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE

Under H. R. 7289, as it passed the House, $86,575,000 is provided for the entire program of International Information and Educational activities. (P. 13, line 20 to p. 17, line 3, H. R. 7289.)

Of this amount $5,500,000 is available for exchange of persons under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright acts. In its report (S. Rept No. 1807) the Senate Appropriations Committee (p. 8) states: "The committee believes that the amount (for the total IIE program) allowed by the House is adequate and will allow for the program to proceed at about the same rate as the current year. It is the opinion of the committee that this activity should have a breathing spell for a year and get itself organized and integrated before embarking on another expansion."

Although the committee indicates a desire that the program "proceed at about the same rate as the current year", the effect of its action is to reduce the exchange of persons program. The fiscal 1952 appropriation was $6,567,958. Therefore, the direct reduction is $1,067,958, or 16.3 percent below the level of the current year.

The Army has been carrying out an exchange of persons program in Japan, the present year's budget for which was approximately $1,400,000. As the occupation of Japan has ended, the program has been transferred to the State Department, and the House committee required that the program be carried on within the limits of the total of $86,575,000. However, only $690,000 of the total is available for exchange students, and, therefore, the result is a further reduction in the current program of $710,000.

Pay increases directed by Congress ($37,958) and an increase in per diem necessary to be paid to leaders brought to this country under the Smith-Mundt Act ($10 to $12, total, $135,600) require the absorption of $203,558, reducing the amount available for grants by that amount.

Therefore, the action of the committee, far from maintaining the program at its present level, reduces it as indicated below:

1952 (Smith-Mundt and Fulbright)	$6,567,958
1952, Japan	1,400,000
Total, 1952	7,967,958
1953 (Smith-Mundt and Fulbright)	5,500,000
1953, Japan	$690,000
	6,190,000
Less absorption of increase costs	203,558
Total available for 1953	5,936,442
Total reduction	1,981,516
Percentage reduction	24.9

A further comparison might be made with the bill passed by the Senate last year. Under the sponsorship of Senators MUNDT, NIXON, SMITH, FULBRIGHT, and others, the Senate increased the appropriation of funds for the entire information and exchange program of $85,000,000. As a part of this appropriation, $10,000,000 was earmarked for exchange of persons, although this amendment was stricken in conference. This amount, which did not include funds for the Japanese program, would be comparable to the $5,500,000 figure in the pending bill. Thus, the Senate was on record last year as favoring a program of almost twice the amount carried in the pending bill.

The effect of the reduction in numbers of persons to whom grants may be made is as follows:

Fulbright program	102
Smith-Mundt program	176
Japanese	143
Total	421

A further factor is that Fulbright agreements have been instituted, since last year, with five additional countries: South Africa, Iceland, Ceylon, Sweden, and Indonesia. Unless Smith-Mundt funds are made available for these countries, or unless the programs with other countries are reduced further, a two-way exchange with these countries will not be possible.

If it is desired that the exchange of persons program should be carried on in 1953 at the same level as the present, the total for international information and educational activities (appearing at p. 15, line 14, of H. R. 7289) should be increased to $88,556,516 ($86,575,000 plus $1,981,516), and by adding a proviso that $7,967,958 should be available for the exchange of persons.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make a small increase in the appropriation for the international information and education program as it applies to the exchange of students and other persons. This amendment is limited to the exchange of students and other persons, a subject in which those of us who are sponsoring the amendment are very much interested.

As a result of the action the House of Representatives has taken on this bill, we are afraid that the program which has been carried on during the past year will be curtailed. I am among those who feel that the exchange of students and other persons is one of the most important programs we have. That is why I am offering the amendment.

The increased appropriation called for by the amendment amounts to somewhat less than $2,000,000. The amendment provides that the increase proposed be earmarked for the exchange-of-persons program.

Mr. President, I have already requested that there be printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the amendment. The statement explains how we have arrived at the amount of the proposed increase, and indicates the purpose of the amendment.

I understand from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], that he is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in two parts. Are they to be considered as one amendment or are they to be considered separately?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have submitted the amendment as a single amendment. The several parts cover the same subject. Therefore, I should like to have both parts of the amendment considered as one amendment.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Nevada is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, where the conferees can handle it as they see fit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the amendment and the exchange-of-persons program. I have followed the program very closely, and have interviewed hundreds of persons who have participated in it, and have also discussed it with a number of our important representatives in the Government service, both abroad and here in the United States. They have expressed themselves very favorably regarding this program.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received recently from Mr. Walter J. Donnelly, United States High Commissioner to Austria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Vienna, Austria, June 3, 1952.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: With reference to our recent conversation concerning the initiation in Austria of the educational exchange program authorized by Public Law 584 (the Fulbright Act), I wish to send you the enclosed copy of the first annual report of the United States Educational Commission in Austria and to offer the following comments and observations regarding the first year of program operations in this country.

The program thus far is generally regarded as an outstanding success. The Commission has benefited by the experience in other countries. It has been possible, for example, to coordinate the program closely with exchange activities financed from appropriated dollar funds and those carried on by private organizations and institutions. In consequence, travel grants were awarded last year to 117 Austrian students, 4 school teachers, 19 university lecturers or research scholars; on the American side, 48 students received grants, 4 school teachers and 12 lecturers or research scholars. The numerical predominance of Austrian over American beneficiaries has averted the criticism, frequently directed against the program in some other countries, that its benefits are primarily for Americans. In fact, the Communist press in Austria has found little in the program that it could pervert for propaganda purposes.

The United States Educational Commission succeeded in holding its administrative costs, even in its first year of operation, to 4.14 percent of program costs, the lowest percentage of any country participating in the program. Moreover Austria, although it ranked only twelfth among the participating countries in the amount of funds expended in 1951, ranked fifth in the number of persons receiving benefits under the program.

The successful initiation of the program in Austria is doubtless due in considerable measure to the high caliber of the Commission's membership and the careful attention which it has given to all problems. Under the chairmanship of the Embassy's Cultural Affairs Officer, it includes the Director of the CARE organization in Austria, the Educational Adviser to United States forces in Austria, and a retired United States Foreign Service officer; the Austrian members include the rectors of the University of Vienna and the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts, a high official of the ministry of education, and a distinguished professor of biology. There has been excellent cooperation on the part of Austrian officials in overcoming obstacles to the execution of the program. For example, the Austrian National Bank has approved a blanket exception to its usual currency control regulations, making it possible for transportation companies serving Austria to accept payment of international travel in Austrian currency.

Very few of the Austrial grantees have returned from the United States as yet, but uniformly good reports have been received concerning their activities and contributions. In one case, a petition was signed by over 100 students urging a visiting professor to remain for an additional semester at his American host university.

Americans of all categories applying for awards in Austria appear to be interested predominantly in the humanities, particularly literature and music. This year there were relatively small but good representations of students in the natural and social sciences. It has been a disappointment that few qualified lecturers in American literature have applied to come to Austria so far, and none in American history. In preparing the program plan for the next academic year, these fields have been stressed particularly.

Because of the circumstances of the occupation and the critical international political situation which centers in Vienna, the American grantees in Austria have an important mission and an unusual responsibility. They have been encouraged to subordinate their relations with the large American community to the important field of developing close contacts with Austrian people and institutions. Most of them have responded extremely well to the challenge of the situation. They have adjusted to Austrian life and to the peculiar conditions which they face here. Their behavior and attitudes have been such as to create a generally good impression upon their Austrian associates. It is perhaps surprising that virtually no incidents have been reported involving the American scholars which would tend to increase tensions or hard feelings. On the other hand, many of them have made concrete, demonstrable contributions to information and educational programs sponsored by this mission.

Particularly striking has been the voluntary participation of a considerable number of the grantees in an American lecture program. Not only the professors, research scholars and teachers, but a number of the graduate students have lectured extensively in all parts of Austria. Between October 1951 and May 1952, Fulbright scholars have reported a total of 132 lectures to a combined audience of more than 10,000 people. They have lectured not only at all of the nine United States information centers and subcenters in Austria but also at numerous Austrian organizations and institutions, including youth groups, trade-unions, international relations clubs, adult education centers and schools at all levels. The response has been surprising. At the small agricultural town of Ried in upper Austria, for example, 300 people attended a lecture by a graduate student on life in the American Middle West; a similar number attended a lecture on modern American music in the provincial capital of Klagenfurt. Besides the reported lectures, many of the scholars participate regularly in less formal discussion groups and club meetings. Others have given concerts, spoken on the radio, taught American folk songs and dances, etc.

In Austria's present situation, a program such as this one can make a very real and significant contribution in support of American policies in Austria. It is gratifying that the potentialities of the program have been realized to such an extent in its first year of operation. There is every reason to believe that the program will grow in effectiveness during the coming years.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. DONNELLY,
United States High Commissioner to Austria.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have had Mr. Donnelly's letter printed in the RECORD because it illustrates what some of our finest representatives abroad think about this program and how they have evaluated it.

I have also discussed this matter with Mr. McCloy, our High Commissioner to Germany. His statements regarding this program are in accord with those of Mr. Donnelly.

I have also discussed the program with Mr. David Bruce, our Under Secretary of State, who recently returned from Paris, where he was our Ambassador. His views regarding this program are similar to those stated by Mr. Donnelly in his letter.

I have received letters about the program from Mr. Jarman, our Ambassador to Australia, and formerly a Member of the House of Representatives. In those letters Mr. Jarman states his opinion of this program in very much the same way that Mr. Donnelly has stated his opinion of it.

I wish to emphasize that from the point of view of dollars, this program calls for a relatively small part of the appropriations carried by this bill. As I estimate the amount of appropriations involved for the exchange-of-persons program, it is approximately one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the amount we are spending this year on military preparations.

The exchange-of-persons program is a very important one if we assume that war with Russia is not inevitable. Of course, if we assume that war with Russia is inevitable, then perhaps my emphasis on the importance of this program may not be justified. On the other hand, if there is any hope of a solution short of total war between the free world and the Communists, I believe this program can make and is making a great a contribution as anything else we are doing.

In the past year the program has been operated in connection with 19 countries.

and I believe 5 additional countries have recently joined in the program, with the result that now it approaches the point where it brings us into contact with practically all the other free nations.

The program has one very unique characteristic which no other program that I know of has, namely, that the Communists cannot and do not dare follow this example. The Communists do not dare invite people from the free countries to go to Russia and travel freely there and examine what the Russians are doing. On the other hand, under this program we invite people from practically all the other free countries to visit the United States and see what we are doing in our country. To my mind, that is the most persuasive aspect of this program.

Of course the Russians can build and are building bigger and better radio stations. Almost every time we build a large radio station, the Russians build one that is equally as large, if not larger; and frequently the Russian radio stations jam the broadcasts made by our stations. Similarly, no matter how much information we print in newspapers or no matter how much information we publish abroad in magazines, the Russians do likewise; in fact I believe the Russians are spending a great deal more money in the field of psychological warfare and information and propaganda than we are, as an over-all matter.

But the one thing the Russians do not dare do, and have not done, is to invite people from the free countries—for instance, the countries of the Middle East or the countries of South America—to visit Russia and to travel freely there and to judge for themselves about the Communists' so-called paradise.

So that aspect of this program is extremely important. Even in the short time the program has been under way, it has made a great impression, particularly on the smaller countries, because it has given them some basis by means of which they can judge the truthfulness of what they hear on the radio about our country. If they do not have some basis for judging who is telling the truth, they usually are confused by the tremendous program of propaganda and counterpropaganda. On the other hand, when the leaders of other free countries or the young people who eventually will be the leaders of those countries visit the United States and see for themselves what we in the United States are doing here, they are able to judge correctly the truth of the situation.

In fact, I do not believe there is any other way to describe effectively what is of value in the United States. It cannot be effectively described in words; I cannot do it, and I do not believe anyone else can. If the peoples of other free countries are to learn adequately of the values of the democratic society we have built up in our country. I think there is no other way for them to do so except by visiting the United States and living here for a certain period of time and experiencing for themselves what life in the United States means. Then they can correctly determine who is right in the present world conflict.

So I am very much pleased that the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling this bill has accepted the amendment. As the Senator from New Jersey has said, the amendment will simply retain the program on the level at which it now exists, plus including the Japanese program, which formerly has been paid for by the military.

Thus, I do not believe that by adopting the amendment we shall be violating the spirit of the statement contained in the committee report, in which the committee states in a general way that it intends to maintain the over-all program of information on the same basis on which it was maintained this year.

So, Mr. President, I appreciate very much the action of the chairman of the subcommittee in agreeing to take the amendment to conference, and I hope that in the conference he will insist that the amendment be agreed to by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to reduce the so-called "representation allowances" from the committee recommendation of $650,000 to $500,000. The term "representation allowances" is a euphemism designed to conceal the truth. No citizen knows what the term "representation allowances" means, that is, no one outside the sacred precincts of the Appropria- permit members of the Foreign Service But once we penetrate the inner mystery of this language we find that it is an entertainment allowance designed to permit members of the Foreign Service to give cocktail parties and dinners to entertain other diplomats, sometimes distinguished visitors from home, and other persons.

I may point out that I suppose the major portion of this item of representation allowances goes for alcoholic beverages. I want to make it clear that I, myself, am not a teetotaler, and I do not wish to pose under any false colors in urging this amendment. But I do not think the United States of America needs to spend $650,000 in cocktails and champagne in order to win friends and influence people in other portions of the globe.

In the first place, in Mohammedan countries the United States actually loses prestige by serving liquor, because the Mohammedans are by their religion nonalcoholic. The prestige of the United States in a number of the Mohammedan countries, ranging from Cairo to Singapore, has been distinctly reduced by the representation expenditures, or the liquor expenditures of the members of the Foreign Service. So far as the non-Mohammedan sections of the world are concerned, it is not necessary for the United States to spend $650,000 in order to acquire prestige in those quarters. The prestige of the United States comes from the strength of the United States and the moral purpose of the United States, and it is not necessary to float American foreign policy in a sea of liquor in order to win friends and influence people. Our diplomats could do it equally well with nonalcoholic fruit punch and cookies. Entertainment does not need to be accompanied by a filet mignon, martinis, and champagne cocktails. I believe that simplicity of life should be characteristic of all public officials, and quite as characteristic of foreign officers as of domestic officials here at home. There is great danger that we may take on the customs of the foreign countries of Europe and adopt them in toto for our Foreign Service.

I shall not criticize the Foreign Service today, but if the Foreign Service has a fault—and I think it has many—it is usually because of the fact that they have aped the manners of the British Foreign Service and have almost completely adopted their scale of values.

The United States does not have to enter into competitive entertainment with other countries, and as a matter of fact most of the cocktail parties given by diplomats consist of an exchange in which each entertains the other, and each nation says that it must spend money in order to keep up with the other nations. Now, it may be well if, with the strength of the United States, this powerful Nation sets an example of withdrawing from this process of competitive expenditure, instead of allowing the other parties to set the pace and determine our scale of values. And so, Mr. President, my amendment is an appeal for greater simplicity of life. Just as we have reduced the number of Foreign Service officers by our amendment, and I hope that will be agreed to in conference, I may say that this is a proposal to introduce greater simplicity—I shall not say greater sobriety, but greater simplicity—into the Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amount of representation allowances was cut by the committee from $750,000 to $650,000. This is not for cocktails, this is not for liquor, this is not for the brand of entertainment to which the Senator from Illinois refers. It may be that, in his experience, that was the only line of entertainment that appealed to him; I do not know; but for 2 years I have heard him talking about diplomatic cocktail parties. This fund is not for cocktail parties. The fact is that the filet mignon accompanying the entertainment, of which he speaks, is referred to as though it were some kind of liquor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator included it with martinis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is frequently a concomitant of liquor, but it is not liquor, itself.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know about the concomitant. What I am talking about is that this is not an item for liquor, but on the contrary, has nothing to do with liquor. Tomato juice could be served, or anything else that might be desired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How often has the Senator from Nevada seen tomato juice served in large quantities at diplomatic cocktail parties?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have seen it in great bowls, so large that one could swim in it. I did not try to swim in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what I am drawing to the attention of the Senate is that the Senator from Illinois brings this up, and he gets a little amusement out of it. I like to see the Senator from Illinois laugh once in a while. As a rule, he is of a serious turn of mind. But if this were a liquor amendment, if it were an appropriation for liquor, I would go along with the Senator in eliminating it. But it is not. We must at least keep abreast of the remainder of the civilized world. We must provide a certain amount of entertainment when meeting the other peoples of the world in our Embassies, in our consulates, and so forth, both in Washington and abroad. The amount is so modest that I wonder that the Senator raises the question at all. So far as the item of liquor is concerned, I say there simply is no liquor in it. It is a prohibition amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator must mean that there is hardly any liquor in the representation allowance, does he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I say none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What? None? No liquor?

Mr. McCARRAN. No liquor that I have ever seen—none so far as I know, I will put it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. (Putting the question.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "noes" seem to have it. The "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

The Chair did not understand a remark made by the Senator from Illinois. Will he repeat it, please?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I asked for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois calls for a division. Those in favor of the amendment——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. McCARRAN. The result has been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois requested a division before the result was announced. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$40,399,000" and insert "$44,400,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment at the suggestion of the Department of Justice, which is responsible for the enforcement and administration of what is called the wetback bill passed by the Congress several weeks ago. The proposed amendment, which would add $4,001,000, would allow the Department, according to their estimates and figures, to administer the law passed by the Congress, with the administration of which the Department was charged.

On June 5, 1952, funds and authoritative language were provided by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952—Public Law No. 375—to permit the Immigration and Naturalization Service to accomplish the following:

First. Strengthen the border patrol force on the Mexican border by 335 additional positions.

Second. Establish and operate two processing facilities for the purpose of documenting and fingerprinting apprehended illegal entrants prior to removal to Mexico.

Third. Remove approximately 25,000 Mexican nationals to the interior of Mexico following their apprehension after entry into the United States illegally.

An item of $4,001,000 was included in the 1953 budget for the purpose of carrying forward the emergency program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952. On March 28, 1952, the House committee recommended a reduction of $1,000,000. By floor action on April 4, 1952, the House eliminated the entire item of $4,001,000. On June 13, 1952, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service appeared before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee and testified in support of an appeal for restoration of the item of $4,001,000. On June 24, 1952, the Senate committee reported the 1953 bill without restoring the item of $4,001,000.

Pursuant to the authorization in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has caused to report for duty some 300 additional employees, recruited from various locations throughout the United States and reporting at their own expense to positions of duty on the southern border; also, construction work has been started for the two processing stations and supplies and equipment have been ordered to implement the program. Unless the Congress now provides money to carry forward this emergency program already authorized, it will mean that those additional employees so far recruited must be separated as of June 30, 1952, and that they must return to their homes at great personal expense and sacrifice. It will also mean that augmented corrective measures on the Mexican border must be immediately halted and that much of the money already appropriated and expended during the current fiscal year will have been in vain.

I know there was some controversy about this proposal. I am in hope that some of the items can be taken to conference so that the Commissioner may at least proceed with the processing stations, which are necessary, in order that someone can check the entry of so-called wetbacks.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am concerned with the breakdown of the $4,000,000. I am thoroughly in accord with continuing the number of men who have been employed to carry on this work. I think they should not be discharged. They are needed in order to enforce the program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under a law which Congress passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. A law was passed authorizing the work to be done, and we are obligated by an international agreement to see that the law is carried into effect. It is necessary that the immigrants be placed in barracks where they can be examined. In order to do that there must be buildings. Sending them back to Mexico by airplane or by other means is another matter. How is the amount broken down?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have received from the chairman of the subcommittee a statement in which it is broken down as follows:

Border patrol, $1,460,500; detention and deportation, which is broken down into operation of detention camps, $540,500, and removal of aliens, $2,000,000.

I think the controversial figure was the figure relating to removal.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is the Senator most interested in this item. I think, in all fairness, in view of the bill which has been passed and has become law, there should be consideration of some of these items.

The border patrol involves some 300 men who are supposed to be hired to patrol the border. That involves a figure of $1,465,500.

The operation of detention camps amounts to $540,500.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would not that be in connection with the erection of buildings and to check the wetbacks in and out?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what I understand. I do not want to take the Senator off his feet.

Mr. HAYDEN. Those two figures amount to how much?

Mr. McCARRAN. They amount to $2,000,000. I do not want to take the Senator from Arizona off his feet, either.

Let me say that a great deal of unfavorable comment came to the committee with reference to the air trips which are afforded the Mexicans. They come across the border and are returned to Mexico by airplanes. Some people say there are hostesses on the planes, but I do not believe that. But they are flown south into Mexico. It is said—I do not know it to be a fact, but I repeat what has been told to me—after being returned to Mexico they get on the first freight train bound north and in a few days are back again at the border. If that is true, it is a waste of money.

With regard to these two items of border patrol and the operation of detention camps, speaking for myself, I would be willing to take those two items to conference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield, but before I do so I should like to modify my amendment so as to strike out "$40,399,000" and insert "$42,400,000," thus making the increase $2,000,000 instead of $4,000,000.

Mr. THYE. It was exactly to that point that I wanted to speak.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On page 26, line 9, I would strike out "$40,399,000" and insert "$42,399,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. The additional $2,000,000 is to cover border control, $1,460,500, and operation of detention camps, $540,500.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe that $2,000,000 will be sufficient. The chairman is entirely correct when he says there has been much criticism of the flying of so-called wetbacks back into Mexico.

I think the amendment will correct the situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the understanding that no part of the $2,000,000 shall be used to transport wetbacks to Mexico by air. If they are to be transported, let it be in some other manner. It seems to me that to transport them by air is a little bit too luxurious.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think this amendment relates in any way to bringing in farm labor. It refers to immigration inspection, and provides for keeping out illegal entrants. The detention camps are intended to keep illegal entrants under detention until they are returned, rather than to obtain farm labor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator understands that unless some methods are adopted to prevent illegal immigration from Mexico, legal immigration will not operate satisfactorily. That is the point.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Labor Department has jurisdiction of the matter of legal entry.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand, but the United States has entered into an agreement with Mexico to supervise the legal entry of agricultural laborers. The agreement is conditioned upon the fact that illegal immigration will be restrained. That is our part of the bargain.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Washington will yield further, it is my understanding that in the event we do not in some manner patrol the border and safeguard it from illegal entrants, Mexico may have to stop her cooperation with the United States, and we would not have the benefit of Mexican workers to aid in the harvest in the United States. That is the threat with which we are faced.

Mr. HAYDEN. The essence of the agreement with Mexico was that we would restrain illegal immigration in order to facilitate the admission of legal entrants.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that Mexico is now cooperating in keeping out illegal immigrants?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not so understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the understanding between the two Governments. Mexico has insisted that the United States do its part to prevent illegal immigration, and in return Mexico will do its part to encourage legal immigration.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only way in which I knew Mexico was cooperating was that she allowed planes to fly the wetbacks half way into Mexico. That was the only way in which I could ascertain Mexico was helping.

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to speak in my own time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator desire to speak on this amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I myself had intended to offer an amendment identical with the one offered by the Senator from Washington. I had intended to do so primarily because the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held extensive hearings on the whole subject of migratory labor and the wetbacks. There are volumes of testimony on the subject.

First of all, the airlift has been the most effective weapon we have had against illegal entrants, and it has been phenomenally successful.

In the hearings, we learned that the airlift began in June, 1951. In the Imperial Valley area, 15 days before the airlift began, the apprehension of wetbacks had averaged 878 a day. Simultaneously with the beginning of the airlift, the effective border patrol was increased 100 percent, which should have drastically increased apprehensions. Yet within 2 weeks apprehensions had dropped to between 200 and 300 a day, and in 3 weeks to less than 100. This was within the same crop cycle, so there was no change in terms of job opportunities. The airlift was directly responsible for this marked improvement in the situation.

Let me point out that the airlift system, under which the illegal entrants are picked up, screened, checked by immigration authorities from Mexico as well as from the United States and deported to the heart of Mexico, has slowed down drastically the movement of illegal entrants across the Rio Grande into the United States. In other words, it has diminished the flow of wetbacks. To be sure, the program has cost money, but it has been effective. However, the complaint about the program is made because of its effectiveness.

The figures are quite revealing as to how most of the illegal entrants get into the United States and where they go after they have entered. During the fiscal year 1951, the border patrol in the Imperial Valley of California apprehended 221,502 illegal aliens. This year the service has moved a sufficient number of illegally entered aliens from that area to the interior of Mexico, to have reduced during the first 6 months the number of apprehensions to 46,486. In other words, this operation has helped the Immigration Service regain very substantial control over the illegal entry of aliens in that area.

When we consider the Texas situation, we find that most of the difficulty is concentrated in about six counties along the border of Texas. There is a great hue and cry rising from that area, the complaint being that the airlift is extravagant and ridiculous; that all it does is to give the aliens a nice ride. The fact is that the airlift has reduced the number of illegal entrants. The effectiveness of the program is what some persons are complaining about.

Unless the Government takes drastic measures to stop the wetback invasion, the gates will be opened for every kind of influence that could possibly be dreamed of to permit illegal entry into the United States.

Next door to us is the Republic of Mexico. Under our immigration laws, citizens of the Republic of Mexico have free access back and forth across the border. If illegal entrants can come into the United States, why check with consuls? Why check with immigration officials? We must have an idea of the type of people who are moving into some areas of this country.

Furthermore, the wetback invasion is not concentrated in the Imperial Valley or the Rio Grande Valley; it has gone as far north as Detroit and Chicago. Thousands of such people have been moved out of the Chicago and Detroit areas, from Cleveland and Akron, Ohio, and from other places. They were working in factories, and in packinghouses, in particular, but were picked up by the Immigration Service as illegal entrants. We have been able to move those people out of the United States effectively.

What is the difference between deportation by airlift and the other type of deportation? Ordinary deportation

takes illegal entrants just across the bridge and deposits them on the other side of the river. When they have gone across the bridge, they come right across the river again. Air deportation makes it possible to put them down into the heart of Mexico.

The Mexican Government is cooperating with the airlift operation. It is cooperating to make the program effective. I think it would be a serious mistake to limit these funds.

I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for what he said in reference to detention centers and patrolmen. Unless an appropriation is provided for 300 patrolmen, the effectiveness of the program will be lost.

Detention centers are for the purpose of holding illegal entrants until they can be screened and checked by the Immigration Service, for a host of different reasons, before they are put on planes and deported.

The airlift is not a Fancy Dan operation. It is the cheapest kind of coach service. The kind of planes on which these people are sent home are DC–4's, a type of converted military craft, having a maximum number of seats so as to be able to fill the plane, consistent with safety, and to transport the illegal entrants from the United States border literally as far south into Mexico as the planes can travel. The planes go far below Mexico City.

Mr. President, I believe we should continue this operation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was quite concerned about making the amount $4,000,000. Not having as much knowledge about the airlift as has the Senator from Minnesota, I, of course, compromised to the extent that I wanted to be sure that detention places and an adequate personnel at the border would be provided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is vital.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would have no objection to having the Senator from Minnesota, amending my amendment by adding the amount for the airlift, at least, and keeping it open, so that the amendment might be taken to conference and the facts ascertained.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My desire is to get this subject into conference. I know that can be done through the amendment of the Senator from Washington. In that way the subject can be properly reviewed.

It is inconceivable to me that both the House of Representatives and the Senate committee should have done nothing about this particular item. This is one of the most serious problems we have. The wetback problem is not a Texas or California problem. It has become a problem for the State of Washington. It is a problem in the State of Michigan. It is a problem in the State of Minnesota, in the State of Ohio, and in the State of Illinois. We are picking up literally hundreds of illegal entrants. In the city of Chicago hundreds of them have been picked up and held for deportation proceedings. The only way they can be adequately and quickly deported and gotten back to the country where they belong is through the airlift service. If we want this program to work we must maintain the airlift operation. Even with the border patrol as good as it is—and we could put on another thousand officers—it will never stop this invasion unless it is made clear to the wetbacks that the minute they are picked up they will be deported. When they are deported by means of the airlift operation they cannot immediately get back on a freight train and return to the United States in equal numbers. No one can substantiate the claim that they are returning to the United States in equal numbers.

The evidence before the committee showed that the airlift operation augmented and supplemented the effectiveness of the immigration program. It was proved quite conclusively that with the airlift, a limited number of border patrol officers can do a good job. Without the airlift, we have the border patrol officers playing "ring around the rosy" with illegal entrants. The border patrol officers take them across the bridge and deposit them at the other end of the bridge, and almost immediately they come back across the river.

I should like to modify the Senator's amendment, if I may be permitted to do so. I do not know what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington may modify his own amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Washington to modify his amendment so as to provide at least for a continuation of the airlift service. I want to be reasonable. The Bureau of the Budget has asked for approximately a $4,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, so that the Senator from Minnesota may offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington withdraws his amendment. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of enabling him to offer an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not necessary for the Senator to withdraw his amendment. I ask the Senator if he will not modify his amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I took the position that it was vital to get the other two items into conference, but I appreciate the importance of the suggestions of the Senator from Minnesota. It would be simpler for the Senator from Minnesota to offer an amendment on page 26, line 9, to strike out "$40,399,000" and insert the new figure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now withdraw the offer which I made to accept the two items referred to, in the amount of approximately $2,000,000. I am opposed to the whole thing. I offered to take to conference an item of $2,000,000 for two separate purposes, namely, $1,460,500 for the border patrol, and $540,500 for operation of detention camps. That was to carry out the spirit and the provisions of the law already enacted. I offered to take that proposal to conference. Now it is proposed to increase the amount to $4,000,000, and I withdraw my offer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to offer an amendment?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$40,399,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$44,400,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Nevada has taken the position he has taken. I was trying to explain the airlift operation. I recognize that in the Senate we frequently do not get what we think we ought to have. The Senator from Nevada is hurting no one but himself, as the responsible chairman of the subcommittee. Whether the wetbacks come in or not is not a personal problem. It is a problem of national magnitude. If we are to look at it from the personal standpoint, then all we shall be doing will be jeopardizing the security and the standard of living of this country.

Frankly, the Congress has an obligation under the law and under the treaty and agreement which we have entered into.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Minnesota will suspend, the Chair thinks it might clear the atmosphere if the Chair were to explain that before the Senator from Minnesota came into the Chamber the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] offered the identical amendment which the Senator from Minnesota is now offering.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Later the Senator from Washington modified his amendment to the smaller amount, at which time the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] indicated that he would not oppose the smaller amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that clearly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a word of explanation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In furtherance of that plan the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I held a

discussion on the floor of the Senate, in which it was agreed that the $2,000,000 appropriation necessary for the two items referred to would be taken to conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I presume that is where we shall land eventually. However, I hope that we may at least have the privilege of debating what we consider to be a desirable program. So long as I am exercising my rights as a United States Senator, I propose to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Minnesota says that I am making it a personal matter. It is not personal with me. It has nothing to do with me. I am here simply as a responsible chairman of the subcommittee. The subcommittee submitted a certain figure to the full committee, and the full committee adopted it. I was offering to take one-half of the amount for two particular items which are provided for in the law already in existence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observation and contribution to this debate. I have no objection to compromising on the basis of the total amount of the budget figure. I simply say that I feel a deep responsibility. I attended all the hearings on this subject, for 7 weeks. There were 7 weeks of hearings on the entire problem of migratory labor and wetback invasion. I would feel derelict in my duty as a United States Senator if I did not tell the Senate that the airlift operation is an integral part of the whole Immigration Service and the border patrol.

It is not sufficient merely to put on additional officers, and to have two detention centers. To be sure, that helps. That fulfills our legal commitments, so far as concerns any agreements which we have made. However, the simple truth is that the airlift operation has been an effective weapon against the illegal invasion of wetback entrants.

All I am arguing is that the Senate should take cognizance of the evidence which has been submitted. I am no expert in the field of wetbacks. All I know is that every single witness who appeared before our committee testified as to the value of this kind of operation. It seems to me that the Senate should want the truth. It seems to me that the Senate should want to know what the witnesses who have appeared before a committee of the Senate have said. It seems to me that it is right that we should express our opinions, when we know that this service is vital to the immigration program. We shall have to be satisfied with whatever figure we can get. We shall do the best we can. It is my hope that, if the figure of $4,000,000 is too large, we can compromise on a lower figure. I do not think we should tie the hands of the Immigration Service today and say that it cannot use any of this money for an airlift operation. The facts reveal that the border patrol and the detention centers alone are not adequate to meet the problem.

The facts further reveal that there are some people in this country who want this cheap labor. The facts further reveal that the most of the problem is concentrated in five or six counties in one State, and in the Imperial Valley of California. The facts reveal that the airlift operation in the Imperial Valley of California was a phenomenal success. It was successful from Detroit. It was successful from Chicago; and it has been successful in Texas, in dealing with the situation along the Rio Grande.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to explain the parliamentary situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the proponents of the amendment, controlled by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has not yet elapsed. After that time has elapsed, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will have the full time.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is exactly what I wish to address my remarks to.

Earlier in the day when it was sought to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for the limitation of debate I raised an objection to the proposed arrangement unless 30 minutes on a side were allowed in connection with an amendment which was to be proposed by certain of my colleagues and myself. It was agreed to by the distinguished majority leader. Unanimous consent was given to that effect. The amendment which is offered by the Senator from Minnesota is the amendment which I had in mind and as to which unanimous consent was given to limit debate to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side. Therefore, the proponents are entitled to 30 minutes of debate on this amendment. I believe the distinguished majority leader will bear me out.

In connection with the amendment itself I should like to say that we have been hearing for a long time about the large number of people who are coming into this country illegally. It was for that reason—and it is a very valid reason—that immigration legislation was proposed.

I believe that we should do everything we possibly can to stop at the border and to turn back persons who seek to enter this country illegally. I know of no class which is so typical of illegal entrants as the wetbacks.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, has already referred to the hearings which were held by the Labor Committee. Testimony was offered before the committee by well-informed officials of the Government that as many as 700,000 or 800,000 persons annually come into this country illegally by swimming the Rio Grande or coming across the border at other points. These persons do not enter the country under an agreement with the Mexican Government, but come into the country under the protection of darkness or by other means. They take up residence in this country and compete illegally with our labor. They are willing to work for a pittance. They are willing to work for as little as half or a third of the prevailing wages which are guaranteed to American citizens and foreigners who come into this country legally.

Naturally many of those who want to employ that kind of labor do not cooperate in apprehending and deporting such illegal entrants. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota provides for the detection, apprehension, and deportation of this large number of persons who have come across the Mexican border illegally, and who have taken up residence in this country and compete with agricultural labor in the South, with railroad labor all over the country, and with labor in industry as far north as Detroit, Minneapolis, and New York City.

Mr. President, there are no adequate means to apprehend and deport this great number of illegal immigrants. There is no doubt whatever that one of the greatest weapons with which to control this bad situation is to deport these people by airplane, not by taking them across the international bridge and turning them loose, because in that way they can get back into the country within 2 days. They must be taken deep into Mexico, from which it will be difficult for them to return to the border. I believe we are receiving the cooperation of the Mexican Government in that regard. I feel very strongly that the Senate should adopt the amendment in the full amount asked for, namely, $4,000,000. It is the only way in which the situation can be handled.

If we earnestly desire to exclude people who want to come into this country illegally, and who are actually coming into this country illegally, the Senate will agree to the amendment, so that it may be taken to conference, in the hope that it will be accepted by the conferees of both Houses.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that no immigration quota applies to Mexicans?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Any Mexican who can pass the qualification with respect to health, criminal record, and so forth, can come into this country legally without regard to any quota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. It is entirely possible that among the wetbacks there may be diseased persons and persons with criminal records; and that is one reason why we should prohibit the illegal entry of such people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also true that the budget estimate for immigration was made up on the theory that we would be able to take these people so far down into Mexico that it would be hard for them to get back into this country; otherwise we would have to have a border patrolman for every 25 miles of border?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It would be impossible adequately to police the border without a division of troops.

Mr. KILGORE. It would require more than a division of troops. It would require several divisions. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding.

Mr. KILGORE. The reason for the airlift is to limit the number of border patrolmen necessary, so that it will be possible for a limited number of border patrolmen adequately to protect the border from illegal entrants.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The Senator from West Virginia has made a very valuable contribution to the debate by pointing out that legal entrants are not subject to any quota. Anyone in this hemisphere can come into the United States if he meets certain qualifications. There is no quota in effect. Any Mexican who wants to come into the United States under our immigration law can come in.

Therefore, what is the wetback problem all about, Mr. President? Why is it that some persons are so much concerned about the wetback problem? It is because the testimony before the committees of Congress reveal the fact that wetbacks are exploited to the extent of paying them as little as 5 cents an hour. They are paid from 5 to 20 cents an hour. That is the prevailing wage for wetback labor. The prevailing wage for labor which comes into this country legally runs from 50 cents to $1 an hour.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that, in addition to exploiting the wetbacks to the extent of paying them as little as 5 cents an hour, the inevitable result is to drive down the wages paid to American labor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There can be no doubt about that at all.

Mr. LEHMAN. The wages paid to American labor are driven down from 30 percent to 60 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is absolutely no control over the wages that can be paid to wetbacks. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not also a fact that the wet-back problem affects not only labor in the agricultural States of the South and the States which border on Mexico but also affects labor in every State of the Union?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Testimony before our committee revealed the fact that there was an influx of wetbacks into industry in Detroit, into the packing houses of Chicago, and into other areas of the United States. It has become a very serious problem in every industrial area of the United States.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that it is possible that leprosy might be brought into the country by an illegal entrant?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a possibility.

Mr. KILGORE. That is a possibility, in the light of the fact that no health inspection is carried on so far as wetbacks are concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. It is a possibility.

Mr. KILGORE. Any kind of disease might be brought into the packing houses, or even spread through medium of fruits and vegetables handled by such labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I have a statement which is much more explanatory than any spontaneous or ad lib remarks can be. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with documentations as to appropriations for the Immigration Service as they pertain to the wetback problem.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

During the past 10 years the illegal entry of aliens over the Mexican border has increased from a few thousand annually to an unknown figure in excess of a half million during the fiscal year 1951. During that year the border patrol of the Immigration and Naturalization Service apprehended more than 510,000 aliens who had entered illegally, the vast majority of them over the Mexican border. During the first 11 months of the current fiscal year, border patrol has apprehended 478,352 aliens, of which 242,407 were made in one border patrol sector in the extreme lower Rio Grande Valley. Ten years ago the border patrol had an authorized officer force of 1,450. This force had gradually been reduced to 1,081 officers until on the 5th of this month this Congress authorized an increase of 335 additional border patrol positions.

Much has been said recently before congressional committees and in debate upon the floor of Congress concerning the evils to the country at large of the so-called Mexican wetback invasion. It is not only those evils with which Congress should feel concerned, great as they are. What should concern Congress is the threat of the internal security of the United States that such an uncontrolled border situation should be permitted to exist under present world conditions. To the south of us, only one country removed, lies what amounts to a Soviet beachhead in the Western Hemisphere and, yet, for the sake of permitting the illegal entry of a horde of cheap Mexican illegal aliens, the Congress until recently has repeatedly refused to strengthen our border patrol force.

On June 5, 1952, 3 weeks ago today, this Congress approved in the third supplemental appropriation bill for 1952 the sum of $1,390,000 for the purpose of enabling Immigration and Naturalization Service to do the following:

1. Increase the border patrol force by 335 positions.

2. Establish two detention camps required for the assembling and processing of illegal Mexican aliens being removed to the interior of Mexico, and provide 90 positions for the manning of these camps.

3. Make possible the removal to the interior of Mexico by aircraft with the full cooperation of the Mexican Government approximately 25,000 nationals of Mexico who have entered this country illegally.

Pursuant to this authorization by Congress, which of course the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be expected to take as a directive, that Service has caused approximately 300 men from all parts of the United States who were on border patrol eligible registers to report for duty at border patrol stations along the Mexican border. These men gave up jobs to accept appointments, proceeded to the border at their own expense, in many cases accompanied by their families. If Congress does not provide the funds which appear to have been guaranteed when the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act was passed, these new officers who have just reported for duty will have to be separated on June 30, and they will have to return to their homes at their own expense.

Next, the Immigration Service has obligated the funds which were appropriated for the establishment of the two camps, one at Chula Vista, Calif., and the other at Brownsville, Tex., and, in fact, construction has already commenced. Therefore, unless this amendment is passed the Service will find itself in the position of having two camps, on or shortly after July 1, with no personnel authorized to man them. The money which has been appropriated will have been wasted.

Lastly, the Immigration Service resumed the airlift on June 12. This has already had a telling effect, but it will be of no effect unless the operation can be continued until the Mexican border situation is brought under control. Unless the amendment is passed the operation will have to be discontinued and the money thus far expended upon it will have been for naught.

Incidentally, there has been a most violent reaction in the lower Rio Grande Valley to the recent resumption of the airlift. It has been attacked in the lower valley, where the greatest numbers of illegal laborers are used, as being extravagant and ineffective. Note again that so far this year more than half of all of the illegal aliens apprehended in the United States have been arrested in this small area embracing only about six counties. I am sure that the users of illegal labor are not concerned with its ineffectiveness. As a matter of fact, the violence with which this operation has been attacked is the best evidence of its effectiveness.

During the fiscal year 1951 border patrol in the Imperial Valley of California apprehended 221,502 illegal aliens. This year the Service has moved a sufficient number of illegally entered aliens from that area to the interior of Mexico to have reduced during the first 6 months the number of apprehensions to 46,486. In other words, this operation has helped the Service regain very substantial control over the illegal entry of aliens in that area. Obviously what needs to be done is to extend that control instead of abandoning it.

There is another aspect of this matter. Last July Congress passed Public Law 78 for the purpose of providing in a legal manner, pursuant to an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, Mexican workers needed in American agriculture. That act, among other things, imposed certain sanctions, although weak, against the employment of Mexican aliens not lawfully within the United States.

On August 11, 1951, a new agreement was signed between the United States and Mexico relating to the legal importation of Mexican farm workers. The agreement prohibits the use of Mexican laborers illegally in the United States and commits the United States to enforce to the fullest extent the provisions of our applicable laws, and to take all possible additional measures for the elimination of illegal Mexican traffic across the international boundary. Perhaps the most serious impediment to the success of the program relating to the importation of Mexican farm workers has been the continued presence in the United States of scores of thousands of illegal Mexican aliens.

Further, to carry out this country's commitment to enforce the immigration laws relating to the illegal entry of Mexicans as well as of other aliens, Congress only last March passed Public Law 283 to provide

clearer penalties against the illegal bringing in, harboring and concealing, shielding from detection and transporting of aliens illegally in the United States. This act also clarified the authority of immigration officers to carry out their responsibilities under the law.

And now, as recently as March, Congress having taken that action, and as recently as 3 weeks ago it having provided funds to step up the enforcement program of the Immigration Service, it is proposed that as of 5 days hence the Congress completely eliminate the same necessary funds.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 7289, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

On June 5, 1952, funds and authoritative language were provided by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 375) to permit the Immigration and Naturalization Service to accomplish the following:

1. Strengthen the border patrol force on the Mexican border by 335 additional positions.

2. Establish and operate two processing facilities for the purpose of documenting and fingerprinting apprehended illegal entrants prior to removal to Mexico.

3. Remove approximately 25,000 Mexican nationals to the interior of Mexico following their apprehension after entry into the United States illegally.

An item of $4,001,000 was included in the 1953 budget for the purpose of carrying forward the emergency program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952. On March 28, 1952, the House Committee recommended a reduction of $1,000,000. By floor action on April 4, 1952, the House eliminated the entire item of $4,001,000. On June 13, 1952, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service appeared before a Senate Appropriations Subcomittee and testified in support of an appeal for restoration of the item of $4,001,000. On June 24, 1952, the Senate Committee reported the 1953 bill without restoring the item of $4,001,000.

Pursuant to the authorization in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has caused to report for duty some 300 additional employees, recruited from various locations throughout the United States and reporting at their own expense to positions of duty on the southern border. Also construction work has been started for the two processing stations and supplies and equipment have been ordered to implement the program. Unless the Congress now provides money to carry forward this emergency program already authorized it will mean that those additional employees so far recruited must be separated as of June 30, 1952 and that they must return to their homes at great personal expense and sacrifice. It will also mean that augmented corrective measures on the Mexican border must be immediately halted and that much of the money already appropriated and expended during the current fiscal year will have been in vain.

CHRONOLOGY OF APPROPRIATION EVENTS, MEXICAN BORDER PROBLEM

July 25, 1951: Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1952 in amount of $6,500,000 requested by President (H. Rept. No. 208).

August 17, 1951: House Committee recommended $4,000,000 (H. Rept. 890).

August 20, 1951: By floor action the House eliminated entire item.

October 6, 1951: Senate Committee recommended restoration of $3,000,000 (S. Rept. No. 891); bill was passed by Senate for $3,000,000.

October 19, 1951: Joint Committee of Conference recommended $1,000,000.

November 1, 1951: Amount of $1,000,000 made available by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 253).

February 14, 1952: Supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1952 in amount of $2,000,000 requested by President (H. Doc. No. 348).

March 7, 1952: House Committee recommended $1,390,000 (H. Rept. No. 1503).

March 13, 1952: By floor action the House eliminated the entire item.

April 10, 1952: Senate Committee recommended restoration of $1,390,000 (S. Rept. No. 1454); passed by Senate April 22, 1952.

June 3, 1952: Joint Committee of Conference recommended $1,390,000 (H. Rept. No. 2017).

June 5, 1952: Amount of $1,390,000 made available by Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 375).

1953 budget: Item of $4,001,000 included for continuance of program covered by Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952.

March 28, 1952: House committee recommended a reduction of $1,000,000 (H. Rept. 1665).

April 4, 1952: By floor action the House eliminated the entire item of $4,001,000, leaving a recommended appropriation of $40,399,000 for the entire service.

June 13, 1952: Commissioner Mackey appeared before the Senate committee and gave testimony in support of an appeal for restoration of the item of $4,001,000.

June 24, 1952: The Senate committee reported the 1953 bill in the amount of $40,399,000, thus failing to restore the item of $4,001,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my hope that we will make a proper settlement of the problem. I wish the Senator from Nevada were on the floor. I feel an obligation to the Senator from Washington to permit him to again offer his amendment. I wanted time to discuss the proposal, because I believe that the RECORD should be perfectly clear. It is my understanding that the Immigration Service feels that under no circumstances could they operate for even a short period of time for less than $2,500,000, and that $4,000,000 is a basic minimum for the program for a full year's operation.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment so as to permit the Senator from Washington to offer his amendment and thereby permit the Senate to get some action on this problem through the conference committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 26, line 9, to strike out "$40,399,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$42,399,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington desire to be heard?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I do not.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator's amendment is accepted it places the whole item in conference. Is that correct? Is it possible that in conference adjustment can be made in terms of the total sum?

Mr. KILGORE. The conference may not go above the figure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I incorrectly informed the Senator from Minnesota. I thought that the conference committee could change a figure up or down. I understand now that the conference committee cannot go above a figure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington would be willing to modify his amendment so as to provide an additional half million dollars, because $2,500,000 is considered the basic minimum needed for the program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I broke down the figures shown in the hearings. For the border patrol there is provided $465,500, and for the operation of detention camps there is provided $540,500. I eliminated the item of $2,000,000 for the removal of Mexican aliens. I understood that is the figure that would be acceptable. Those are the figures as broken down in the hearings.

If we were to add $500,000, I do not know what the additional amount would be used for, other than in connection with the item for removal of Mexican aliens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the explanation the Senator has given, I feel morally bound at least to place before the Senate my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. I would not feel that I had done my duty as a responsible Member of this body if I did not offer my amendment to his amendment, so as to provide that the airlift be placed in operation.

If the Senate wishes to reject my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, that is for the Senate to decide. I simply wish to have the RECORD perfectly clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Minnesota can submit such an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, at this time I offer to the amendment of the Senator from Washington an amendment calling for an additional $500,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that amendment to my amendment is in order, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair understands the present parliamentary situation to be as follows: The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has submitted an amendment, on page 26, in line 9, to strike out "$40,399,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$42,399,000." To that amendment, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has submitted an amendment to strike out "$42,399,000" and insert "$42,899,000."

In short, the Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would increase by $500,000 the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington to the amount appearing in the bill on page 26, in line 9.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, previously I offered to compromise this matter, but apparently my offer was not acceptable. I offered to accept an amount of $2,000,000, specifying the items; but that was not acceptable.

I must resist this amendment.

My information is that the luxury flights by which the wetbacks are taken back to Mexico, result in taking them to Mexico City, and thereafter they board

the first northbound train, and soon have crossed the border again. Thereafter they are given another airplane ride to central Mexico, and so forth.

This item was cut on the floor of the House, as being unnecessary. The item has been critized severely. In view of the fact that my compromise was not accepted, it seems to me that at this time I must resist the amendment.

I now ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair explain the parliamentary situation: The Senator from Washington reoffered his amendment, which previously had been withdrawn, to change the item of "$40,399,000" in line 9, on page 26, to "$42,399,000."

The Senator from Minnesota has submitted to that amendment an amendment to increase that amount by $500,000.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington.

All time on the so-called Magnuson amendment has expired.

All time on the amendment calling for $44,000,000 has expired.

The only time remaining is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not take much time. I merely wish to say that the Immigration Service has told the Senate's committee and, in fact, told my legislative counsel within the last half hour, that an additional amount of $2,500,000 is the absolute minimum with which it can possibly "get by."

The Senator from Nevada was willing to accept the amount of $2,000,000 in reference to the detention camps and border patrol.

The simple fact of the matter is that this airlift operation is an integral part of the enforcement plan of the Immigration Service. I submit that all that has been stated today is a charge that these flights are "luxury" flights, and that thereafter the wetbacks board northbound trains and return to the United States. However, there is no evidence to support such a statement.

The evidence before the Congress, already published in our committee reports, indicates that the airlift operation has been very effective and has had positive results.

Soon we shall vote on the question of whether the Senate wishes to do something about the wetbacks, or whether again the Senate will fail to act in accordance with its responsibility to stop this invasion of the United States by illegal entrants, who drive down our standard of living and our standard of labor and jeopardize the health and security of our Nation.

Some of us have worked long hours on this problem. A number of Senators who listened to the testimony on this problem are now on the floor. I regret that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has recently left the Chamber, but he attended the hearings. The Senator from Montana knows that hearings were held before this committee. The Senator from New York attended the hearings. In all, 13 Senators attended those hearings. Among them was the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. Those Senators heard the testimony.

All I say is that there must be something more than an assertion that this program is a luxury program and is ineffective. The fact of the matter is that the testimony reveals that the program has been effective. The additional $500,000 that is requested will be enough to keep the program operating for a short period of time.

Congress has acted on this matter on other occasions. The airlift is now in operation, and it has been in operation. It is not a new operation; Congress has previously authorized it.

I submit that the appropriation of an additional amount of $2,500,000 certainly is justified, inasmuch as it is approximately $1,500,000 below the amount of the Budget estimate, and is smaller than any appropriation previously made for this purpose.

So I plead with the Senator from Nevada to give us help in having this amendment included in the bill as finally enacted. I know of his influence in this body. I know he can get his way. But I know he is a man of fair judgment. If he will simply consider this proposal for an increase of $2,500,000 in the appropriation, he will see that it is needed. He has already said that an increase of $2,000,000 is needed. I say that the extra $500,000 will provide an opportunity to continue the airlift. If anyone wishes to say that the airlift is not effective, I think we should have the proof of that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the issue involved in this matter is far more important than that of appropriating an additional $500,000, even though that is a large amount of money. I believe this issue is vital in connection with our entire migration problem. We have made every effort—and it is proper for us to do so—to exclude from our country those who have no right to be here—those who do not meet the standards and qualifications which have been established. We have made every effort—and we shall continue to do so—to deport from the United States all who enter our country illegally.

I assume that a considerable number of persons have entered the United States illegally. In most instances I believe it has been found possible, under our laws, to deport them.

On the other hand, in this case we are dealing with a number of persons far greater than the number involved in any other classification with which we have had to deal or with which we are dealing today.

About 700,000 of these wetbacks are entering the United States illegally each year, and in most instances they remain in the United States illegally.

When the question of an agreement with the Mexican Government came before the Senate, I remember that my distinguished colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I submitted an amendment to impose a penalty on those who knowingly employ persons who are illegally in the United States and who remain here illegally. We did not wish to have that penalty imposed on an honest farmer who employs such a person through ignorance. We merely proposed that it be a misdemeanor or a felony for a person to employ a person known by him to be a wetback or, in short, to be in the United States illegally.

The amendment, as the Senator from Illinois will recall, was defeated. No effort whatever was made to strengthen the enforcement arm of the law so as to exclude persons who had entered this country illegally. The only way by which it was possible to get at them was to punish the employers who sought to use their labor, knowing that they had come in as wetbacks or in other illegal classifications.

We provide for the exclusion of a sailor who jumps ship, as we should do, if he is not eligible to come here as a legal immigrant. We deport other persons who, in small numbers, may have entered the United States, in one way or other illegally; and we should deport them. Yet, in the same breath, we say we are willing to tie the hands of our law-enforcement officials in the case of at least 700,000 immigrants whom we know to be here illegally. That, to me, simply does not make sense. If we are really sincere in trying to exclude those who cannot legally enter this country; if we are really sincere, as has been claimed, in seeking to deport those who have entered illegally and who do not belong here, then certainly we are not justified in refusing to strengthen the arms of our law-enforcement officials in detecting, apprehending, and deporting this vast number of persons, many of whom are now openly employed in Southern States, and many of whom in other sections of our country compete illegally with American labor in railroad work and in other lines of industry.

Mr. President, this issue far transcends the matter of a half million dollars. This issue, I think, goes to the very heart of the question of whether we are sincere in trying to exclude persons who do not belong in this country, persons who, because of acts of moral turpitude or through failure to possess the qualifications set forth in our laws, should be excluded. Are we sincere in our determination to deport persons who have entered this country illegally, and who should be deported? Seven hundred thousand persons enter this country illegally each year. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will prevail.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator please explain what seems to me to be the incompatible situation in which he finds himself? I now find him zealously advocating the deportation of persons who are in the United States illegally, when, only a week or two ago, he bitterly and at length fought an immigration bill which provided machinery under which a potential 1,000,000 people who are here illegally and who are competing with our labor could have been deported. The Senator's position, to me, seems incredible.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am delighted to answer the question of the Senator from Iowa. My position from the very start has been that I want no man or woman to come into the United States who is guilty of an act involving moral turpitude or who has otherwise shown by his or her acts that he or she will not make a good citizen.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I decline to yield until I have fully answered my distinguished colleague from Iowa. I shall then be very glad to yield.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I decline to yield until I have answered my distinguished colleague from Iowa. I shall then be very glad indeed to answer my colleague from Nevada.

I have taken the position consistently from the start—and I took this position long before I came to the Senate—that if a person were in this country illegally and could be shown to be here illegally, he should be deported, after he has been given a fair hearing and a fair trial on the charges or accusations made against him. I do not believe that any agency of the Government should have the power to go into homes and seize and deport men without a fair trial, without compliance with our judicial procedure. But, when a trial has been had, when the test has been made, and the facts justify, I certainly favor deportation.

In the instant case, the immigrants certainly have made no effort whatever to come into this country under the agreement which we have with the Mexican Government, permitting the entry of many thousands of persons—I do not recall the number—under the protection and supervision of our Government and that of the Mexican Government, with the idea that they should be returned at the conclusion of their employment or service. With respect to the 700,000 so-called wetbacks, who enter this country clandestinely, even when they are shown to have entered illegally, I do not want to deprive them of their rights to defend themselves, any more than I would want to deprive anyone else of such rights. But when it has been demonstrated, and when, in fact, most of these people acknowledge and confess, that they have entered the United States illegally, I want to make it possible to deport them by legal means, under the close supervision of our law enforcement agencies.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may suggest to the Senator, I agree with him that people who are here without proper authority should all go back to the places from which they came. But, by the same token, I think the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people who have been brought into this country by entirely illegal means and who are living off the bounty of the United States, and competing with American labor, should be deported, and most of them would have been deported in due time under the McCarran bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LEHMAN. Gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The position of the Senator from New York and the position of several of the other Senators has been made perfectly clear. We want administrative, quasi-judicial review of individual cases; but, when it is decided that a person is an illegal entrant, we want him deported, whether on the Atlantic coast or on the Mexican border.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator think it fair that when a man is deported he should be flown to some point hundreds of miles away from his home, or from the place at which he entered this country? It suggests to me that perhaps this amendment, instead of being called the wetback amendment, perhaps should be called the catback amendment, having in mind the time-honored custom of taking a cat as far away from home as possible and then turning it loose, in the hope that it could not get back.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would call it a parcheesi amendment, parcheesi being a game in which the player goes back two places from where he started originally, that serving as a deterrent. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan did not play parcheesi when he was a boy.

Mr. FERGUSON. The older Senators may remember that game.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan ought to know that it is at the request of the Mexican Government that the wetbacks are being flown back to Mexico.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why does not the Mexican Government fly them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because they come into the United States as illegal entrants, and it is to our advantage to get them as far back into Mexico as may be possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. They should be put back across the border.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what we have been doing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then Mexico could prevent their return to the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows more about the Rio Grande than that; he is a world traveler. The only thing we can do is to put them in the heart of Mexico—not of Texas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, one statement made by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I am sure he did not mean to make, namely, that these Mexican laborers are guilty of moral turpitude, and that they are not to be regarded as proper citizens. Many Mexican have come to the United States and have become very honorable citizens. I do not think his statement should stand as I understood it to be made. The fact is that these unfortunate Mexican laborers are seeking employment. They are not guilty of being immoral; they are not guilty of any moral turpitude; they are simply seeking employment. They come into this country, and are encouraged to come here, as a matter of fact. I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] should be here, and he would probably tell us that Mexicans make very good citizens.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from New York yielded the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time have we?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have the highest regard and respect for Mexicans, as I have for other persons, but the fact is that some of them enter this country clandestinely and illegally, and we do not have the slightest idea what their qualifications are, what their character is, what their record was, or anything in connection with them. I say to the Senator from Nevada, and I mean what I say, that I do not want such persons to remain in this country. I want them to get out.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the Mexican Government has requested that they be sent into the interior of Mexico?

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand that that is the case.

Mr. KILGORE. One reason why I have felt favorably toward an appropriation of $500,000 in this connection is that it may be an incentive to have a treaty with Mexico under which that nation will do more than it has been doing. We have been flying wetbacks into the interior of Mexico, making it more difficult for them to get to the border.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 or 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, we are just starting the third year of the Korean war. It seems to me it would be very cheering news to our soldiers to say to them that while they are short of airplanes, we are voting $500,000 to set up an airlift to give plush rides to wetbacks

entering or leaving this country. It would be a very cheering message to our farmers, too, to tell them the Senator from Minnesota is in favor of this airlift.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota, with reference to his statement about plush rides, if he thinks it is a plush ride to sit on steel bucket seats for a 7-hour trip into Mexico? Apparently the Senator has not read the testimony before the committee and has no evidence whatsoever on which to base his comments. Furthermore, he said we were bringing the Mexicans in on plush rides.

Mr. CASE. I said we were bringing them in and taking them out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a one-way trip, out. It is an out-ride, not an in-ride. They are being taken a considerable distance into Mexico at the request of the Government of Mexico, which wants to make sure that it cooperates with our Government in the enforcement of the immigration laws.

I want to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his observations. The farmers of the United States are not asking for wetbacks. The farm organizations of the United States have testified before committees of the Congress in favor of stringent controls on wetbacks. The Senator is not representing the farmers or speaking in their behalf when he says that the farmers will be interested in knowing that the Senator from Minnesota is in favor of these plush rides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be rejected. The question has been discussed at length. It seems to me we should stop the procedure which is now going on. What we are doing, according to the statements made, is to pick these Mexicans up after they come across our border and return them to places in the central part of Mexico remote from their homes, since their homes must have been close to the border or otherwise they would not have come across. On the first freight train which runs north they will come back and again cross the Rio Grande, or the border, wherever it may be.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—11

Benton	Kilgore	Morse
Douglas	Lehman	Murray
Hayden	Magnuson	Neely
Humphrey	Moody	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Malone	Stennis
Ecton	Martin	Taft
Ellender	Maybank	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Duff	Lodge
Brewster	Flanders	McMahon
Byrd	Hill	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Kerr	Tobey
Chavez	Langer	

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment to Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there is no further time for debate.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have the question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$40,399,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$42,399,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senate now voting on my amendment, which increases the amount by $2,000,000 for maintenance and employees?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a point of order. The roll call has started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Washington that he is correct.

The clerk will proceed with the roll call.

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent because of illness in her family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—17

Aiken	Kilgore	Murray
Benton	Knowland	Neely
Douglas	Lehman	Nixon
Hayden	Magnuson	Thye
Hennings	Moody	Tobey
Humphrey	Morse	

NAYS—62

Bennett	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Bricker	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Eastland	Hoey
Butler, Md.	Ecton	Holland
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Hunt
Cain	Ferguson	Ives
Capehart	Frear	Jenner
Case	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Clements	George	Johnson, Tex.
Connally	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Cordon	Green	Kem

Long	Mundt	Sparkman
Martin	O'Conor	Stennis
Maybank	Pastore	Taft
McCarran	Robertson	Underwood
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Watkins
McClellan	Schoeppel	Welker
McFarland	Seaton	Wiley
McKellar	Smathers	Williams
Millikin	Smith, N. J.	Young
Monroney	Smith, N. C.	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Flanders	Malone
Brewster	Hill	McMahon
Byrd	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lodge	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 8, after the word "radio", it is proposed to insert the words "and television."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute to explain the amendment. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MCCARRAN], has agreed to take the amendment to conference. It is a clarifying amendment.

It is my feeling that under the terms of the Smith-Mundt bill the authority to use television is now included, but if there is any doubt about it and since the world of television is moving so rapidly and the opportunity for conveying ideas is so great in the field of television, I feel that it would be wise to make certain that the Voice of America operation has the authority to explore further the activities and potentialities of television.

This amendment involves the expenditure of no additional funds. It is simply clarifying language. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept it.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have not looked into this matter. The Senator from South Dakota spoke to me about it a little while ago. I said I would be willing to take the amendment to conference. I understand there may be a plan on foot to televise a program in Europe to which I might not be willing to give my assent. However, I shall keep my word and shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Nevada. In concluding my presentation of the amendment I should like to say that I know nothing about any particular program. I am not interested in any particular plan or program. I am interested only in clarifying the language of this provision of the Smith-Mundt bill so that America will not be left behind in the progress that is being made in other countries with respect to television development. It is my thought that the President or our Department of State might want to create a committee of television experts to counsel with other countries on the techniques of expanding television for transoceanic purposes. Last week the House of Commons took very constructive action when for the first time it provided that television development shall henceforth be financed by private corporations, instead of by Government operation. It is conceivable that by the expenditure of smaller sums than we are now spending we will be able to carry the voice and vision of America to a great many more people than we can do now by radio alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 305. No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for disbursement to any State which submits programs to the Bureau of Public Roads for Federal-aid highways in excess of 91 percent of the amounts apportioned to that State by the Bureau of Public Roads for the two fiscal years beginning July 1, 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to recapture the savings in highway funds which the Senate voted during the consideration of the highway bill a short time ago.

If Members of the Senate will check the RECORD they will find that the House appropriated $550,000,000 a year for the Federal aid road program. When the bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works it contained the figure of $600,000,000. That is the amount of the authorization which the Committee on Public Works reported to the Senate.

By amendment the authorization was reduced from $600,000,000 to $500,000,000, by the overwhelming vote of 57 to 14. But when the bill went to conference, the committee of conference agreed with the House figure of $550,000,000, and the House figure was upheld. The pending amendment is designed to recapture the $50,000,000-a-year savings in highway funds. The amendment will recapture that amount. The amendment will not affect any program.

The highway bill to which I have referred was signed by the President late yesterday afternoon. The Bureau of Public Roads has not even apportioned the funds to the States. They are unapportioned at this time. Commonly, the apportionment is made in the fall of the year preceding the year when the funds will be committed. Thus the funds are not committed at the present time. I want to make that point perfectly clear.

Adoption of the amendment will not cause any administrative problems in the slightest. The amendment will not effect the $325,000,000 appropriation included in the pending bill. The appropriation will be used merely as a lever with which to effect a reduction in the amount to be expended in the two subsequent years.

Mr. President, without presuming to anticipate a motion or any ruling by the Chair, I may say humbly that in my judgment the amendent is not properly subject to a point of order. It is a limitation on the use of funds. It does not require the performance of any duty by the admininstration, and the Bureau of Public Roads can proceed as it has always proceeded. The amendment merely states that those States which submit programs in excess of the amounts which the Senate voted they should receive cannot qualify for the $325,000,000 provided in this bill.

It is a very simple amendment, and constitutes a very simple way of recapturing the savings which the Senate voted in the highway bill. An amendment of exactly the same wording, with the exception of the applicable fiscal years, was declared not subject to a point of order by the Vice President on April 21. I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. If the amendment prevails it will penalize States under the Federal-highway program and would set at naught the Federal-highway program as it is now in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 7289) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON HOUSE BILL 5693

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 5693, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes, failed of passage on June 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The motion will be entered.

INVESTIGATION OF THE TUNA-FISH INDUSTRY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate considered the so-called tuna-fish bill. Today the Senate

Finance Committee approved a resolution directing the Tariff Commission to make a thorough investigation of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen, and to report the result of its investigation to the Finance Committee of the Senate on or before March 1, next. The resolution has other provisions, as well.

The resolution was submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I believe, on behalf of himself and his colleague the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was sponsored also by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to express, on behalf of my colleagues and other Senators in the Chamber, the concern we have felt about the problem facing the tuna industry; and I wish to express our appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee, and to the committee itself for taking action on this matter, so that the Tariff Commission will make the study and will present the facts to the Congress before March 1.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the request the committee is making.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, and by direction of the committee, I have today transmitted a copy of the resolution to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. Because this matter is one of interest and concern, I ask that a copy of my letter, as chairman of the committee, and a copy of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

JUNE 26, 1952.

The Honorable OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYDER: The Finance Committee today approved a resolution directing the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of the domestic tuna-fishing industry. A copy of that resolution is enclosed.

As you have been aware, the House last year passed a bill which, among other things, would have directed the Tariff Commission to carefully study this matter. That bill failed of passage in the Senate. It was brought out during the debate that the action of the Senate should probably be delayed until a thorough study had been made. The committee felt that the situation was such that an investigation by your agency would be of great help to the Congress should any future action be considered.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

Resolved, That the Tariff Commission is hereby directed, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1332), to make a thorough investigation of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen, and to report the results of its investigation to the Senate Finance Committee on or before March 1, 1953.

SEC. 2. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing is given to interested parties. The report of the Commission shall set forth the facts so determined relative to the production, trade, and consumption of tuna fish in the United States, and shall take into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. Such report also shall contain a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic tuna fishing industry of the present free entry of foreign tuna, so as to assist the Congress in determining what change, if any, shall be made in the tariff status of fresh or frozen tuna.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 7 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $2,725,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $4,825,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
ZALES N. ECTON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. VAUGHN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
BEN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PALMER, ALASKA, AIRPORT—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared, together with some letters attached thereto, relating to the Palmer, Alaska, Airport.

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

REJECTION BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL GRANT FOR THE PALMER, ALASKA, AIRPORT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER IN THE SENATE, JUNE 26, 1952

Mr. President, nearly 2 years ago, I first exposed what has since become notorious in Alaska as the Palmer Airport deal. This was an attempt by certain officials of the Territory of Alaska in collusion with representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to extract from the Federal Government the sum of $150,000 to which they were not entitled under the Federal Airport Act. My disclosures were based on the facts developed by the Fairbanks News-Miner, a daily newspaper in Fairbanks, Alaska.

At that time, I introduced Senate Resolution 331, Eighty-first Congress, calling for a Senate investigation of all the ramifications of this attempt.

Subsequently, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments conducted a very thorough and complete investigation. The committee concluded that these representatives of the territory were attempting to obtain by subterfuge Federal matching funds which could not be obtained directly under the law, and that there had been collusion between territorial officials and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The committee recommended that the Comptroller General make a very careful study of the facts developed by its investigation before approving any Federal payment.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, has now finally ruled that because of this misrepresentation of the facts, no Federal funds may be paid under the Federal Airport Act on any of the items included by the Territory of Alaska in its application for final grant payment.

If these representatives of the Territorial Government had set forth the true facts in a sincere and forthright manner, they would have been entitled to a Federal grant for at least part of the cost of the airport. As it is, the Territory will receive nothing from the Federal Government because of the misrepresentations by these men.

I hope this incident may serve as a lesson and a warning to any other person who may be tempted to secure Federal funds to which they are not entitled.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 24, 1952.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Reference is made to your letter of March 4, 1952, relative to the Palmer (Alaska) Airport project. I have made a very careful study of all the facts of this case. For the reasons stated in my decision of today to the Secretary of Commerce on this matter, a copy of which is transmitted herewith for your information,

it is my view that the facts and circumstances of the case preclude allowance of any of the project costs on the present record.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 24, 1952.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to letter dated January 31, 1952, from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, requesting a decision on certain questions presented by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in a memorandum enclosed therewith, concerning, in general, the allowability of costs involved in the acquisition of project lands under the Federal Airport Act approved May 13, 1946, 60 Stat. 170, and, in particular, the propriety of making grant payments on the Palmer (Alaska) Airport project.

On January 9, 1950, the Territory of Alaska, through the Director of Aviation, submitted a project application to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for Federal aid under the Federal Airport Act for the development of the Palmer Municipal Airport. The application shows the estimated cost of the land as $5,500 and other estimated project costs totaling $124,500. The estimated Federal share of the total cost was $94,750, representing 25 percent of the cost of the land and 75 percent of the other project costs. It is recited in paragraphs 3 and 14 of the application that the sponsor held full title to tract No. 1, as identified on the map attached as exhibit A, and would acquire full title to tract No. 2 and aviation easements to tracts 3 and 4. A grant offer upon the basis of such project application was made by the Civil Aeronautics Administration but was rejected by the officials of the Territory of Alaska.

On March 17, 1950, a second project application was submitted which shows the estimated cost of the land as $150,000 and other estimated project costs as $143,500. The estimated Federal share of the total costs is shown as $145,125. This project application recites in paragraph 3 that the sponsor did not hold title to any land, and in paragraph 14 that the sponsor would acquire title to tracts 1 and 2. Grant Agreement C8ca-3390, offered upon the basis of the second project application, was accepted on March 31, 1950. The grant agreement provides that the Government would pay, as its share of the cost incurred in accomplishing the project, a maximum of $145,125 upon the basis of 25 percent of the cost of the land and 75 percent of other project costs to the extent such costs are determined to be allowable.

By application for grant payment dated June 6, 1951, the sponsor applied for the first and final payment in the total amount of $148,922.68, which is in excess of the maximum of $145,125 specified in the grant agreement. The application for payment shows the Federal share of the cost of the land to be $38,285.96, representing 25 percent of the total estimated cost of $153,143.85, and the cost of construction, engineering, and administration to be $110,636.72 representing 75 percent of the cost of $147,515.63.

Senate Resolution 331, Eighty-first Congress, authorized a study and investigation of the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of the Palmer Airport with a view to determining whether any actions with respect thereto were taken for the purpose of obtaining Federal funds in excess of the amount authorized by law and whether such actions were fraudulent or otherwise in violation of law. An inquiry was conducted by the Subcommittee on Investigations, Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hearings having been held on January 18 and 19, 1951, and an interim report was filed, Senate Report No. 357, Eighty-second Congress.

It appears from the entire record before this office that on February 26, 1945, a group of citizens representing the various civic organizations of Palmer and the Matanuska Valley organized a nonprofit organization to be known as the Palmer Airport Association for the announced purpose of acquiring, equipping, maintaining, and otherwise operating an airport at Palmer, Alaska. A landing field was selected upon the recommendation of officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and construction was begun in 1945. Following the subsequent enactment of the Federal Airport Act, the Palmer Airport Association repeatedly attempted to obtain Federal aid for development of the airport through the cooperation of the Territory of Alaska. However, there was no public agency in Alaska which could qualify as a sponsor under section 2 (9) of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170), for the Palmer Airport until passage of Territorial enabling legislation, which became effective June 1, 1949. Prior to the passage of the enabling legislation, the Territory of Alaska made Territorial funds available to the association for airport construction, allegedly in the approximate amount of $53,000. Also extensive and valuable improvements were donated by individuals in the form of labor and the use of machinery. The airport as thus constructed comprised what was designated in the project application and the grant agreement as tract No. 1.

It appears from all available evidence that the Territorial officials clearly intended to claim reimbursement from the Federal Government on a matching basis for their expenditures on tract No. 1 when they could qualify as a sponsor. The said officials testified that the money was expended on the strength of representations made by officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska that a claim for reimbursement of such costs could be eligible as a project cost under the Federal Airport Act. The testimony of the Civil Aeronautics officials as to such representations is to the contrary.

In any event, it finally was learned that, because of the prohibition in section 13 (2) of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 177) against the allowance of a project cost (except the cost of acquiring land) incurred prior to the execution of a grant agreement, the construction cost expended on the airport prior to the grant agreement, dated March 31, 1950, could not be used as a project cost. The alternative method of including the reasonable value of the land as enhanced by the airport improvements as a project cost of land acquisition was not suggested to the Territorial officials until after submission of the project application of January 9, 1950.

After such alternative method had been suggested by the Civil Aeronautics officials, the first grant offer dated January 9, 1950, of $94,750 was rejected by letter of March 15, 1950, and a revised project application dated March 17, 1950, was submitted showing the estimated cost of all of the land as $150,000 rather than $5,500 as shown in the first application. The only reason assigned for the increase in land value was that recent developments adjacent to the airport resulted in a substantial increase of property values. See exhibit No. 6A, page 186 of the hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution 331. The regional office of the Civil Aeronautics Administration forwarded the project application to the regional administrator, who was then in Washington, D. C., by letter dated March 21, 1950 (exhibit No. 6B), wherein it was stated that the land costs have been increased from $5,500 to $150,000, construction costs from $106,500 to $122,500, and an amount of $3,000 inserted for administrative costs, and that the statement concerning land ownership of tract No. 1, which appeared in the original application, had been omitted. The increase was explained to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in a memorandum dated March 27, 1950 (exhibit 6C), upon the basis that the land which the sponsor originally thought was to be donated had to be purchased, making a considerable increase in the project costs.

In suggesting the alternative method above, the Civil Aeronautics Administration officials testified that they had advised the Territorial officials in effect that the prior construction cost could be recouped, in part, by including as a cost of acquiring land the purchase price of the entire airport; that appraisals be made of the value of the property, including improvements as it existed at the time of acquisition, which would be reviewed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and that, if necessary, the appraised value would be confirmed by additional appraisals. The appraisals were made and, rather than use the appraisals to establish the value of the land acquisition for the purposes of evaluating a donation to the Territory, the Territorial officials followed the highly irregular means of using a paper transaction whereby they allegedly purchased the airport for $150,000 and the airport association immediately donated $145,000 back to the Territory. The difference of $5,000 was retained by the association for the acquisition of the additional land from private owners. In regard to the title to the land, which was certified in the first application as being held by the Territory, it was testified that the certification was based upon an oral option and that the land of the existing airport was to be donated whenever desired by the Territory; also, there was testimony to the effect that the erroneous certification was made upon advice of the Civil Aeronautics Administration regional officials who were of the view that it was easier to get approval of an application if a sponsor was shown to have title to the land and that the title actually was not required until the application was made for a grant payment.

The subcommittee stated in its interim report that it was of the opinion the Territory attempted by subterfuge to obtain Federal matching funds which could not have been obtained directly under existing law; and that as a result of collusion between officers of the Territory and those of Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska there was an attempt to shift the entire cost of the new improvements on the Palmer Airport to the Federal Government. The report of the subcommittee specifically recommends that the Comptroller General make a very careful study of the facts of this case before making any final decision relative to the disbursement of Federal funds.

The specific questions presented by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in connection with the Palmer project, on the basis of the foregoing facts, are as follows:

"Query No. 1. In view of the facts and circumstances developed in the Senate subcommittee's investigation of the Palmer, Alaska, airport project, the information contained herein, and such additional facts as the Comptroller General may deem it desirable to obtain by further investigation, is it proper to consider for allowance as project costs any of the items of cost for which payment is requested by the Territory in the subject application for final grant payment (attachment No. 1)?

"Query No. 2. Is the Territory's claimed acquisition of the Palmer Municipal Airport from the Palmer Airport Association,

under the circumstances and conditions developed in the Senate subcommittee investigation of the subject project and as outlined herein, an eligible item of airport development under the Federal Airport Act?

"Query No. 3. If the answers to queries Nos. 1 and 2 are in the affirmative, may the allowable projects costs of acquisition by the Territory of the two parcels comprising tract No. 2, exceed the sum of approximately $5,000 of territorial moneys which the Territory appears to have been out of pocket for such acquisition, if the transfer of such parcels by the association to the Territory is determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to be (a) valid or (b) invalid? It will be noted that the Palmer Airport Association retained such sum of $5,000 for use in paying to the respective record owners of the two parcels comprising tract No. 2 the full purchase price of each such percel, as described in attachment No. 2.

"Query No. 4. If the answers to queries Nos. 1 and 2 are in the affirmative, may the allowable project costs of acquisition by the Territory of the two parcels comprising tract No. 1, being the nucleus of the airport, include or reflect any portion of the sum of approximately $6,000, representing the total purchase price and interest on unpaid balances which the Palmer Airport Association paid during the years 1945–49 to the record owners of such parcels, if the transfer of tract No. 1 by the association to the Territory is determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to be (a) valid or (b) invalid?

"Query No. 5. If the answer to either part of query No. 4 is in the affirmative, may the allowable project costs of acquisition by the Territory of the two parcels comprising tract No. 1 exceed such sum of approximately $6,000, the total purchase price and interest paid the former record owner?

"Query No. 6. If the answer to query No. 5 is in the affirmative, may the allowable project costs of acquisition of the two parcels comprising tract No. 1 include or reflect the reasonable value of airport improvements or construction accomplished on such parcels prior to the date of execution of the subject Grant Agreement?

"Query No. 7. If the answer to query No. 6 is in the affirmative, may the allowable project costs of acquisition of the two parcels comprising tract No. 1 include or reflect any portion of (a) the cost of airport improvements or construction accomplished on such parcels with the aid of Territorial funds, totaling approximately $53,000, claimed to have been granted to the Palmer Airport Association for such purpose, or (b) the reasonable value of such airport improvements or construction at the time of the alleged transfer of such tract No. 1 to the Territory by the Palmer Airport Association, which value may or may not exceed such sum of $53,000?"

In connection with such questions, and with general questions 8 and 9 presented by the Administrator, attention is invited to the fact that, under section 13 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, it is the responsibility of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to determine in the first instance whether a cost incurred in carrying out a project is allowable. Therefore, unless a determination of allowability is made by the Administrator, there ordinarily is no question presented for advance decision by this Office as to whether the proposed action is authorized by law and otherwise is free from objection. The record here involved indicates that the Administrator has not made any determinations as to whether or not any item of cost in connection with the Palmer project is allowable. However, you may be advised that the views of this Office in the matter are as follows:

It is felt that the record of the hearings adequately supports the views expressed in the report of the subcommittee that there was collusion between officials of the Territory and those of Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska to the end that the Territory might receive credit in the grant agreement for funds which it had previously expended in improving the airport. Such officials were aware of the provisions of section 13 (2) of the Federal Airport Act which provides in part that—

"A project cost shall be allowable if—

* * * * *

"(2) it was incurred subsequent to the execution of the grant agreement with respect to the project, and in connection with airport development accomplished under such project after the execution of such grant agreement * * *."

Those officials were also aware of the implementing regulations of Civil Aeronautics Administration which precluded the allowance of such an item as an eligible project cost.

As a result of the methods used by Territorial officials to conceal the true nature of the estimated costs of the project and the failure of regional officials to disclose fully the facts to the Civil Aeronautics Administration officials in Washington, a grant agreement was approved for an amount in excess of that which was legally permissible under the provisions of the basic law.

The decision of November 19, 1948, B–81321, held that the value of land donated to the sponsor properly may be for consideration, under certain conditions, as a part or all of the sponsor's share of the project cost. It did not hold that such value might be enhanced by the value or cost of improvements to the land, otherwise unallowable, which had previously been added by the sponsor; nor did it contain such elements of irregularity and nondisclosure of facts as here indicated. It does not appear, therefore, that the cited decision in any respect authorizes or sanctions the type of transaction or the methods used in this case.

Accordingly, it is my view that, on the present record, the facts and circumstances would require that exception be taken to the payment as project costs of any items included by the Territory of Alaska on its application for final grant payment. In such connection, it is noted that paragraph 5 of the grant agreement accepted by the Territory of Alaska on March 31, 1950, provides as follows:

"Any misrepresentation or omission of a material fact by the sponsor concerning the project or the sponsor's authority or ability to carry out the obligations assumed by the sponsor in accepting this offer shall terminate the obligation of the United States, and it is understood and agreed by the sponsor in accepting this offer that if a material fact has been misrepresented or omitted by the sponsor, the Administrator on behalf of the United States may recover all grant payments made."

Question No. 1 is answered accordingly, making unnecessary replies to questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

It is felt that questions 8 and 9 are too indefinite and general to permit of any expression of views thereon at this time. If such questions are involved in any application or applications for payments now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Administrator determines that the items are properly allowable, submission may be made of the individual case or cases for a decision as to whether or not this Office perceives any objection to his determinations.

The administrative officer's copy of the Administrator's memorandum of January 18, 1952, and the Acting Secretary's letter of January 31, 1952, apparently forwarded here by mistake are returned herewith, together with the application for grant payment and supporting documents thereto.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Subsequently,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1837) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1736, H. R. 7800, to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title; for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill

(H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is a very important bill, and many Senators have requested to be notified when it is taken up by the Senate. Therefore, I will take the liberty of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, having been made a special order, is comparatively short, but in the form in which it now stands it is of very great importance. In reporting this bill to the Senate I called attention specifically to a provision in the report in which it was stated that the committee had deleted the provisions contained in the House bill which would have (1) preserved the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled persons, and (2) extended to the States the option of placing under old-age and survivors' insurance certain State and local employees covered by existing local or State retirement systems. In deleting these provisions, as stated in the report, it was the sentiment of the committee that the committee had not predetermined or considered the merits of these provisions, but that, because of the unusual demand for the right to be heard by people interested in both sections of the bill, the committee had simply deleted these two sections of the bill—which, incidentally, of course, reduces the cost of the bill somewhat—and had then proceeded to consider all the other sections which were included by the House. To some of these sections the committee has recommended amendments; to others, it has not.

The bill now before the Senate does these things:

First, it raises the benefits for retired persons now on the roll—that is, those who have the benefit of the old-age and survivors insurance system—by $5, or 12½ percent, whichever is larger.

Second, it increases the benefit formula from 50 percent to 55 percent of the first $100 of the average monthly wage. This, Mr. President, is an important provision, and it becomes a permanent provision of the law. The remainder of the formula, 15 percent of the next $200, would remain unchanged. This higher benefit formula will apply to those who retire in the future.

Third, the bill will increase proportionately the benefits for wives, widows, children, and beneficiaries in other categories.

Fourth, it raises from $20 to $25 a month the minimum benefit payable to a retired person. That is, the minimum benefit is raised from $20 to $25 a month, and the maximum amount payable to a family is raised from $150 to $168.75.

Fifth, the four changes noted above would become effective beginning with the month of September 1952; that is, if the bill is passed during this month and is submitted to the President.

Sixth, credits of $160 a month are provided members of the Armed Forces serving since the close of World War II, through 1953. These credits are the same as those provided in the Social Security Act amendments of 1950 for servicemen of World War II. This section was amended by the Senate Finance Committee to provide that such credits be paid out of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, rather than out of general revenues, as provided in the House bill.

Seventh, it makes technical changes that will simplify the administration of the insurance payments and correct certain inequities of the 1950 amendments.

Eighth, it provides that States may disregard the first $50 of the earned income of a needy, blind recipient, in determining the need of other members of his family receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the disabled. The committee amendment makes this provision mandatory upon the States after June 30, 1954.

Mr. President, I may explain—and this is an important provision of the bill—in the amended Social Security Act of 1950, the committee, with the Senate's approval and with approval in final conference with the House, provided that the first $50 of income earned by a blind person should not necessarily be denied the blind person by the State in fixing the amounts which his dependents might receive under some other form of aid. It was left optional, so to speak, with the States.

Again, the House has dealt with the problem, but not in the same manner the Senate dealt with it. The Senate Finance Committee has said that in their judgment the first $50 of earnings of a blind person should not be taken into consideration by the State in reducing, let us say, the amount of old-age benefits payable to the wife, or the amount payable to a dependent child living in the family. We said that, until June 30, 1954, the States may take into consideration earnings of the blind person; but that, after June 30, 1954, they may not do so. The purpose of leaving it optional with the States, until June 30, 1954, is to enable the States to make such readjustments in their laws as perhaps one or two of them may be required to make. It is not done for the purpose of encouraging the States to deduct the earned income of a blind person from the amounts which otherwise would be allowed to his wife or dependent or helpless children if they were receiving benefits under one of the assistance programs.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. First, I may say I think the committee has acted very commendably in relation to the amount of earned income which either those who come under the general provisions of the bill or the blind could earn. I think it desirable that we encourage self-help to the extent that that is possible.

I realize that it may, as the committee report suggests, take care of the eligibility of certain individuals. At the same time, I feel that if it were not for that, there would be much greater pressure for an even greater expansion of the benefits to be paid out of the fund. The pressure comes from a lack of income by which to live, so that to the extent income may be supplemented by earned income, it reduces the pressure for a greater increase.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator from South Dakota is correct. In that connection, we have increased the amount which the insured beneficiary may earn, even in a covered industry, from the present $50 a month to $100 a month. The House increased the figure from $50 to $70, but the Finance Committee was of the opinion, particularly during this period, that the recipient should be allowed to earn $100 a month without affecting his retirement benefits.

Mr. CASE. I have noted that with interest. The question I want to raise, however, is with relation to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, which has to do with the other side of social security; namely, old-age assistance. If it is desirable to liberalize the amount of money that may be earned by individuals under the insurance features of social security, would it not also be desirable to raise the amount which persons coming under old-age assistance may earn, because there is no greater eligibility created, and, actually, the earned income will supplement the needs of older persons who receive old-age assistance.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment which I propose to offer for myself and a group of Senators contains the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Georgia offered a year ago when the Senate adopted an amendment which would exempt farmers up to an amount not in excess of $50 a month for agricultural labor. We have attached the Senator's amendment to our amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that meets the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I made a mistake when I referred to the Senator from Alabama as having offered the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator was referring to the amendment which I expect to offer.

Mr. CASE. It is very much in line with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia had just been saying.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment is to raise the allowable earnings of beneficiaries of old age and survivors' insurance from $50 to $100, and also to raise the amount of the earned income of the self-employed, so that the self-employed person may be permitted to earn $100 a month and not be denied his benefits unless his earned income exceeds $1,200 a year. Both of those provisions seem wise to the committee.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the able chairman of the committee a question or two concerning the possible inclusion of parts of State retirement systems? I inquire whether any consideration was given, or is to be given, to the question, because I recall distinctly that the able Senator from Georgia gave special attention to this question in the past and manifested a very keen interest in the welfare features of State systems and those affected thereby who might properly be included in the Federal system.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the committee is not unaware of that problem; it is also acutely aware that it is a problem which ought to be fully considered. Speaking for myself, and I am rather of the opinion that I am speaking for a majority of the committee, we recognize the necessity of broadening the present provision of the Social Security Act so that State employees may have the option, at least, and the State itself may be given the option, of bringing those employees under the Federal social-security system if they wish. We have, in a separate bill which has already passed the Senate, given the States until January 1, 1954, to readjust their agreements with the Social Security Board if they wish to bring employees under the Federal system.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator very much. I am sure he is aware of the fact that at the present time there are some conditions which, in the estimation of certain of the retired and other employees, appear discriminatory and which may very well deserve the attention of the committee. I believe the Senator's suggestion is a very good one, because I think that in the end it will expedite the matter rather than delay it. I think the attention which the Senator intends to give it will actually hasten the day when the proper solution is reached.

Mr. GEORGE. That was the view taken by the committee. We were faced with the request of a large number of important witnesses, both for and against the proposal in the House bill, and the general proposal to bring State employees who are under separate retirement systems under Federal social security.

We are not predetermining the merits of the issue at all, but in the report, politely, as we should, we are asking the House to send us back a bill containing the two sections which we have deleted, in order that we may begin work on it, if we are to remain in session beyond next week.

I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland, and to all other Senators interested in this important phase of social security, that the Finance Committee proposes, in any event, to open hearings in January on this question, and on another question involved in a section which had been stricken from the bill, to wit, the freezing of wage payments during the permanent and total disability of the wage earner. Early in January we shall be able to complete the hearings and report a bill. There is always some bill to which social-security amendments may be attached, even if the Senate has no original jurisdiction of this particular question.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very much indebted to the Senator from Georgia for the assurance that the committee will give consideration to the question. While I have the opportunity, may I say that the Senator from Georgia is entitled to the gratitude of all concerned in connection with other provisions, specifically, that pertaining to the blind, to which reference was previously made. I certainly think we owe him a debt of gratitude for his painstaking care in this connection.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to emphasize that the Finance Committee has every disposition to proceed with the hearing on these two particular matters in January. Speaking for myself, and not for the committee, I would be disposed to go even further than the House committee went on the question of permanent and total disability. They merely froze the wages and stopped payment during the period of permanent and total disability. We must try to bring the permanent and totally disabled cases under old-age and survivors' insurance at an earlier age than 65, or else we must make a specific provision for adequate benefits under State-aid systems. We must do one or the other.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I have noted with a great deal of satisfaction the provision in the bill reported by the distinguished chairman, increasing from $50 to $100 the maximum amount that can be earned by a person who is eligible to receive an annuity. Does not the chairman feel that it would be fair—in view of the fact that these annuities are paid for by the people as they work and their payroll taxes are collected from them—that the eventual objective of Congress should be to remove such a limit?

Mr. GEORGE. In the 1950 act, the Finance Committee, with the final approval of the Senate, removed any limitations upon earnings of a beneficiary who had reached the age of 75. It is true that very few people have any great earning capacity after they become 75, but many professional people, including architects, engineers, lawyers, doctors, and various others, have.

If we were to remove all limitations as to such work, and allowed a beneficiary to earn as much as he could, it would possess elements of equity, but under our system the experiment would be very costly, because a great many payments are made on the basis of earnings after the recipient becomes 65 years of age. Really they are adding to their benefits.

The increase from $50 to $100 a month, which would carry with it an increase of $100 a month, or $1,200 a year, to the self-employed person, will not be very costly. It will cost a small fraction, perhaps one-tenth of 1 percent, of the payroll. It would not be a very costly amendment, but it would seem to be just. It seemed to the committee that the beneficiaries of the old-age and survivors insurance ought to be allowed to earn at least $100 a month.

Mr. MOODY. I wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee on taking what I consider to be a step forward. My question was related to the principle of a system in which a great many people are now paying into the fund weekly or monthly a part of their earnings, with the idea that they are laying aside an annuity they can collect at the age of 65 or some later age. As a matter of fact, unless they retire, they will not be able to collect the annuity they are paying for now. If they earn more than $50 a month or, if the bill goes through as the committee has recommended it, more than $100 a month, they will receive nothing for all the years they have been paying for their annuity. In my judgment, this is wrong and should be changed.

I desired to get the view of the distinguished chairman of the committee as to whether or not, as a question of justice, the committee would not be wise to consider the fact that the beneficiaries, after all, have bought and paid for the old-age insurance.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. The Senator is quite correct. It is not a gift, because the old-age and survivors fund is now in the neighborhood of $16,000,000,000. It is a self-sustaining operation, and would even support somewhat greater benefits. I do not mean to say that the money is lying idle in the Treasury, because the Treasury has probably given a bond and has become obligated to the fund.

Mr. MOODY. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that since the annuities have been earned and paid for, when the committee considers the subject again, it should consider the possibility of allowing people who have earned their annuities to collect them whether they are working or not.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator's suggestion is certainly worthy of consideration. I neglected to say that the committee had four or five bills before it, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan himself was the author of one of the bills suggesting that the limitation on monthly earnings be increased to $100.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator. Along with the chairman of the committee, I felt that a step forward now would be worth while. I merely bring up the matter of lifting the earnings limitation entirely for future consideration of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, there are various amendments in the bill which I think would be very helpful. It is not necessary for me to enumerate them, unless some Senator desires to ask about them.

However, I wish to call attention to a provision for the filing of a claim for lump-sum payment in the case of a soldier killed while in active military service outside the United States. In that provision there is a time limitation requiring the application to be made within a certain number of months. The committee has amended the provision so as to provide that the application for lump-sum payment in the case of a member of the Armed Forces killed outside the United States, or who dies outside the United States, may be made within 2 years, or perhaps it is 4 years, after his body is returned to his country, if the family should request return of the body to the United States. In other words, the period in which the lump-sum payments may be made has been extended. We are providing for soldiers now engaged in the Korean war the same credit of $160 a month on their social security that was provided for soldiers in World War II. I think everyone recognizes that as a very just provision.

Mr. President, the committee has acted as promptly as possible on the bill, in order that, if it receives approval of the Senate, and we finally succeed in obtaining a conference report which both Houses will approve, the bill may become effective within the month of September, or at least in October; otherwise it would be almost the end of the year before it could become effective.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, 7 years ago today, on June 26, 1945, in San Francisco, we signed the Charter of the United Nations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the U. N. "offers the world's best hope to outlaw war and to ordain peace."

The United States delegation to the San Francisco conference consisted of the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., then Secretary of State; the Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally; the late Senator from Michigan, the Honorable Arthur H. Vandenberg; the late Sol Bloom, then Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; the Honorable Charles A. Eaton, then, as now, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; the Honorable Harold Stassen, then on leave from the Navy; and Dean Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard College.

None of us ever proclaimed the Charter as embodying perfection. In the intervening 7 years, the United Nations has been frustrated on occasion by the Soviet Union's excessive use of the veto, which we did not then foresee.

The important point, Mr. President, is that on the most crucial occasions the United Nations has been able to overcome these frustrations through the General Assembly and other means. It has demonstrated a capacity for growth and change to meet new circumstances as they arise, and that is one of its most hopeful aspects.

Mr. President, I do not approve of all the things the United Nations has done and is doing. I do not suppose there is anyone who does approve of all of them. I think the U. N. has engaged in altogether too many subsidiary enterprises not directly related to its main, overriding job of adjusting international differences and keeping the peace. It has caused trouble for itself by these irrelevant excursions.

But, Mr. President, simply because we do not agree with every minor action an organization takes is no reason to disavow it. I do not approve of all the things the United States Government is doing, either, and I doubt very much that there is a Senator who does approve of all of them. We have all from time to time voted against bills that have passed and become law. But in my time in the Senate, at least, I never knew a Senator to resign his seat because he disapproved of something the Senate did.

Mr. President, in its main objective of providing collective security, the United Nations has measurably succeeded. I do not agree at all with the complaint which is heard from time to time that it has been a failure. On the whole, it has been remarkably successful. It has done a great deal of good—in Iran, in Greece, in Turkey, in Korea, and elsewhere.

If it had not been for the United Nations, we might very well have been in world war III at this moment.

On its seventh birthday, the United Nations is a going concern, which has on numerous occasions demonstrated its vitality and its courage. It deserves our wholehearted support.

KOREAN WAR POLICIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the United Press today carries a story out of London, the opening paragraphs of which read as follows:

LONDON, June 26.—Former Labor Defense Minister Emanuel Shinwell, winding up Commons debate on American bombing of the Yalu power stations, indicated last night Britain had forced the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from Korea.

The Commons debate on Monday's bombing came as United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden prepared to resume discussions today during which Britain is expected to press for a greater voice in the Korean war.

Yesterday's debate ended in a stand-off when the Labor Party did not call for a vote of censure against the government of Prime Minister Winston Churchill. However, the Laborites made it clear they may yet push for a showdown with the government over Korea when a full report from Defense Minister Earl Alexander and Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd is presented to Commons Tuesday.

EQUALITY

Mr. Shinwell, in a fighting speech concluding the debate for the Laborites, implied that the former Labor government of Premier Clement R. Attlee had forced General MacArthur's removal as Allied Commander in Chief of the Far East in 1951.

A few minutes ago, over one of the news tickers in the anteroom, there came this additional dispatch, dated London:

LONDON.—Informed sources said United States Secretary of State Acheson apologized to about 200 Members of the British Parliament today for failure to notify Britain in advance of the American bombing of Yalu River plants in Korea this week.

Mr. President, for a period of 2 years now the United States has been engaged in a war in Korea. It is not a police action. We have suffered 110,000 casualties up to the present time. The United States is supplying more than 90 percent of the forces in Korea.

We did not go across the Yalu River. Our bombing was within the area of an enemy who is trying to destroy our forces there. I have no objection to the British Government or any other government having a larger voice in this situation if they will supply a larger share of the troops and furnish a larger number to help carry this very heavy burden which the American people have been carrying.

I believe that this subject should be thoroughly investigated. Inquiry should be addressed to the State Department and the Department of Defense to see if, as a matter of fact, any representations were made by the British Government which caused the recall of General MacArthur a year ago.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The statement which the Senator from California read was to the effect that Secretary Acheson had apologized to 200 Members of the British Parliament. If that be true, it is a shocking thing that a Secretary of State of the United States should go over to a foreign country and apologize for an American action in fighting a war in which America is bearing some 92 percent of the burden. I hope it is not true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I hope it is not true. The dispatches come from two responsible American press associations. I think we should withhold final judgment until the full facts can be obtained from the State Department. However, I believe that the Senate has a responsibility to request forthwith—and I am doing so this afternoon—that the full text of the debate in Commons be presented to us so that we can see whether or not there is ground for inferring from this story that the British former Minister of Defense was laying claim to the credit for getting the scalp of MacArthur. I think the American Congress and the American people are entitled to know if there is any basis of fact for such a claim.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator remembers the hearings we held in connection with the so-called MacArthur inquiry. The hearings ran last year for 7 or 8 weeks. The Senator will remember that it was specifically and emphatically denied that either the British or any other government had anything to do with the recall of MacArthur. It is very interesting that a year later some officials over there are claiming credit for it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I think we should do some staff work in going through the testimony, because I know that that question was raised.

I also know that when we began to make inquiries with respect to certain White House conferences and other discussions which took place, an iron curtain was lowered so that we could not pursue some of those questions. It was said that they related to a confidential relationship between the President of the United States, certain Cabinet officials, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. My recollection is that the inference was certainly left with the committee that no such representations had been made from abroad. It seems to me that perjury was committed if in fact it now turns out that such representation had been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. With American boys dying in Korea, with more than 110,000 battle casualties, more casualties than the United States suffered in four previous wars in which it participated, and with probably 150,000 nonbattle casualties, making the total battle and nonbattle casualties mount to staggering figures, I think it ill becomes any nation which claims to be an ally of ours to protest because the United States, whose boys are dying, has started to loosen one arm or a finger of one hand which has been tied behind her, by bombing some of the power plants on the Korean side of the Yalu River.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Particularly when that power is being supplied to industrial plants which are being used for arsenal and other purposes, for the purpose of supplying the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists with the wherewithal to make war against the United States and the other United Nations forces and the Republic of Korea, which has been defending itself for a period of 2 years.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has felt that the very recent bombings of the power plants along the Yalu River should have been undertaken several years ago.

Can the Senator from California give us any reason why there is anything about the recent bombings to apologize for to the British Government or to any other people anywhere?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In fairness to the Secretary of State, let me say that the dispatch which I read did not refer to an apology for the bombing, but an apology because the British Government had not been given advance notice of the bombing. However, we are engaged in a military operation. I know of no commitment which this Government has ever entered into that in carrying out the war south of the Yalu River and within the confines of Korea, we had to obtain advance permission from any other government to protect the security of our forces in Korea. No apology should be needed, if indeed such an apology has been made, to any members of the British House of Commons or to the members of any other parliament of the world, for our taking action in defense of our own forces which are so heavily engaged in Korea.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does not the Senator from California understand, as does the Senator from Washington, that the United States has been, since the beginning of the collective war in Korea, the command agent for our allies, which is to say that as the command agent we are authorized to take any steps required by military necessity, without referring the need for a particular operation to anyone?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is certainly true within the confines of Korea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

DEBATE RAGES IN COMMONS—LABORITES CLAIM MACA.'S SCALP

LONDON, June 26.—Former Labor Defense Minister Emanuel Shinwell, winding up Commons debate on American bombing of the Yalu power stations, indicated last night Britain had forced the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from Korea.

The Commons debate on Monday's bombing came as United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden prepared to resume discussions today during which Britain is expected to press for a greater voice in the Korean war.

Yesterday's debate ended in a stand-off when the Labor Party did not call for a vote of censure against the government of Prime Minister Winston Churchill. However, the Laborites made it clear they may yet push for a showdown with the government over Korea when a full report from Defense Minister Earl Alexander and Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd is presented to Commons Tuesday.

EQUALITY

Mr. Shinwell, in a fighting speech concluding the debate for the Laborites, implied that the former Labor government of Premier Clement R. Attlee had forced General MacArthur's removal as Allied Commander-in-Chief in the Far East in 1951.

The former Defense Minister also demanded that the United States treat the British as equal partners in the Korean war.

When there was a prospect of MacArthur taking action which exceeded his authority and which was resented not only in this country, but in the United States we took effective action," Mr. Shinwell said.

Cries of disbelief were heard from the Conservative benches.

"If we had not taken effective action I would ask them why I and others were accused of taking action which brought about his (MacArthur's) recall?"

REGRETS

"We must be treated by the United States Administration and military commanders as equal partners in this affair. That is our demand," Mr. Shinwell said.

Mr. Eden and Mr. Lloyd, who returned yesterday from Korea and Washington, assured Commons they regretted that America had bombed the Yalu bases without informing Britain beforehand.

Mr. Lloyd closed the debate for the government. He said he told "certain officials in the Department of State" when he was in Washington how Britain felt about not having been advised in advance of the major bombing raid.

EDEN WILL HAVE SOME SUGGESTIONS

LONDON, June 26.—The British Cabinet heard today an eye-witness report on Korea from Defense Minister Earl Alexander and discussed demands which Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden will present to United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Official sources said Lord Alexander and Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd had brought back special recommendations which Mr. Eden could be expected to make to Mr. Acheson at their meeting.

Mr. Acheson took a day off yesterday to receive an honorary degree at Oxford University.

Meanwhile, United States Ambassador to Moscow George F. Kennan, reported to be disturbed by increasing anti-American feeling in Moscow, was expected to arrive by plane to inform Mr. Acheson of his impressions of the Soviet capital.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from California has stated is very fundamental, for this reason. I supported, as I know he supported, the United Nations' action in going into Korea 2 years ago, because the whole future of the United Nations was at stake. If we had not gone into Korea the United Nations would have gone the way of the League of Nations. It seems to me that the debate in the House of Commons with respect to the support which the British are to give to our efforts goes fundamentally to the existence of the United Nations Charter. If we are not successful and if we are not supported, when we are carrying 90 percent of the load, the whole program of NATO, the whole program in Europe, and the whole program of mutual security, and all that goes with it, may become involved in the situation.

We must have their support in Korea, where we are carrying 90 percent of the load, if they want the United Nations Charter to succeed in other sections of the world, as well as NATO and the whole mutual-aid program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. I think it must be recognized that communism is a global menace, and that we cannot merely close the door to it in Europe and leave it wide open in Asia.

The policy which some of the members of the former Labor Government of Britain have been following, and which they are apparently still following on the floor of the House of Commons, even though they are no longer responsible for the Government of Great Britain, would in my judgment lead to the fall of all of Asia into the Communist orbit. If Korea were allowed to pass completely into Communist hands, there is grave doubt in the minds of a great many people as to whether ultimately Japan could be kept out of Communist hands, and whether Southeast Asia, India, and Pakistan could be kept out of Communist hands. If we lose all of Asia, we lose 1,100,000,000 people, a worth-while strategic position, and the resources of that vast area of the world.

As I pointed out yesterday afternoon, the Communists clearly understand the importance of Asia. Many years ago Lenin said that the road to Paris was through Peking. He meant that if the Communists could get control of the manpower of Asia and the resources of Asia they could turn that overwhelming power against the West. It is highly dubious whether any structure of defense could stand up against such overwhelming mass power.

Therefore, the persons in Great Britain who are criticizing the United States for undertaking the bombings on the Yalu River are giving aid and comfort to the Communists by their action, and it may ultimately destroy the very fabric of security in Europe as well.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I fundamentally agree with what the Senator from California has stated. The Senator has supported the United Nations Charter, as I have supported it, and as a great majority of our people in our own States and throughout the country have supported it. If the state of mind revealed by the criticisms of some persons in Britain prevails it will shake the confidence of our people in the United Nations Charter. Does not the Senator from California agree with that statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly agree.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yielded the floor for only a few minutes. I may be called off the floor on an emergency matter at any moment. I would appreciate it if the Senators would premit me to offer my amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is a matter of grave importance.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand, but it may take me off the floor for some time. I should like to proceed with the offering of my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall yield only to the Senator from New Jersey and the the Senator from New Hampshire. With that we shall bring the discussion to a close.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very happy to rise in support of the position taken by the Senator from California. I think I speak from some experience, because I have recently traveled in the Far East. I am greatly concerned over the whole situation. Mr. President, I am shocked and surprised to find that our Government is being criticized by the British Parliament because we are doing what so obviously is necessary for us to do.

I support the Senator from California in taking a strong position. If only we could get our British friends to join with us in a sound policy in the Far East we could make great strides toward a settlement in Korea. We can never reach such a settlement if we do not get the support of our allies. Particularly at a time when 90 percent of the effort in Korea is being made by our country, it is important that we express our thoughts on this important matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New Jersey. It is a well-known fact that international communism and the men in the Kremlin have a strong desire to drive a wedge between the people of Great Britain and the people of the United States.

When the members of the Labor Party take the position which they have taken in criticizing this Government, at a time when we bear more than 90 percent of the load in Korea, they are giving aid and comfort to the men in the Kremlin and to the Communist satellites in Red China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from California is exactly right in what he says. We are in great danger unless we face the issue and our friends face it with us, and unless we head up to what is our position in Asia.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has pointed out that members of the British Parliament are protesting because they were not consulted with respect to our bombing of the power plants on the Yalu River, when we are furnishing 92 percent of the manpower and supplies in Korea.

The Senator from California is thoroughly informed with respect to our foreign relations, and he is one of the outstanding men in that field. I should like to ask him whether he has ever heard that the British, who are supposed to be our allies, or any other nation which is a member of the United Nations, ever gave us advance information or obtained our advance consent to furnishing materials to Communist China or to Communist Korea prior to the time they furnished the materials?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I know, they did not do so. I would be deeply shocked if I learned that they had received advance approval for such shipments. It seems to me that the least they could do would be to stop playing footsie with the Communists by shipping war materials and materials with which they can build up the economic life of Red China and aid the Government of Red Korea.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered immediately, out of order, because I may be called off the floor in a very short time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that his amendment may be considered prior to the consideration of the committee amendments. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. 7. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as

old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30, and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

(b) Section 403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 403 (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $30, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $30 with respect to one such dependent child and $21 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $30—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of the expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus.

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $18 with respect to one such dependent child and $12 with respect to each of the other dependent children; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose."

(c) Section 1003 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose."

(d) Section 1403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or both, and for no other purpose."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective October 1, 1952.

SEC. 8. (a) If—

(1) during the 1-year period beginning October 1, 1952, or the 1-year period beginning October 1, 1953, the total State expenditures (as defined in subsection (b)) for any State under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act are less than the total State expenditures for such State under such plan during the base period (as defined in subsection (b)), and

(2) the State expenditure per recipient under such plan for such year is less than the State expenditure per recipient under such plan during the base period, then the amount payable to such State under such title for such year shall be reduced by whichever of the following is the least:

(3) the amount by which the total State expenditures during the base period under such plan exceeds the total State expenditures during such year under such plan;

(4) the amount by which the State expenditure per recipient during the base period under such plan multiplied by the monthly average of the number of individuals who received aid or assistance under such plan during such period exceeds the State expenditure per recipient under such plan for such year multiplied by the monthly average of the number of individuals who received aid or assistance under such plan during such year; or

(5) the amount by which the sum which would be payable to such State for such year under such title but for the provisions of this section exceeds the sum which would be payable to such State for such year under such title if this section had not been enacted.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "total State expenditures" means, in the case of a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act, the difference between (1) the total expenditures (other than expenditures to meet the cost of administering the State plan) with respect to which amounts are payable to the State under sections 3, 403, 1003, and 1403, respectively, and (2) the amount so payable to the State; the term "State expenditure per recipient" with respect to any year or with respect to the base period, as the case may be, means, in the case of a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act, the total State expenditures during such year or period under such plan divided by the monthly average of the number of individuals who received aid or assistance under such plan during such year or period; the term "base period" means the 1-year period ending September 30, 1952; and the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. For a period of 1 year commencing October 1, 1952, notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistant to any individual at a rate not more than $5 in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of September 1952, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual not in excess of $50 per month arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, or income and resources from performance of

service as a nurse as an employee, or in connection with the care of the sick or confined persons as an employee, shall not be the basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can explain in a few moments the amendment which I have offered. It was before the Senate previously. I will make my explanation very brief. First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for reporting the bill to give additional assistance to the people covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

The amendment I have offered similarly takes care of the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the dependent children. It increases by $5 a month the Federal Government's share in caring for the aged, the blind and the disabled, and it increases by $3 a month the contribution of the Federal Government in caring for the dependent children.

The amendment also includes the amendment voted by the Finance Committee, to the effect that any State which fails to pass along these increased funds to the recipients in the four specific programs cannot obtain the benefit of this measure.

The amendment also includes an amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], at the time when the bill was previously under consideration here on the floor. That amendment provides that for a period of 1 year, beginning October 1, 1952, earnings of up to $50 a month of an assistance recipient in agricultural or nursing pursuits shall not be taken into consideration by the States in determining need.

Mr. President, with that statement, I hope the distinguished Senator from Georgia will accept the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand in a general way the amendment the Senator from Arizona has submitted. The amendment has a fine objective, but does the Senator from Arizona know what the amendment will cost?

Mr. McFARLAND. It will cost approximately $240,000,000 a year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Where will the $240,000,000 a year come from?

Mr. McFARLAND. It will come from the same place from which all other appropriations come—from the same place from which the funds required for salary increases for Government employees come, from the same place from which the funds required for salary increases for those in the armed services come, from the same place from which the funds required for all increases in benefits, other than those to which the beneficiaries contribute come—namely, from the taxpayers, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, from the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. But I say to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I hope he will join me in supporting the amendment, because I know he wishes to see the persons covered by the amendment taken care of. They have not had a general increase in their benefits during the past 4 years. During that time the cost of living has risen about 10 percent. The increase made by this amendment will not meet the increase which has occurred in the cost of living.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Arizona is in a hurry to leave the Chamber, but I wish to have this matter stated clearly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall remain here as long as the Senator from New Hampshire wishes me to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Today the Federal Government is operating at a deficit, is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is true. I concede that today the Federal Government is operating at a deficit and I concede that we should save every dollar we possibly can save.

On the other hand, Mr. President, we cannot afford to neglect the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the dependent children.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much do the States contribute at this time?

Mr. McFARLAND. That depends upon the State, but the over-all average for public assistance throughout the country is 46 percent from the Federal Government, 43 percent from State funds, and 11 percent from local funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I be permitted to insert statistical data I have obtained from the Federal Security Agency.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	January 1952 in—		February 1951 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total [2]	2,685,066	$120,215,489	$44.77	−0.3	+0.1	−3.3	+0.9
Alabama	75,921	1,615,024	21.27	−1.2	−.9	−6.7	−3.5
Alaska	1,646	93,206	56.63	−.5	−.6	+1.1	+10.9
Arizona	13,941	686,397	49.24	−.7	−.8	−4.3	−9.4
Arkansas	58,931	1,269,178	21.54	−.6	+.2	−14.5	−2.8
California	273,687	18,172,892	66.40	−.2	−.3	−.1	−1.8
Colorado [3]	52,154	3,689,884	70.75	−.2	−.2	+.6	+6.2
Connecticut	18,330	1,129,158	61.60	−2.0	−2.3	−8.3	−5.8
Delaware	1,620	52,370	32.33	−1.2	−.4	+1.7	+14.6
District of Columbia	2,774	134,308	48.42	−.3	+.3	−2.4	+5.3
Florida	67,869	2,594,990	38.24	−.5	−.3	−2.2	−4.0
Georgia	95,296	2,966,427	31.13	−.1	[5]	−6.6	+21.7
Hawaii	2,246	74,294	33.08	−.5	−2.1	−2.0	−3.2
Idaho	9,394	473,868	50.44	−.7	−.8	−18.0	−11.0
Illinois	113,016	4,840,191	42.83	−.4	−3.6	−4.6	−7.0
Indiana	44,231	1,581,627	35.76	−1.1	−.8	−12.6	−11.9
Iowa	48,420	2,476,713	51.15	−.4	−.1	−1.3	+2.2
Kansas	37,532	1,973,075	52.57	−.1	[4]	−3.8	+3.2
Kentucky	64,412	1,908,059	29.62	−1.1	−1.1	−4.2	+37.9
Louisiana	119,134	5,560,995	46.68	+.1	+.3	+.5	+.4
Maine	14,395	619,159	43.01	−.9	−.8	−6.0	−5.7
Maryland	11,368	462,597	40.69	−.2	[4]	−2.6	+5.8
Massachusetts	100,418	6,936,871	69.08	−1.3	+3.6	−1.6	+9.8
Michigan	93,375	4,522,090	48.43	−.3	+.2	−4.1	+1.4
Minnesota	54,814	2,498,999	45.59	−.2	−.1	−.9	+5.0
Mississippi	57,428	1,205,198	20.99	−.1	+12.0	−5.7	+7.6
Missouri	132,194	5,739,724	43.42	−.1	[4]	−.1	+.3
Montana	11,312	580,720	51.34	−.4	−.4	−4.2	−8.6
Nebraska	22,014	1,014,988	46.11	−.9	−1.1	−4.4	+1.6
Nevada	2,740	149,030	54.39	−.9	−.9	+.4	+5.2
New Hampshire	6,935	305,358	44.03	−.8	−1.5	−6.5	−10.3
New Jersey	22,288	1,197,793	53.74	−.5	+1.0	−6.2	+5.2
New Mexico	10,698	421,406	39.39	[4]	+.2	+2.2	+4.8

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.
[2] Includes 4,032 recipients under 65 years of age in Colorado and payments to these recipients. Such payments are made without Federal participation.
[3] Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]—Continued

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	January 1952 in—		February 1951 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New York	115,139	$6,455,282	$56.07	−.4	−1.0	−1.5	+1.4
North Carolina	51,777	1,229,746	23.75	−.4	+.1	−15.8	−9.8
North Dakota	8,961	462,550	51.62	(2)	+2.1	−1.2	+1.2
Ohio	117,265	5,751,064	49.04	−.5	−.6	−3.6	+5.9
Oklahoma	96,593	4,686,984	48.52	−.3	−.4	−2.8	+4.4
Oregon	22,802	1,302,469	57.12	−.3	+.2	−3.2	+6.8
Pennsylvania	74,961	2,929,238	39.08	−.9	−.1	−9.7	−8.8
Puerto Rico	26,898	203,970	7.58	+7.4	+7.0	+58.3	+56.8
Rhode Island	9,565	453,419	47.40	−.6	−.1	−3.9	+1.1
South Carolina	42,615	1,162,551	27.28	−.3	−.2	+1.2	+11.2
South Dakota	11,977	496,246	41.43	−.4	+.8	−2.2	+2.0
Tennessee	60,414	1,866,771	30.90	−.3	−.3	−8.6	−5.6
Texas	219,279	7,323,262	33.40	−.1	+1.5	−2.1	−.1
Utah	9,777	542,512	55.49	−.2	+3.8	−1.2	+20.2
Vermont	7,010	276,368	39.42	+.2	+.4	+.6	+10.4
Virgin Islands [3]	665	7,420					
Virginia	19,060	435,243	22.84	−.5	+.1	−3.2	+1.8
Washington	67,929	4,192,674	61.72	−.3	−.5	−5.5	−6.3
West Virginia	25,903	751,852	29.03	−.7	+13.0	−2.8	+6.9
Wisconsin	51,659	2,501,362	48.42	−.3	+.1	−1.2	+12.7
Wyoming	4,284	237,917	55.54	−.4	−.4	−2.4	−3.9

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.
[2] Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.
[3] Estimated.

Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total [2]	Children	Total amount	Average per—		January 1952 in—		February 1951 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Total	594,042	2,050,853	1,531,121	$45,275,761	$76.22	$22.08	+0.1	+0.3	−8.9	−5.4
Total, 52 States [3]	594,011	2,050,742	1,531,041	45,274,247	76.22	22.08	+.1	+.3	−8.9	−5.4
Alabama	18,285	65,018	50,895	639,670	34.98	9.84	+.5	+.7	−3.1	+1.0
Alaska	723	2,291	1,662	52,712	72.91	23.01	+1.4	+2.1	+8.9	+17.5
Arizona	3,492	12,979	9,680	254,749	72.95	19.63	−1.7	−1.6	−18.0	−33.9
Arkansas	13,371	48,889	37,395	513,158	38.38	10.50	+.2	+2.6	−28.1	−33.8
California	55,228	172,377	129,406	6,359,036	115.14	36.89	(4)	−.2	−2.6	+3.4
Colorado	5,189	19,053	14,397	510,791	98.44	26.81	−.2	−.3	−7.3	−.8
Connecticut	4,913	16,032	11,631	525,741	107.01	32.79	−2.5	−3.3	−12.3	−12.1
Delaware	706	2,728	2,090	57,046	80.80	20.91	+1.3	+.8	+2.6	+15.1
District of Columbia	2,043	8,350	6,489	200,205	98.00	23.98	−.3	−.2	−5.1	+1.8
Florida	17,897	57,566	42,792	811,215	45.33	14.09	−4.3	−4.0	−38.1	−43.8
Georgia	21,381	71,090	54,535	1,065,535	49.84	14.99	+1.9	+1.9	+19.0	+27.7
Hawaii	3,247	12,037	9,375	272,318	83.87	22.62	−.2	+.1	−12.1	−17.0
Idaho	2,203	7,678	5,671	246,807	112.03	32.14	+1.0	+1.0	−12.4	−6.5
Illinois	22,967	81,896	60,719	2,560,661	111.49	31.27	+.8	+.8	−2.7	+10.7
Indiana	8,523	28,425	21,004	570,235	66.91	20.06	−1.1	−.9	−22.7	−21.2
Iowa	5,298	18,607	13,849	[5] 530,599	100.15	28.52	+1.8	+2.2	+2.2	+4.7
Kansas	4,312	15,300	11,591	399,802	92.72	26.13	−.4	+.2	−16.5	−5.2
Kentucky	20,633	73,036	53,844	864,700	41.91	11.84	−1.1	−1.0	−13.9	−3.1
Louisiana	21,836	79,597	59,192	1,315,382	60.24	16.53	(6)	+.8	−17.7	−.4
Maine	4,458	15,462	11,203	326,266	73.19	21.10	+.2	+.1	−.5	−2.2
Maryland	5,124	19,767	15,083	434,708	84.84	21.99	+.8	+.6	−19.2	−13.3
Massachusetts	13,162	43,343	31,875	1,535,433	116.66	35.43	+.3	+.6	−2.1	+3.2
Michigan	24,875	80,503	57,335	2,406,472	96.74	29.89	+.7	+1.5	−3.2	+5.9
Minnesota	7,903	26,516	20,180	778,213	98.47	29.35	+1.3	+.4	−.2	+8.4
Mississippi	10,280	38,866	29,885	270,847	26.35	6.97	+1.0	+.9	−4.7	+35.6
Missouri	22,392	75,935	55,886	1,167,805	52.15	15.38	−.9	−.9	−9.8	−9.6
Montana	2,373	8,292	6,146	204,973	86.38	24.72	−.5	−.2	−3.1	−2.7
Nebraska	2,853	9,570	7,028	254,782	89.30	26.62	−.3	−.6	−19.0	−11.7
Nevada	*31*	*111*	*80*	*1,514*	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
New Hampshire	1,445	4,990	3,648	151,043	104.53	30.27	−1.8	−2.4	−13.7	−14.8
New Jersey	5,149	17,240	13,045	518,289	100.66	30.06	+.5	+1.0	−2.7	+5.6
New Mexico	5,309	18,390	14,117	274,619	51.73	14.93	+.1	+.8	−3.0	−15.9
New York	53,208	179,840	128,263	6,015,794	113.06	33.45	−.2	−.4	−3.9	−.4
North Carolina	16,944	60,910	47,126	793,683	46.84	13.03	+.4	+1.0	+4.8	+10.0
North Dakota	1,653	5,877	4,452	158,121	95.66	26.91	+.2	+3.2	−10.0	−17.8
Ohio [8]	13,574	49,936	37,579	983,820	72.48	19.70	−.4	+.7	−8.3	−15.0
Oklahoma	20,342	68,044	51,288	1,434,338	70.51	21.08	−.6	−.5	−6.2	−6.3
Oregon	3,411	11,450	8,597	357,874	104.92	31.26	+1.2	+1.9	−15.0	−12.2
Pennsylvania	32,921	119,972	89,576	2,900,092	88.09	24.17	−2.3	−.7	−26.1	−27.4
Puerto Rico	17,920	54,560	40,467	164,734	9.19	3.02	+7.9	+7.7	+57.2	+71.6
Rhode Island	3,357	11,272	8,134	324,019	96.52	28.75	(6)	+.8	−3.7	+4.6
South Carolina	6,507	24,269	18,831	310,516	47.72	12.79	+.6	(6)	−3.3	+33.9
South Dakota	2,619	8,491	6,350	183,848	70.20	21.65	+1.0	+2.8	+1.6	+5.8
Tennessee	20,726	74,630	55,955	997,546	48.19	13.37	−.2	+.1	−14.8	−14.0
Texas	16,231	62,954	46,989	801,178	49.36	12.73	(6)	+.6	−15.9	−4.2

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent program administered without Federal participation. All data subject to revision.
[2] Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.
[3] States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration.
[4] Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.
[5] Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.
[6] Increase of less than 0.05 percent.
[7] Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 families; percentage change, on less than 100 families.
[8] In addition to these payments from aid to dependent children funds, supplemental payments of $92,209 from general assistance funds were made to 2,861 families.

Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]—Continued

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total [2]	Children	Total amount	Average per—		January 1952 in—		February 1951 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Utah	2,953	10,272	7,616	$323,030	$109.39	$31.45	−1.0	+.8	−9.9	+6.8
Vermont	1,019	3,543	2,734	54,284	53.27	15.32	+1.3	+1.1	−1.7	−1.8
Virgin Islands [3]	230	707	624	3,740						
Virginia	7,773	29,007	22,055	406,070	52.24	14.00	+.5	+1.7	−8.7	−4.8
Washington	9,173	30,543	22,196	950,109	103.58	31.11	+1.2	+.9	−18.7	−36.1
West Virginia	16,878	62,099	48,066	1,021,765	60.54	16.45	+.3	+7.6	−7.2	−3.7
Wisconsin	8,434	28,489	20,950	958,412	113.64	33.64	+.9	+2.3	−5.7	+5.2
Wyoming	568	2,054	1,545	57,462	101.17	27.98	+2.9	+3.7	−11.0	−11.2

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent program administered without Federal participation. All data subject to revision.
[2] Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.
[3] Estimated.

Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	January 1952 in—		February 1951 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total [2]	97,144	$4,840,382	$49.83	−0.1	+0.7	+1.1	+8.7
Total, 51 States [3]	97,089	4,837,332	49.82	−.1	+.7	+4.1	+11.4
Alabama	1,514	36,283	23.96	−.8	−.8	−2.9	+5.7
Alaska	*17*	*888*	(4)	(4)	(4)		
Arizona	722	39,225	54.33	−1.6	−1.8	−19.4	−25.4
Arkansas	1,883	50,514	26.83	+.2	+1.4	−7.8	−20.2
California [2]	11,522	939,556	81.54	+.1	+.1	+4.0	+3.4
Colorado	351	22,394	63.80	−1.1	−1.5	−5.6	+1.6
Connecticut	306	20,465	66.88	−.3	−1.8	+3.4	+10.7
Delaware	224	10,213	45.59	+1.4	+1.8	+12.6	+15.3
District of Columbia	263	13,543	51.49	0	−.1	+1.9	+8.4
Florida	3,226	131,363	40.72	−1.0	−1.1	−2.8	−7.2
Georgia	2,916	104,797	35.94	+.2	+.2	+2.7	+29.1
Hawaii	114	4,593	40.29	−3.4	−4.1	+.9	+7.3
Idaho	198	10,903	55.07	−2.9	−3.9	−4.8	−1.6
Illinois	4,080	203,774	49.94	(5)	−2.2	−3.9	+.4
Indiana	1,732	67,224	38.81	−.5	−.5	−5.8	−5.3
Iowa	1,293	[6] 76,700	59.32	+.2	+.1	+3.2	+6.4
Kansas	620	34,594	55.80	−1.4	−.4	−6.8	+1.9
Kentucky	2,533	79,506	31.39	+.7	+.5	+2.8	+46.1
Louisiana	1,886	85,278	45.22	+.4	+.9	+.9	+4.0
Maine	596	27,323	45.84	−1.5	−1.1	−9.7	−8.7
Maryland	474	21,557	45.48	−2.9	−3.1	−2.1	+7.3
Massachusetts	1,632	124,851	76.50	+.8	+2.9	+6.7	+19.2
Michigan	1,875	100,589	53.65	+.9	+1.1	+1.1	+5.5
Minnesota	1,165	72,933	62.60	−.8	−1.3	+2.4	+14.9
Mississippi	2,808	72,257	25.73	+.3	+.3	+.2	+9.8
Missouri [2]	2,977	148,850	50.00	+2.0	+2.0	+6.4	+32.9
Montana	528	30,019	56.85	−1.5	−.6	−.4	−5.4
Nebraska	760	47,848	62.96	−.1	(5)	+3.8	+14.0
Nevada	*38*	*2,162*	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
New Hampshire	304	14,937	49.13	+.3	−1.4	−5.0	−7.2
New Jersey	794	47,508	59.83	0	+.6	+2.2	+12.8
New Mexico	489	17,992	36.79	−2.0	−1.4	−6.3	−6.4
New York	4,068	263,436	64.77	+.1	+.5	+1.3	+5.7
North Carolina	4,443	152,275	34.27	−.4	−.1	+2.5	+2.7
North Dakota	111	5,962	53.71	0	−1.6	+1.8	−3.4
Ohio	3,740	183,420	49.04	−.6	−.6	−3.8	+4.1
Oklahoma	2,584	132,500	51.28	0	−.1	−3.0	+4.2
Oregon	385	25,552	66.37	−.8	−.8	−2.5	+1.6
Pennsylvania [2]	15,355	772,215	50.29	−.2	+3.3	−.6	+25.9
Puerto Rico	566	4,160	7.35	+2.7	+4.2	+7.8	+8.2
Rhode Island	187	10,853	58.04	−1.6	+.2	−.5	+5.5
South Carolina	1,596	44,904	28.14	+.2	+.9	+1.3	+5.3
South Dakota	210	8,138	38.75	−.5	+.7	−5.0	−1.6
Tennessee	2,776	105,077	37.85	+.4	+.4	+2.6	+2.7
Texas	6,012	225,668	37.54	−.2	+1.5	+22.3	+20.5
Utah	222	13,258	59.72	0	+2.4	+8.3	+30.4
Vermont	179	7,725	43.16	−.6	−.2	−3.2	+5.6
Virgin Islands [7]	45	475					
Virginia	1,482	45,918	30.98	−.7	−.2	−3.1	+.8
Washington [2]	832	63,249	76.02	−1.1	−1.1	−1.7	−1.8
West Virginia	1,070	36,525	34.14	−.7	+10.2	−.8	+8.6
Wisconsin	1,343	73,177	54.49	+.3	−.1	−3.1	+9.0
Wyoming	99	5,256	53.09	(4)	(4)	−10.8	−14.8

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs administered without Federal participation. All data subject to revision.
[2] Data include recipients of payments made without Federal participation and payments to these recipients in California (556 recipients, $46,179 in payments), in Washington (13 recipients, $677 in payments), in Missouri (1,038 recipients, $51,985 in payments), and in Pennsylvania (6,118 recipients, $314,935 in payments). State plans for aid to the blind in Missouri and Pennsylvania were approved under the Social Security Act amendments of 1950.
[3] States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration. In computing percentages, data for Missouri for February 1951 were excluded because the State did not have an approved plan in that month. (See also footnote 2.)
[4] Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients; percentage change, on less than 100 recipients.
[5] Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.
[6] Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.
[7] Estimated.

Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1952 [1]

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from January 1952 in—	
		Total amount	Average	Number	Amount
Total [2]	131,779	$6,097,622	$46.27	+2.6	+2.7
Alabama	8,524	190,036	22.29	−.2	+.4
Colorado	3,621	185,748	51.30	+2.0	+2.2
Delaware	129	5,624	43.60	−.8	−1.0
District of Columbia	1,268	68,594	54.10	+.8	+1.3
Hawaii	1,140	53,166	46.64	+.1	+1.5
Idaho	790	41,242	52.21	+.8	+1.1
Illinois	2,532	109,569	43.27	+4.9	−.6
Kansas	2,623	133,981	51.08	+.8	+.7
Louisiana	14,515	569,519	39.24	+.8	+1.1
Maryland	2,583	122,612	47.47	+.4	+.3
Massachusetts	*3,846*	*231,373*	*60.16*	*+14.7*	*+16.2*
Michigan	1,098	66,318	60.40	+3.8	+5.3
Mississippi	782	15,465	19.78	+5.0	+5.8
Missouri	10,743	497,151	46.28	+2.0	+1.9
Montana	1,078	59,839	55.51	+2.1	+2.0
New Jersey	1,247	73,896	59.26	+17.3	+20.4
New Mexico	2,000	78,992	39.50	+1.2	+1.2
New York	29,088	$1,784,140	$61.34	+1.7	+1.5
North Carolina	4,354	118,643	27.25	+1.7	+1.9
North Dakota	615	37,592	61.13	+1.0	+7.0
Ohio	4,607	204,828	44.46	+3.0	+3.0
Oklahoma	*2,046*	*59,760*	*29.21*	*+11.1*	*+11.5*
Oregon	1,727	117,516	68.05	+2.9	+3.1
Pennsylvania	9,498	422,177	44.45	+.8	+2.2
Puerto Rico	3,579	32,844	9.18	+10.8	+10.4
Rhode Island	*198*	*12,810*	*64.70*	*+3.7*	*+5.7*
South Carolina	3,925	124,741	31.78	+3.6	+3.6
South Dakota	160	6,471	40.44	+11.1	+11.3
Utah	1,558	89,064	57.17	−.4	+1.6
Vermont	191	7,892	41.32	−1.0	−1.1
Virgin Islands [3]	25	265			
Virginia	2,918	98,107	33.62	+3.9	+4.6
Washington	5,358	327,861	61.19	+.4	−.4
West Virginia	2,039	66,527	32.63	+13.8	+27.2
Wisconsin	891	57,654	64.71	+2.5	+3.8
Wyoming	483	25,605	53.01	+.8	+.1

[1] For definition of terms see the Social Security Bulletin, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs under State plans not yet approved by the Social Security Administration. All data subject to revision.
[2] Represents States reporting plans in operation.
[3] Estimated.

Special types of public assistance and general assistance: Expenditures for assistance to recipients, by program and source of funds, fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 [1]

[Including vendor payments for medical care]

Program	Expenditures from—			
	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Local funds
	Amount (in thousands)			
Total	$2,409,142	$1,122,204	$1,025,326	$261,612
Special types of public assistance:				
Old-age assistance	1,472,617	794,013	594,960	83,644
Aid to dependent children	567,685	288,794	219,805	59,086
Aid to the blind	54,372	24,453	26,030	3,839
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	32,506	14,944	13,930	3,633
General assistance	281,961		170,551	111,410
	Percentage distribution by program			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Special types of public assistance:				
Old-age assistance	61.1	70.8	58.0	32.0
Aid to dependent children	23.6	25.7	21.4	22.6
Special types of public assistance—Con.				
Aid to the blind	2.3	2.2	2.5	1.5
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
General assistance	11.7		16.6	42.6
	Percentage distribution by source of funds			
Total	100.0	46.6	42.6	10.9
Special types of public assistance:				
Old-age assistance	100.0	53.9	40.4	5.7
Aid to dependent children	100.0	50.9	38.7	10.4
Aid to the blind	100.0	45.0	48.0	7.1
Aid to the permanent and totally disabled	100.0	46.0	42.9	11.2
General assistance	100.0		60.5	39.5

[1] Expenditures for assistance include all money payments to recipients, vendor payments for medical care and assistance in kind to, and vendor payments on behalf of recipients for goods and services to meet their maintenance needs. Vendor payments for burial are excluded. Amounts cannot be compared with annual data based on monthly series or with amounts of Federal grants to the States. For aid to dependent children and aid to the blind, data include programs administered under State laws without Federal participation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the present matching formula, of the first $20, the Federal Government contributes $15 and the States contribute $5. Above that amount, the contributions are made on a 50–50 basis, up to $50.

This amendment would have the Federal Government contribute four-fifths of the first $25, and above that amount, the contributions would be made on a 50–50 basis up to $55.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the additional contribution made by means of this amendment would be made only by the Federal Government, would it not, and the States would not cooperate in any way in connection with the additional contribution? In short, the amendment proposes that the Federal Government provide an additional amount, to be added to the first $15. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. It has been the experience that when the Federal Government adds $5, the States contribute a corresponding amount, except in the case of the States that are not in a position to do so. Frequently the poorer States do not increase the contributions they make to the same extent that some of the other States do.

This is the third time I have offered an amendment of this sort, and the previous two amendments, in 1946 and 1948, were enacted into law. My State has always matched a Federal Government contribution of $5 by providing an additional $5, and I think that will be done in this case, for certainly the people affected by the amendment need this additional amount, in order to be able to eke out a bare existence.

Mr. BRIDGES. At the present time the Federal Government contributes $15 of the first $20; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the State contributes $5, I believe.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Above $20, the State and the Federal Government share on a 50–50 basis up to $55, I believe.

Mr. McFARLAND. Up to $50; and this amendment would increase it to $55.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well, the amendment the Senator from Arizona submits would change that arrangement, so that of the first $25, the Federal Government would contribute $20 and the State would contribute $5; and above the amount of $25, each would contribute the same amount, or would divide the expense on a 50-50 basis, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; up to a maximum of $55.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator from Arizona tell us how many States now are contributing, so that we can get some idea of how this plan operates? Two hundred and forty million dollars is a very large amount of money.

As I have said, the objective of the proposal of the Senator from Arizona is an excellent one, and of course we wish to do all we can for the aged people of the United States. On the other hand, we must also consider the practicability of such proposals.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have placed in the RECORD a chart showing what the various States have done in this respect.

Mr. BRIDGES. My point is that at the present time the persons in this category in some States are receiving much less than such persons in other States are receiving, even though the Federal Government is cooperating to the same extent with all the States. Is not that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That situation has existed ever since the law was passed. In some of the Southern States, in particular, when the law began to operate on a 50–50 contribution basis, many of the States were not able to reach even the minimum amount. But at this time the contributions are increasing year by year, as the revenues of those States increase. Gradually the respective payments are leveling off, and we are approaching the point where the same amount will be received in all the States. Of course, the States only receive Federal funds in proportion to the amounts they themselves contribute.

Mr. BRIDGES. If we are not to increase the deficit, where would the Senator from Arizona suggest that we obtain the $240,000,000 which would be needed if the amendment were agreed to?

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, the $240,000,000 could be obtained from one place or another, but we cannot earmark money saved from a cut and say that the amount thus saved will be used for any particular purpose.

I concede that we should save every dollar we possibly can save. I myself would not be in favor of increasing the amount of these payments if these needy people were receiving enough for a livelihood. Today their condition is pathetic. I think we can well afford to make a reduction of $240,000,000 in the appropriations for almost any other Government activity, in order to be able to take care of the aged and the blind, the disabled and the dependent children. In terms of national defense activities or any other activities on the part of the Federal Government, I believe that taking care of the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the dependent children is one of the most important things for a democracy to do. If a democracy does not take care of its needy, it does not set a good example of what a democracy should do for its people.

So I say to my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, that I believe it would be well for us to obtain the necessary amount by making a reduction in almost any other appropriation, if necessary, in order to provide this amount of money for these needy people.

Mr. BRIDGES. First of all, Mr. President, I do not wish the Senator from Arizona to fall into error in any way. I remind him that we do not live in a democracy; we live in a republic. Sometimes the distinguished majority leader, as the leader in the Senate for the Democratic Party, rather confuses those words. I wish to remind him that we live in a republic.

In the second place, I agree completely as to the worthiness and desirability of caring adequately for our elderly people and those in the category he mentions. No other subject has a greater appeal to our hearts. I wish to see those people cared for.

On the other hand, I am disturbed about the way the Federal Government is spending money; I am disturbed about the failure to obtain votes for economy on the floor of the Senate; I am disturbed about the way increased appropriations have been voted, and I am disturbed about the high rate of taxes and the terrifically large deficit.

I wish to have all of us realize very clearly what we are going into when we vote for additional appropriations.

I agree with the Senator from Arizona about the desirability of achieving the goal which he wishes to have us achieve.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have found the argument of the majority leader to be both persuasive and appealing. He has said that, as a matter of duty, we must take care of our aged. My question is, how can we properly take care of the aged in America through our social-security system, when more than 50 percent of all the men and women in this Nation, over 65 years of age, are benefiting today neither from old-age assistance nor from old-age survivors' insurance? What, I may ask the majority leader, are we intending to do about the 6,000,000 aged Americans who today receive no assistance from any source?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to point out to the able junior Senator from Washington that, during the past two years, Congress has enacted legislation which has considerably broadened the scope of the old-age and survivors' insurance program. Of the 6,000,000 persons he mentions, I am sure that many are those who neither want nor need social-security aid. Naturally, it is our desire that the contributory system take care of all our needy aged, but, since there are so many thousands of old people who were not making social security payments during their productive years, we have created the public-assistance program.

Mr. CAIN. By his response, the distinguished Senator from Arizona gives evidence of strong sympathy for the needs of all the aged persons in America. He seems clearly to indicate that he is conscious of the fact that the social-security system we now have is not designed ever to cover all the aged persons within the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. I presume the Senator is correct. It does not cover them.

Mr. CAIN. And it will not cover them. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall have to determine that.

Mr. President, may I have a vote on my amendment, as I must leave the floor? We might have a unanimous-consent agreement that any Senator who wants to offer an amendment may do so later on. I should like to leave the floor in response to an emergency telephone call, provided I could have this amendment voted on and adopted; following which, any Senator who desires may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent that any Senator who cares to amend my amendment may do so, after it has been adopted, if it is adopted. I do that in order that Senators may not be precluded from proposing amendments to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I presume the Senator means that any Senator may offer an amendment to the amendment, without being precluded therefrom.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator does not mean that any Senator may amend it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Arizona mean that any Senator who desires to do so may offer an amendment to the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, and it could be acted upon the same as though it were offered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt, and will request a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. A little later on, I shall propose an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. In the meantime, I merely wish to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee upon his report, and upon the work that has been done. I think this is a very fine step forward. I have a statement prepared in regard to the report of the committee and the proposed amendments. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily, and I

therefore ask unanimous consent to have my statement, with supporting papers, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the statement and supporting papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LEHMAN

I rise in support of H. R. 7800, the Social Security Act amendments of 1952. The provisions of the bill increasing the Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits are practically the same as the provisions of the bill (S. 1983) that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I sponsored a year ago. The benefit increases were badly needed by the beneficiaries last year; the need is even more desperate now.

I am also glad to say that H. R. 7800 embodies also two provisions of the omnibus social-security bill (S. 2705) which I introduced on February 21, 1952, in association with Senators MURRAY, MAGNUSON, and HUMPHREY, and which was introduced simultaneously in the House by Representatives DINGELL, ROOSEVELT, and others. These two provisions, which I am glad to note are included in H. R. 7800, are as follows:

1. Provision to grant employment credit for time spent in the military service of the United States.

2. Provision to liberalize the retirement test.

I am glad that the Committee on Finance has taken such prompt action in reporting out H. R. 7800. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for seeing to it that the bill has reached the floor so soon after the passage of the bill by the House.

I strongly favor the provisions in the bill as reported out by the Committee on Finance. These provisions are as follows:

1. It would provide larger benefit payments than present law.

2. The bill would liberalize the amount of earnings from covered work a beneficiary could have and still receive his benefits.

3. Persons serving in the Armed Forces during the present emergency period would get old-age and survivors insurance wage credits.

4. The bill corrects a defect in the blind-assistance provisions of present law.

I am in complete agreement with the bill as reported by our Finance Committee. I am sorry, however, that the committee felt that there was insufficient time to take action on the provision in the House bill for preserving the retirement and survivorship rights of disabled people.

It seems to me that the need for what has been described as a "waiver of premium" is every bit as great under our program of old-age and survivors insurance as it is in private life insurance contracts. I have before me a letter which has come to me only recently and in which the writer complains as follows:

"I am going on 66 years of age. I got the first check for social security in March, and I find it * * * very hard to make it on $20 per month. Twenty per week would be more like it. I am a disabled person through accident in 1945 and I have not had any employment owing to disablement since. I would be pleased if I could get my monthly check raised so I may be able to buy the necessities of living; I need shoes and clothes badly. It seems every time the Nation has a strike, up goes the price of food. I ask you how can I get along on $20 a month. I have to have medicines.

"Please help me all you can and those who are in the same state as myself."

This letter is as timely as it is moving. The writer's benefit is a minimum one because he was disabled before he reached 65 and every day between his disablement and his reaching 65 reduced his retirement benefit to the point where only the minimum is payable. It could have been worse. His entire right to a retirement benefit could have been wiped out by the fact that he was disabled. But that is small consolation.

I have closely followed the debate on the floor of the House and in the newspapers about the merits of this provision and I have studied the reservations expressed in regard to it by the American Medical Association. At best, their opposition must be construed as arising out of a concern lest the administration of this provision by an agency of the Federal Government might in some way constitute an encroachment upon the prerogatives of their profession. I submit that these fears are groundless. There is no medical care involved in a waiver of premium provision. There is no circumstance that could arise where any doctor would be subject to any controls whatsoever.

There are a variety of programs already administered by the Federal Security Agency that involve close relationships with the medical profession. For instance, the Federal-State rehabilitation program, the administration of the Hospital Construction Act, and the administration of Federal grants for medical and allied research through the National Institute of Health. In these programs and in many others the Federal Government has been able to work out reasonable provisions, satisfactory to the representatives of the professions concerned. I urge the Committee on Finance to give early attention to this disability waiver provision so that the large group of people who stand to benefit from it can be spared further disappointment.

H. R. 7800 is a stopgap measure providing only a few of the necessary changes in the old-age and survivors insurance program. Much more than this is needed to provide a truly effective program of social insurance against the economic hazards of our industrial civilization. S. 2705, our omnibus bill, to which I have already referred, contains some further necessary steps toward the achievement of that result. I would like to mention a few of the most desirable provisions of that bill which I hope will become law next year and which must become law. Our omnibus social-security bill (S. 2705) would—

1. Extend the coverage of the insurance program;

2. Raise the wage base for taxes and insurance benefits from $3,600 to $6,000, to bring the program in line with changing wage levels and provide more adequate benefits for a large segment of our working population;

3. Raise insurance benefits for both present and future beneficiaries considerably above the levels of H. R. 7800;

4. Base the average monthly wage for figuring insurance benefits on the best 10 consecutive years of earnings, so that periods of low earnings will not cut down benefits;

5. Provide cash disability insurance benefits for people with long-term disabilities;

6. Provide cash sickness insurance benefits for shorter periods of illness.

I realize that these changes require study, and that they cannot be considered during the next 2 weeks.

However, the changes made by H. R. 7800 require no such prolonged consideration and debate. The pending bill should be enacted speedily, so that those on the benefit rolls can receive the additional income they so sorely need. I trust that in the near future we will be able to consider fully the broader and equally necessary improvements in the insurance program contained in S. 2705 that our Nation deserves and has a right to expect. I shall continue to urge consideration of the broad and comprehensive changes in the social-security program which are embodied in that omnibus bill.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF LEHMAN SOCIAL SECURITY BILL, S. 2705

A. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Coverage is provided under the program for the following groups not protected under existing law (unless otherwise indicated estimates are of employment in March 1952):

1. Farm operators (over 3,000,000) with annual net earnings from self-employment of at least $400.

2. Farm workers (about 500,000 in March 1952, nearly 2,800,000 during a year) who are paid at least $50 in cash by one employer for agricultural services performed in any calendar quarter.

3. Domestic workers (over 100,000) who are paid at least $50 in cash by one employer in a calendar quarter for domestic service in a private home of the employer.

4. Active members of the uniformed services (over 3,500,000) on a compulsory and contributory basis. Free wage credits of $160 a month are given for military or naval service between the end of World War II and the beginning date of permanent coverage.

5. Persons who are paid at least $50 in cash by one employer for service not in the course of the employer's trade or business, performed in any calendar quarter.

6. Employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and certain employees under State and local retirement systems, i. e., employees of higher educational institutions, employees in the State of Wisconsin, and employees of housing authorities (150,000).

7. Fishermen performing service on vessels of 10 net tons or less, (5,000 in March 1952, about 25,000 during a year) and citizens and resident aliens performing services on vessels or aircraft of foreign registry when they perform services for an American employer.

B. INCREASE IN BENEFITS

1. An increase, averaging 35 percent, over present benefit levels, subject to certain maximum provisions for present and future beneficiaries whose benefits are computed on the basis of earnings beginning with 1937.

2. For other future beneficiaries:

(a) The benefit formula will replace 50 percent of the first $120 of average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the next $380 rather than 50 percent of the first $100 and 15 percent of the next $200 as under present law.

(b) For individuals with 10 or more years of coverage, the benefit is based on the average monthly earnings in the highest 10 consecutive years of coverage after 1950 or after 1952, whichever is more favorable, rather than in all years as under present law. Where the individual has fewer than 10 years of coverage, his average monthly earnings will be computed essentially as under present law. Periods of disability are excluded from the computation.

(c) A regularity-of-service factor is applied to the average derived in (b), so that in the long run, a person in the system only some years after 1950 or 1952 will receive less than one with the same average who has been in every year since that time, unless the absence is caused by disability.

3. The minimum benefit for a retired or disabled worker is raised from $20 to $25.

4. The limit on total family benefits is raised from $150 to $200 subject to the proviso that, for surviving families and

families of old-age beneficiaries, they cannot exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage and for families of disabled workers they cannot exceed 70 percent of that average monthly wage. The lowest point to which either of these percentages can reduce family benefits is raised from $40 to $50.

5. The maximum annual amount of wages and self-employment income taxable under the program and creditable for figuring benefits, is $6,000 rather than the present $3,600. Tips paid to an employee by customers of his employer are counted as wages if they are reported in writing to the employer within 10 days of the end of the quarter in which they were received, if the report is accompanied by a remittance of the employee portion of the tax or if the employer can withhold same from funds in his possession belonging to the employee.

C. LONG-TERM DISABILITY BENEFITS AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

1. Monthly benefits are provided, after a 6-month waiting period for disabled insured workers and their dependents. Benefit amounts would be computed in the same manner as benefits for retired workers and their dependents.

2. To be eligible for disability benefits, the disabled worker—

(a) must have a disability which makes him unemployable and which has lasted for at least 6 months;

(b) must have engaged in covered work in at least half of the time in the last 10 years before onset of his disability and in half of the time in the last 3 years before his disability occurred.

3. Totally disabled children receiving or eligible to receive child's benefits would be eligible to receive such benefits after they attain age 18 provided they continue to be totally disabled.

4. Rehabilitation services are provided for totally disabled workers entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits or serving a waiting period for disability benefits and for totally disabled children entitled to child's benefits as a disabled child, provided they are potentially employable.

5. Existing rehabilitation facilities of the various States would be used to give rehabilitation services and the cost of the services would be paid from the trust fund.

D. CASH SICKNESS BENEFITS

1. Cash sickness benefits are provided for temporarily incapacitated insured workers other than the self-employed, Federal civilian employees, and members of the Armed Forces. (Federal civilian employees and members of the Armed Forces normally do not suffer loss of income for temporary periods of illness.)

2. Benefit amounts and eligibility are related to earnings in covered occupations.

E. FINANCING THE PROPOSED BILL

1. To finance the benefits in the bill, the tax rates for employees, other than those of the Federal Government, and for their employers are scheduled as follows:

	Percent each
1953 and 1954	2
1955 and 1956	2½
1957 and 1958	3
1959 and 1960	3½
1961 and thereafter	4

2. Because Federal civilian employees and members of the armed services are not eligible for cash sickness benefits, the rate of tax for them and for their employers, is less than the amounts shown in the tax schedule for other employees. Their rates are:

	Percent each
1953 and 1954	1½
1955 and 1956	2
1957 and 1958	2½
1959 and 1960	3
1961 and thereafter	3½

3. The rates for the self-employed (who are also excluded from cash sickness benefits) are one and a half times the rate for Federal employees and members of the Armed Forces:

	Percent each
1953 and 1954	2¼
1955 and 1956	3
1957 and 1958	3–3½
1959 and 1960	4½
1961 and thereafter	5¼

4. Authorization is added for appropriations from general funds for benefits for World War II veterans which are not financed from contributions.

5. During periods when the Armed Forces are large, the President may direct that no contributions be paid by servicemen for service performed in designated areas or in designated pay grades. Under these conditions, the servicemen's contributions would be paid by the Government.

Examples of benefits under benefit formula contained in bill for persons whose benefits are based on wages and self-employment income beginning with either 1951 or 1953.

Average monthly wage	Old-age benefits under present law [1]	Old-age benefits under bill after— 10 years of coverage	20 years of coverage	30 years of coverage	40 years of coverage
$50	$25.00	$27.50	$30.00	$32.50	$35.00
$100	50.00	55.00	60.00	65.00	70.00
$150	57.50	71.00	77.40	83.90	90.30
$200	65.00	79.20	86.40	93.60	100.80
$250	72.50	87.50	95.40	103.40	111.30
$300	80.00	95.70	104.40	113.10	121.80
$350 [2]	80.00	104.00	113.40	122.90	132.30
$400 [2]	80.00	112.20	122.40	132.60	142.80
$450 [2]	80.00	120.50	137.40	142.40	153.30
$500 [2]	80.00	128.70	140.40	152.10	163.80

[1] The amount does not change on account of additional years of covered employment.
[2] The average monthly wage cannot exceed $300 under present law.

Examples of benefits under conversion table in bill, for persons whose benefits are based on all wages and self-employment income beginning with 1947:

Old-age benefit under present law:	Old-age benefit under this bill
$20.00	$25.00
$30.00	39.00
$40.00	52.30
$50.00	71.00
$60.00	84.70
$68.50	94.00

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order, and that the bill be read for committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning at the top of page 9, it is proposed to strike out:

PRESERVATION OF INSURANCE RIGHTS OF PERMANENTY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

SEC. 3. (a) (1) Section 213 (a) (2) (A) of the Social Security Act (defining quarter of coverage) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'quarter of coverage' means, in the case of any quarter occurring prior to 1951, a quarter in which the individual has been paid $50 or more in wages, except that no quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)), other than the initial quarter of such period, shall be a quarter of coverage. In the case of any individual who has been paid, in a calendar year prior to 1951, $3,000 or more in wages, each quarter of such year following his first quarter of coverage shall be deemed a quarter of coverage, excepting any quarter in such year in which such individual died or became entitled to a primary insurance benefit and any quarter succeeding such quarter in which he died or became so entitled, and excepting any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability, other than the initial quarter of such period."

(2) Section 213 (a) (2) (B) (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) no quarter after the quarter in which such individual died shall be a quarter of coverage, and no quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (other than the initial quarter and the last quarter of such period) shall be a quarter of coverage;"

(3) Section 213 (a) (2) (B) (iii) of such act is amended by striking out "shall be a quarter of coverage" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall (subject to clause (i)) be a quarter of coverage."

(b) (1) Section 214 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act (defining fully insured individual) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) 40 quarters of coverage

not counting as an elapsed quarter for purpose of subparagraph (A) any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage."

(2) Section 214 (b) of such act (defining currently insured individual) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof: "not counting as part of such 13 quarter period any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage."

(c) (1) Section 215 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act (defining average monthly wage) is amended by inserting after "excluding from such elapsed months any month in any quarter prior to the quarter in which he attained the age of 22 which was not a quarter of coverage" the following: "and any month in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in sec. 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage."

(2) Section 215 (b) (4) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, in computing an individual's average monthly wage, there shall not be taken into account—

"(A) any self employment income of such individual for taxable years ending in or after the month in which he died or became entitled to old-age insurance benefits, whichever first occurred;

"(B) any wages paid such individual in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage;

"(C) any self-employment income of such individual for any taxable year all of which was included in a period of disability."

(3) Section 215 (d) of such act (relating to primary insurance benefit for purposes of conversion table) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) In the case of any individual to whom paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of this subsection is applicable, his primary insurance benefit shall be computed as provided therein; ex-

cept that, for purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) and subparagraph (C) of paragraph (4), any quarter prior to 1951 any part of which was included in a period of disability shall be excluded from the elapsed quarters unless it was a quarter of coverage, and any wages paid in any such quarter shall not be counted."

(d) Section 216 of the Social Security Act (relating to certain definitions) is amended by adding after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"Disability; period of disability

"(i) (1) The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantially gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to be permanent, or (B) blindness; and the term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to five degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered for the purpose of this paragraph as having a central visual acuity of 5/200 or less. An individual shall not be considered to be under a disability unless he furnishes such proof of the existence thereof as may be required.

"(2) The term 'period of disability' means a continuous period of not less than six full calendar months (beginning and ending as hereinafter provided in this subsection) during which an individual was under a disability (as defined in paragraph (1)). No such period with respect to any disability shall begin as to any individual unless such individual, while under such disability, files an application for a disability determination. Except as provided in paragraph (4), a period of disability shall begin on whichever of the following days is the latest:

"(A) the day the disability began;

"(B) the first day of the 1-year period which ends with the day before the day on which the individual filed such application; or

"(C) the first day of the first quarter in which he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).

A period of disability shall end on the day on which the disability ceases. No application for a disability determination which is filed more than 3 months before the first day on which a period of disability can begin (as determined under this paragraph) shall be accepted as an application for the purposes of this paragraph.

"(3) The requirements referred to in paragraph (2) (C) and (4) (B) are satisfied by an individual with respect to any quarter only if he had not less than—

"(A) six quarters of coverage (as defined in section 213 (a) (2) during the thirteen-quarter period which ends with such quarter; and

"(B) twenty quarters of coverage during the forty-quarter period which ends with such quarter,

not counting as part of the thirteen-quarter period specified in clause (A), or the forty-quarter period specified in clause (B), any quarter any part of which was included in a prior period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

"(4) If an individual files an application for a disability determination after March 1953, and before January 1955, with respect to a disability which began before April 1953, and continued without interruption until such application was filed, then the beginning day for the period of disability shall be whichever of the following days is the later:

"(A) the day such disability began; or

"(B) the first day of the first quarter in which he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3)."

(e) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after section 219 the following new section:

"DISABILITY PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE IF BENEFITS WOULD BE REDUCED

"SEC. 220. The provisions of this title relating to periods of disability shall not apply in the case of any monthly benefit or lump sum death payment if such benefit or payment would be greater without the application of such provisions."

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 215 (f) (1) of the Social Security Act, the amendments made by subsection (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall apply to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after June 1953, and to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after March 1953; but no recomputation of benefits by reason of such amendments shall be regarded as a recomputation for purposes of section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act.

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 23, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; on page 16, line 2, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$70" and insert "$100"; in line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$70" and insert "$100"; in line 8, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$70" and insert "$100"; in line 11, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$70" and insert "$100"; on page 17, line 5, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; in line 14, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 19, after line 23, to strike out:

(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund from time to time, as benefits which include service to which this subsection applies become payable under this title, such sums as may be necessary to meet the additional costs, resulting from this subsection, of such benefits (including lump sum death payments). The Administrator shall from time to time estimate the amount of such additional costs through the use of appropriate accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 20, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 21, line 25, after "217 (e)", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 24, after line 2, to strike out:

COVERAGE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES COVERED BY STATE AND LOCAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (d) of section 218 of the Social Security Act (relating to voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees) is amended by striking out "Exclusion of" in the heading, by inserting "(1)" after "(d)," and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an agreement with a State may be made applicable (either in the original agreement or by any modification thereof) to service performed by employees in positions covered by a retirement system (including positions specified in paragraph (3) but excluding positions specified in paragraph (4)) if

"(A) there were in effect on January 1, 1951, in a State or local law, provisions relating to the coordination of such retirement system with the insurance system established by this title; or

"(B) the Governor of the State certifies to the Administrator that the following conditions have been met:

"(i) A referendum by secret written ballot was held on the question whether service in positions covered by such retirement system should be excluded from or included under an agreement under this section;

"(ii) An opportunity to vote in such referendum was given (and was limited) to the employees who, at the time the referendum was held, were in positions then covered by such retirement system (other than employees in positions to which, at the time the referendum was held, the State agreement already applied and other than employees in positions specified in paragraph (4) (A));

"(iii) Ninety days' notice of such referendum was given to all such employees;

"(iv) Such referendum was conducted under the supervision of the Governor or an individual designated by him; and

"(v) Two-thirds or more of the employees who voted in such referendum voted in favor of including service in such positions under an agreement under this section.

No referendum with respect to a retirement system shall be valid for the purposes of this paragraph unless held within the 2-year period which ends on the date of execution of the agreement or modification which extends the insurance system established by this title to such retirement system.

"(3) For the purposes of subsections (c) and (g) of this section, the following employees shall be deemed to be a separate coverage group:

"(A) All employees in positions which were covered by the same retirement system on the date the agreement was made applicable to such system;

"(B) All employees in positions which were covered by such system at any time after such date; and

"(C) All employees in positions which were covered by such system at any time before such date and to which the insurance system established by this title has not been extended before such date because the positions were covered by such retirement system.

"(4) Nothing in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall authorize the extension of the insurance system established by this title to service in any of the following positions covered by a retirement system—

"(A) any policeman's or fireman's position or any elementary or secondary school teacher's position; or

"(B) any position covered by a retirement system applicable exclusively to positions in one or more law-enforcement or fire-fighting units, agencies, or departments.

For the purposes of this paragraph, any individual in the educational system of the State or any political subdivision thereof supervising instruction in such system or in any elementary or secondary school therein shall be deemed to be an elementary or secondary school teacher.

"(5) If a retirement system covers positions of employees of the State and positions of employees of one or more political subdivisions of the State or covers positions of employees of two or more political subdivisions of the State, then, for purposes of the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, there shall, if the State so desires, be deemed to be a separate retirement system with respect to each political subdivision concerned and, where the retirement system covers positions of employees of the State, a separate retirement system with respect to the State."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 218 of the Social Security Act (relating to effective dates of agreements and modifications thereof) is hereby amended by striking out "January

1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1955."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield. Has the Senator from Alabama an amendment to offer?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think I am entitled to the floor in my own right, with reference to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is entitled to recognition.

Mr. SPARKMAN. However, I hope to be able to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia certain questions.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In order to get the matter before the Senate, I propose an amendment, which is a perfecting amendment to the House language, on page 26, line 21, to strike—

Or any elementary or secondary school teacher's position; or

(B) Any position covered by a retirement system applicable exclusively to positions in one or more law-enforcement or fire-fighting units, agencies, or departments.

For the purposes of this paragraph, any individual in the educational system of the State or any political subdivision thereof supervising instruction in such system or in any elementary or secondary school therein shall be deemed to be an elementary or secondary school teacher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Do I correctly understand the situation to be that at present we are considering whether section 6 shall be stricken?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; but I have offered a perfecting amendment, namely, to strike certain words in the House language which would allow elementary and secondary school teachers to be covered. Those words are to be found on page 26, lines 21 and 22, and on page 27, line 4 through line 8. If the language of the House provision is stricken out, it would permit elementary and secondary school teachers to be included under social security. If my amendment is agreed to, my hope would be that the Senate would disagree to the Senate amendment which, in effect, would bring in State and local employees, including teachers, but excluding policemen and firemen.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry there was so much noise in the Chamber that apparently I did not fully understand the distinguished Senator. As the distinguished chairman in charge of the bill intimated his position in relation to this matter, I would suggest a secondary amendment, because I understand the Senator from Georgia wants to strike section 6. On that point I should like to be heard, and I should like to understand the position of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I made my position clear, I thought. It is that the Senate Finance Committee recommended striking the whole section, because we expect to make a study of the entire question not later than January, in which we will deal with the problem as a whole. We cannot do it if the bill is passed with section 3 and section 6 in it, because a question of good faith is involved. We have had applications from a large number of persons who want to be heard, and we have assured them that if these sections were retained in the bill we would ask that the bill go back to the committee. I have tried to explain the situation to the Senate and tried to assure the Senate that in January we shall be able to deal with this particular problem in a comprehensive way.

As to the question which troubles the Senator from Wisconsin, the committee would have no objection to the Wisconsin system coming in because prior to the passage of the Social Security Act the Wisconsin law contemplated and anticipated the setting up of an old-age and survivors' insurance system. That can be cared for in January.

I ask Senators to contemplate the situation. Here is a bill which gives great benefits to the aged and other beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors' insurance system. The Senator from Arizona has just amended it by providing for an additional sum to be paid out of the general treasury to the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. We have done many good things in this bill, but we simply find ourselves in the position of working under great pressure. The House did not send us this bill until a very few days ago, so we have done the very best we could to bring the bill before the Senate. We have given assurance to the Senate that if the House did not care to send us another bill containing these two sections, so that we can deal with the entire problem after hearings, we would do so ourselves not later than January.

I can say to the Senator that the committee will not offer any objection to permitting the State of Wisconsin to bring its system under the Federal system, because that has been anticipated. There is a provision in the section which would——

Mr. WILEY. In what section?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe it is in section 6.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to say that I am very happy the Senator from Georgia gives us this assurance, inasmuch as my people back home are very much concerned because heretofore, apparently, there has been some misunderstanding of our position. Wisconsin led in this matter. I want to make my position clear that section 6 should remain, but, after the assurance of such a distinguished statesman as the Senator from Georgia that he will hold hearings in January and that he and his committee feel favorable to the position which we have maintained for some time, I shall not insist upon it.

I again thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia for their courtesy in the matter.

ORDER FOR A VOTE AT 2:30 P. M. TOMORROW ON VETO OF IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield in order that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am informed that the House has overridden the President's veto of the immigration bill. I have consulted with most of the Senators interested in that bill, and they are agreeable to vote on the question tomorrow at 2:30 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that the call of a quorum be waived——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not require a quorum call.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the House has already acted on the President's veto?

Mr. McFARLAND. If they have not acted, my request is premature.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand there is some doubt about it. The House had not acted up to 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I shall make a request later on. I wanted Senators to know about it while there was a good attendance on the floor.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. How late is the Senate to remain in session today?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to finish the bill which is before us, and then there is a Reserve bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. A message from the House with reference to the control bill will come before the Senate, and when it comes I shall ask for a quorum and shall make no mistake in letting the people of the United States know of the action taken on the bill by the House of Representatives. The control bill expires at the end of the week, and I think we should remain in session all night, if necessary, in order that the bill may go to conference and the conference report may be acted on.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was in hope that we could finish tonight the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not suggest that we should not do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received the information that the House intends to vote on the President's veto of the McCarran immigration bill at 10 o'clock tonight.

In the light of the desire to have a unanimous consent agreement if the House should override the veto, then we could have a tentative agreement to vote as of tomorrow. If the House should not override the veto, there would be no need of the Senate's voting at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate could not vote in that event.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; but it seems to me it would be well to take preliminary action, so that we would know what the situation would be.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, I ask unani-

mous consent that, in the event the House should override the President's veto on the immigration bill, the Senate finally vote upon the question at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon; and that the time between 12 o'clock and 2:30 be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, to be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota on the one side, and the Senator from Nevada on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, was the hour of 2:30 tomorrow afternoon related to the so-called McCarran immigration bill and the question of overriding of the veto?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the social-security bill now pending?

Mr. McFARLAND. It has nothing to do with any other matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arizona is agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not expect to take long, but I desire Senators present to understand the point I hope to make.

First let me say that I propose the amendment at the present time with a great deal of reluctance, because I have a very high regard for the able chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and also for every member of his committee. I wish to join with others in paying a compliment to the chairman and members of the Committee on Finance for having done an excellent job in reporting the bill.

Furthermore, I am pleased with the assurances the able chairman has given to us and his expression of sympathetic understanding of what was sought to be done in section 6.

The reason why I felt the amendment should be presented at this time was that the matter is not new with the Senate. I believe in connection with the reporting of H. R. 6000 on March 29, 1950, the matter received some consideration. That bill contained a provision relating to the bringing of State and local employees under the social-security plan. On previous occasions the House has reported a similar plan. Now the House sends to the Senate a bill with the provision included. In other words, both the House and the Senate have already acted on such a measure. The only question is whether the Senate at this time will go along with the House in the pending bill, and include State and local employees.

Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with what the Senator from Georgia is trying to do. He is trying to have as much of the bill acted on as possible, the provisions which he considers noncontroversial, and which stand a good chance of passage before the adjournment of Congress. Of course, I am in complete sympathy with that proposal.

I should like to have the able Senator from Georgia listen to my statement and correct me if I am wrong; in fact, I wish to ask him a few questions regarding it.

I have felt that the controversy on the question of State and local employees has been narrowed to a very limited field. As originally proposed, I believe it was to include all State and local employees. However, policemen and firemen objected, and many school teachers, though not all of them, objected. Therefore, when the House wrote the proposed legislation this time, it excepted three groups—firemen, policemen, and elementary and secondary school teachers.

I do not know how school teachers everywhere feel about the bill, but I believe that in my State school teachers are almost unanimous in their desire to be covered under social security. As I understand, the school teachers' national organization has not taken a stand on the question, though many in the organization have expressed opposition to being covered. It is also my understanding that the organization, the NEA, will hold a meeting beginning on June 29. I am not sure whether it is to be a convention of the whole organization, or a meeting of the executive committee. At any rate, a body having jurisdiction to make a decision in the matter will hold a meeting starting on June 29, the first of next week. I think it most likely that early in the sessions of that meeting a resolution relating to this matter will be adopted.

Mr. President, I hope that the chairman of the committee will agree to the first amendment I offer, to strike the language only to the extent of at least putting the provision with respect to teachers in conference; and in the event official action is taken which he feels would be sufficient to enable him to agree to including teachers, I would hope that at least the parliamentary situation would be such as to enable us to present the matter. The amendment does nothing except simply to put the matter in conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may address a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, provided I retain my right to the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Whether rightly or wrongly, but certainly in the belief that we were serving the general interest, the Senate Finance Committee told a large number of people that before any kind of action would be taken, they would be accorded hearings. If we are now to depend upon a resolution which a conference might or might not agree to, we would not be keeping our word with the people to whom it has been given that we would not take action on the section until they had a hearing. Is not that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. It is a matter of good faith on the part of the committee. I have frankly stated we would be obliged to grant hearings on section 6 and on section 3, if they were taken out of the bill.

I may say to the Senator from Alabama that by striking section 6, every part of it, including the Wisconsin amendment, will be in conference anyway. The matter will be open in conference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the chairman——

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator does not let me finish my statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to bring up a point there.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no point there, because the subject will be in conference. Since the House excluded school teachers, the Senate conferees, in the event it becomes necessary to compromise, will be prepared with an amendment.

I frankly say to the Senator, that that is one of the real reasons why I would not want to accept section 6 as the House has framed it, because there is very little sense in excluding school teachers. Some of them are covered by good systems, and do not wish to come under the Federal system. They are highly organized. Other teachers are covered by very poor systems, and would like to come under a Federal system. So the Senator would be protected if the committee felt that, as a matter of harmony, we could accept section 6 without giving the witnesses who were interested an opportunity to be heard.

There are many collateral issues involved, which pertain to organizations other than teachers, firemen, and policemen. There are very many collateral issues, and it is highly important to make a very careful study of section 6. The House acted upon it and put it in the bill, whereas a few months ago it opposed it. At any rate, it is in the bill, and it will be in conference, in such a way that if we agree to it, I, as a member of the conference, certainly would want to accept it only with an amendment. But I could not do it as a matter of honor, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has suggested. It is a matter of good faith. I do not know how many witnesses I told that if these two sections were out, before we agreed to take them back, even though the bill passed and the Senate put them back and we were forced into conference, we would certainly give them an opportunity to be heard. As a mere matter of good faith, we cannot accept any compromise with respect to section 6, although there are some things in section 6 to which I would not object, and some thing which I favor. The Wisconsin system is involved in it, and I have assured the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that in January we shall find some way of taking care of the Wisconsin situation.

I know of the very deep interest of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in this subject. I assure him that we can do something in January. I do not think the House has exclusive jurisdiction over the Social Security Act. If a bill does not propose to raise taxes we have original jurisdiction along with the

House. In good faith we shall be glad to consider the question in January. I am anxious to examine the whole of section 6. Personally I agree with the Senator from Alabama that teachers should have the optional right, without being compelled to do so, to come under the Federal Social Security System, even though there are retirement systems in their respective States. I do not want to force any of the associations to come under the act, but I should be glad to see a great many teachers who do not have the advantage of anything like an adequate retirement system have the optional right to come in under the Federal system. That is what the Senator from Alabama really wants.

I again assure the Senator that there are a great many collateral issues and questions involved, when the States and the municipalities within the States, and school districts within counties, are holding elections and providing for formulating a decision as to whether they want to come under the act. There are many collateral isues on which we are obliged to give people an opportunity to be heard. Not all of them relate to teachers, by any means, or to associations.

I wish the Senator would allow us to complete action on the bill, because of the great benefits it provides. It is a great step forward. We have amended the formula, for example. On the first $100 earned by the wage earner he now will receive credit of 55 percent, whereas under the old law he received only 50 percent. That is only one illustration. There are many other beneficial provisions in the bill. I hope that we can complete action on it and go to conference with the House, in the hope of reaching an agreement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me assure the distinguished Chairman of the committee that I would not be a party to any action which would hold up completion of this proposed legislation, because I know its importance. I know that the provision for which I am arguing is only one of many important provisions which I feel ought to be acted upon.

I say again that the able Senator from Georgia and his committee are all entitled to our gratitude for the speed with which they worked in getting this legislation to the calendar in order that we might complete action on it at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I agree with the statement the Senator from Georgia has made with reference to this type of legislation. My understanding is that there is nothing in section 6 which requires anyone to come under it. It is optional. There is one thought which I should like to bring out, and I should like to have the comment of the Senator from Georgia on it.

This proposed legislation itself is not self-enforcing. In other words, it is permissive so far as the States are concerned. It is in the nature of an enabling act. The States themselves must take action before State employees come under the act. The thought occurs to me that many States will have to take action in their State legislatures before they come under the act. Most of our State legislatures will be in session next January, I believe.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that, anticipating exactly that situation, a bill has already passed both the House and Senate and has gone to the President, who, I am sure, will sign it. That bill gives to the States an additional year in which to make their arrangements with the social security officials to take care of that very situation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I recall that bill; but would it take care of the provisions in section 6 if section 6 should later be enacted into law?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, that would cover any provsion already in the law, or any provision which might be enacted into law?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I feel that this is highly desirable legislation. As I said previously, both the House and Senate have expressed themselves as to the desirability of this type of legislation. We have had assurance from the able chairman of the committee that his committee will start hearings in January, or certainly very early in the next session of Congress, looking toward perfecting this type of legislation.

He has also told us in a very clear way, I think, of the pledge that he, representing the committee, has made to various witnesses that they would be given an opportunity to be heard on this question. Of course, I would not want to be put in the position of trying to force a situation in which anyone might feel that that pledge had been violated.

I wish very much that we could have this proposed legislation enacted at this time. It is not going to hurt anything to wait 6 months. I feel that we have just about as clear an assurance as we can have that action will be taken, and will be taken speedily, upon the convening of the new Congress. I am certainly willing to abide by the assurances which have been given to us by the able chairman of the committee. Because of such assurances, I will not press my amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator from Alabama. I am sure that his great interest has controlled him in this matter. He has shown a very fine spirit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, today I made certain remarks regarding an amendment to House bill 7800. Some time ago I introduced Senate bill 2957, which had for its purpose the very thing that the amendment which I suggested today proposes. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on that bill today, a letter from the clerk of the Senate Finance Committee, transmitting a copy of a letter written by John L. Thurston, Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, under date of June 16, 1952, regarding Senate bill 2957, the substance of which, as I stated, was the same as the substance of the amendment which I proposed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
June 17, 1952.

The Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I am enclosing for your information copy of a report from the Federal Security Agency relative to your bill, S. 2957, to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old age and survivors' insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems.

Sincerely yours,
ELIZABETH SPRINGER,
Clerk.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 16, 1952.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of April 4, 1952, for a report on S. 2957, a bill "to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems."

The objective of S. 2957 is to permit old-age and survivors insurance coverage of State and local Government employees who are in positions covered by State or local retirement systems without the necessity of abolishing these systems. The Federal Security Agency believes that this objective is highly desirable. Under present law, as the committee will recall, an employee in a position which is covered by a retirement system on the date when the coverage group to which he belongs is brought into the old-age and survivors' insurance program cannot be covered by that program. This provision was included at the request of representatives of State and local retirement systems in order to protect those systems, but it has actually had the opposite effect since the only way such employees can be covered by old-age and survivors insurance is by abolishing the systems. Several systems have in fact been abolished because of this provision. In one case a new system has been established, after the date of old-age and survivors insurance coverage, to supplement the protection provided by old-age and survivors insurance. Old-age and survivors insurance coverage of retirement systems is therefore not an impossibility under present law, but the process of abolishing a system and establishing a new system where one is desired is a complicated, difficult, expensive procedure, the result of which may be uncertain and which may cause considerable uneasiness and anxiety among the employees affected.

Under S. 2957 this procedure would be unnecessary; members of retirement systems could be brought into old-age and survivors insurance and any necessary adjustments could be made in the systems in a much more simple and direct way than is

possible when the system must be abolished and a new one set up. Moreover the bill contains provisions to safeguard the interest of those employees who prefer not to have old-age and survivors insurance protection and a supplementary system, but rather to remain in their present status. Under these provisions, members of a retirement system could be brought under old-age and survivors insurance only if (1) there were in effect on January 1, 1951, in a State or local law, provisions relating to the coordination of the retirement system with old-age and survivors insurance (we believe this would apply only to the Wisconsin system, or (2) if the Governor of the State certifies that a majority of the members of the system voted in favor of coverage in a written referendum and that certain conditions, designed to assure an expression of the true opinion of the group, were met regarding the referendum.

The bill would also allow two additional years for enacting enabling legislation and making the necessary arrangements for covering retirement system members without depriving the members of the opportunity of making coverage retroactive to January 1, 1951. This provision is necessary to enable these members to obtain full protection under old-age and survivors insurance.

We have one suggestion regarding the detailed provisions of the bill. Under the bill all of the members of a retirement system would constitute a single coverage group even though employed by different political subdivisions. Since the law requires that all members of a coverage group be covered if any are covered, this would mean that, in general, all members of a retirement system would have to be covered if any were to be covered.

As mentioned in our report on S. 2650, such a provision would create serious administrative and legal problems for the State where the members of a retirement system are employees of a number of political subdivisions. Unless all of the poliitcal subdivisions were willing to cover those among their employees who are under the retirement system, the State would have to impose its will on the political subdivisions in order to secure coverage, obtain necessary reports and collect contributions. In some cases the State might not have the authority to require uniform action of the political subdiviisons. In any case, the State would have to maintain controls to assure that all members of the system were covered.

We recommend that the language of the bill be amended so that those members of a retirement system who are employed by a single governmental unit could, at the option of the State, constitute a separate group for purposes of the referendum and subsequent coverage. This alternative would involve fewer problems for the States, and although it would permit partial coverage of a retirement system, it would not result in weakening the system, since the system could be adjusted to take the partial coverage into account. Moreover, the fact that the separate treatment was made optional with the State would mean that, where feasible, the retirement system could be treated as a single group for purposes of coverage.

We strongly urge that the bill, modified as suggested above, be enacted by the Congress. We shall be glad to furnish advice or assistance in drafting any changes the committee desires to make in the bill.

We are advised as follows by the Bureau of the Budget:

"The President has stated, on numerous occasions, the objective of making old-age and survivors insurance a basic protection for all employed groups, with special pension plans supplementing this basic protection. The proposal to permit all employees of State and local governments to obtain old-age and survivors' insurance coverage, whether or not they are covered under an existing pension system, is a move toward this objective. Its enactment would therefore be in accord with the program of the President."

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. THURSTON,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement showing why I favor the retention of section 6. As I have said, Wisconsin is very much interested in having such a statute. If this were to become law it would not be necessary to have the amendment which I have prepared, and which I shall submit, but shall not press because of the wonderful assurance which has been given by the Senator from Georgia. However, I ask that the statement which I have prepared, showing why I favor the retention of section 6, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

I submit the following statement on behalf of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and in favor of retaining section 6.

The purpose of the amendment is to remove the present bar to coverage of certain employees under State and local retirement systems.

PRIVATE WORKERS GET SUPPLEMENTARY COVERAGE BUT NOT PUBLIC WORKERS

When we passed the 1950 amendment to the Social Security Act, we unfortunately prohibited coverage under the Federal system to State and local retirement systems.

As a result, several of those State and local retirement systems are being liquidated, according to report No. 1944 of the House Ways and Means Committee, p. 8. This situation, Mr. President, seems to be very unfair. Over 10,000,000 workers in private industry are covered under 14,000 private retirement plans. In addition, they are entitled to supplementary Federal coverage. Why should not public workers be similarly entitled to supplementary Federal coverage?

PRESENT PLANS PROVIDE ONLY PITTANCE

I have in my hand a telegram received from Mr. Arnold Zander, president of the American Federation of State and County and Municipal Employees.

Mr. Zander points out that, if section 6 is not added back on the bill, the retirement rights of some 2,500,000 employees will be jeopardized.

I see no justification for harming these faithful public workers. A full one-fourth of all of these State and local public workers are now drawing only $22 per month or less retirement pay, Mr. Zander points out.

How one can keep body and soul together on $5.50 per week is beyond me. Why should the Federal Government deny these workers opportunity to receive Federal coverage and a few additional dollars per month? All that section 6 does is to provide for a referendum under which workers could come under Federal coverage, if they so choose. That is a fair, democratic procedure.

GROUPS OPPOSING COVERAGE ARE NOT INCLUDED

Section 6 specifically excludes policemen, firemen, and elementary and secondary school teachers, who apparently do not want to come under supplementary Federal coverage.

This is their American right. I do not quarrel with them in the slightest. Coming from a family of teachers, myself, I know the problems of teachers, and I am deeply sympathetic with them.

However, I do not believe that any group which may not—for its own reasons—want to be included under the Federal social-security system should deny that right to others.

As a matter of fact, I cannot understand how any group can justifiably take the position that because it does not want Federal coverage, it will raise so much of a question as to prevent other groups which do want coverage from being allowed the right to exercise their voluntary option.

I have no quarrel with any group of State or municipal workers who do not want to be included. But I do not think that any group should interfere with the right of other groups to come under the Federal system.

I say that with frankness, candor, and with nothing but friendship for any group involved.

SECTION 6'S SO-CALLED CONTROVERSY HAS BEEN MINIMIZED

I note that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] states that:

(a) Section 6 of H. R. 7800 could not be considered in his committee in view of the fact it was controversial, and

(b) that he felt that rather than lose the entire bill, because of the relatively short time remaining in this session, it would be preferable to drop section 6, but would be considered fully in January 1953 by the committee.

I can appreciate the desire to make sure that some version of social security legislation passes. I, too, want the over-all bill with aid to the aged, the blind, dependent children, etc., passed.

I know from long experience that compromises must now and then be made, and controversies must relatively be avoided in the closing hours of the session.

Nevertheless, I cannot help but feel that in the case of a voluntary, optional matter where no single group is going to be forced to do anything it doesn't want to do, that in the case of such a situation, section 6 could well have been retained.

It seems to me that the controversy has been sucessfully reduced to the absolute minimum, and that with a relatively short review, the various groups could have been heard and a more affirmative decision taken on retaining section 6. Why should 2,500,000 public workers who do want Federal coverage be left out in the cold?

WISCONSIN TAKEN CARE OF IN SECTION 6

I want to point out that section 6 provides the answer to the needs of Wisconsin public workers (by pages 24 and 25, lines 19–25 and 1–3), of H. R. 7800 (House version). These lines provide that for workers under coverage under a State retirement system on January 1, 1951, and in which there is agreement between Federal and State governments for coverage, no referendum for coverage is necessary.

This provision is uniquely applicable to the State of Wisconsin, because we, alone, provided for Federal-State integration not just in 1950, but as far back as 1943 in our basic law.

IF SECTION 6 PASSES, SEPARATE WISCONSIN PROVISION NOT NECESSARY

I earnestly trust that the Senate will accept section 6 as a whole. If, however, it does not do so, it will be necessary for me to offer the Wisconsin provision as a separate amendment to the bill.

I will do so in order to strengthen our position and to increase the likelihood of the Wisconsin provision being included in the ultimate conference committee version.

WISCONSIN FEARS CONFERENCE COMMITTEE WILL REJECT HOUSE'S VERSION PROVIDING FOR SECTION 6

The people under the Wisconsin system are concerned that if section 6 is not now restored, the Senate conferees will not accept the House version, containing section 6.

My people are concerned that, for the same reason that the Senate Finance Committee dropped section 6, namely, a fear of controversy—that for that same reason—the Senate conferees will not accept section 6 in conference.

Now, let me state that I have the highest personal regard for the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. GEORGE, and for the ranking members who will accompany him to the conference committee. I know of no Members of this body more earnest, more conscientious, more hard working than these men.

But I have a responsibility to my own people—a responsibility to try to increase the possibility of their being assured justice. I feel that this can be done by restoring to the Senate version—

(a) Section 6 as a whole, or

(b) The Wisconsin provision separately.

And so, I want to discharge my responsibility to my people.

I include herewith, therefore, Mr. Zander's telegram to be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

I earnestly entreat my colleagues to vote for section 6 and in that way guarantee that the final version of H. R. 7800 will contain it, in view of the fact that it is already contained in the House version.

MADISON, WIS., *June 23, 1952.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

There are approximately 3,600,000 State, county, and municipal employees; 900,000 of these are elementary and secondary school teachers, and 200,000 are police officers and firemen. The action of the Senate Finance Committee in striking section 6 from H. R. 7800 deprives the remaining 2,500,000 employees of their rights as citizens with the consent of their employing officers to acquire benefits of OASI to supplement local systems or to use in place of local systems. According to survey made by this union within 2 years 25 percent of all retirants in these State and local systems were drawing $22 per month or less and more than half of all persons on retirement from these State and local systems were drawing less than $50 per month. In behalf of these 2,500,000 State and local employees we plead with you and other United States Senators to reincorporate section 6.

ARNOLD S. ZANDER,
International President,
GORDON W. CHAPMAN,
International Secretary-Treasurer,
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in order to make the RECORD complete I desire to submit my amendment at this time for printing in the RECORD.

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

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment beginning on page 24, line 3, insert the following:

"COVERAGE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES COVERED BY STATE AND LOCAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

"SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (d) of section 218 of the Social Security Act (relating to voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees) is amended by striking out 'Exclusion of' in the heading, by inserting '(1)' after '(d)', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an agreement with a State may be made applicable (either in the original agreement or by any modification thereof) to service performed by employees in positions covered by a retirement system (excluding positions specified in paragraph (3)) if there were in effect on January 1, 1951, in a State or local law, provisions relating to the coordination of such retirement system with the insurance system established by this title.

"'(3) Nothing in the preceding paragraph of this subsection shall authorize the extension of the insurance system established by this title to service in any of the following positions covered by a retirement system—

"'(A) any policeman's or fireman's position or any elementary or secondary school teacher's position; or

"'(B) any position covered by a retirement system applicable exclusively to positions in one or more law-enforcement or fire fighting units, agencies, or departments.'

For the purpose of this paragraph, any individual in the education system of the State of any political subdivision thereof supervising elementary or secondary instruction in such system or in any elementary or secondard school therein shall be deemed to be an elementary or secondary school teacher."

Mr. WILEY. On the assumption that section 6 will go out in conference, Wisconsin takes the position that my amendment then would be necessary. I offer it for the RECORD in order that next January we may be in a position to present the question to the committee of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman.

Mr. President, I also offer at this time a statement which I have prepared. It explains the amendment and gives the reasons therefor.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am offering now an amendment to H. R. 7800, the purpose of which is to validate the bringing in under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of those Wisconsin employees who were covered under the State retirement fund prior to the passage of the Social Security Act of 1951.

This is a unique amendment, uniquely affecting but one State—my own.

It does not include Wisconsin policemen, firemen, or elementary or secondary teachers.

The amendment merely authorizes a State which had the foresight to plan for integration of the Federal and State systems to achieve such integration.

Last Saturday, on page 7772 of the RECORD, I presented the case for this particular amendment.

I pointed out how way back on June 19, 1950, I had offered the amendment on the Senate floor but unfortunately the amendment was rejected.

I stated that Wisconsin, in preparing its basic retirement law in 1943, had with foresight and genuine interest in the workers, arranged for them to be covered under the Federal system, once the Federal Government permitted such coverage. Now 8 years later, at last the Federal Government may be getting around to permitting coverage, but instead of the State of Wisconsin being rewarded for its foresight, it is penalized, and instead of its workers being helped, they, too, are penalized.

WHY WORK FOR STATE OR LOCALITIES?

The situation is that the State of Wisconsin cannot keep workers in State institutions and on the State and local payrolls, for example, hospital workers, university teachers, orphan asylum people, county clerks, treasurers, etc., because if they were to go out to work in private industry, they could often come under a private retirement plan plus getting Federal coverage.

Under these circumstances, there is little reason why a man approaching his later years would want to work for the State and localities other than for purposes of civic service, whereas he could be far better looked after, by working in private industry and getting a more equitable old-age coverage—a combination of two plans, not just one.

What we are in effect doing, therefore, by the status quo is discouraging public workers from working for the State and localities.

This is obviously a short-sighted and wholly unfair arrangement; and it is quite clear that this discriminatory provision in the law should be changed.

That is what I am attempting to do now.

The amendment is fair and helpful. It hurts no one, helps literally thousands of workers, sets no adverse precedent.

Among the favorable messages which I have received on this issue is a message from the distinguished president of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. E. B. Fred.

I send his and other messages to the desk now and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point three telegrams, and a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Eau Claire, Wis.

There being no objection, the telegrams and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *June 23, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

UW is on record in favor of social-security coverage for college and university employees. Understand Senate Finance Committee has deleted provision for voluntary coverage from H. R. 7800. Hope sincerely that Senate will restore this provision in the bill.

E. B. FRED,
President, University of Wisconsin.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., *June 23, 1952.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

The Wisconsin Clerk of Circuit Courts Association, at its annual convention, today respectfully ask that you support section 6 of H. R. 7800 so as to permit integration of the Wisconsin State and municipal retirement plan with Federal social security. If it is impossible to secure passage of section 6, we ask for support of Byrnes and Raines integration bills.

G. ADOLPH STRANGBERG,
President of the Clerk of Circuit Courts Association.
EUGENE A. HICKEY,
Vice President.
VERA C. TERRY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., *June 23, 1952.*

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

The county treasurers association passed the following resolution this a. m.:

"The Wisconsin County Treasurers Association, at its annual convention, today respectfully ask that you support section 6 of H. R. 7800 so as to permit integration of the Wisconsin State and municipal retire-

ment plan with Federal social security. If it is impossible to secure passage of section 6, we ask for support of Byrnes and Raines integration bills."

V. M. KELLY.
ARLETTA ORTENDAHL.
W. C. SMITH.

Be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of Eau Claire, That whereas the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin in adopting sections 66.903 (2) (F) and 66.99 (3) created an enabling act to permit the inclusion of city employees under the old age and survivor's insurance benefit provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, the same to be effective when Congress makes such inclusion available, and

Whereas the benefits under the Wisconsin retirement system appear presently to be wholly inadequate and that sufficient liberalization thereof would impose prohibitive burdens to the contributing employees and municipalities, and that such inclusion would be of much greater benefit to employees without presently increasing the municipal contribution; and

Whereas it appears that pending legislation in Congress, to wit: H. R. 6816 and 6817, provides for the aforesaid inclusion: It is therefore and hereby

Resolved, That said inclusion be adopted when available and that if said legislation is enacted, that the State retirement board be authorized to transfer such necessary funds to make full coverage and inclusion effective as early as possible, it is further

Ordered, That certified copies hereof be forwarded to the Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen with the request that they exert every effort to effectuate the passage of said legislation at the present session of Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his very generous attitude.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the Committee on Finance and the distinguished chairman upon bringing the bill (H. R. 7800) to the attention of the Senate and for its action.

The chairman of the committee knows that I have been the sponsor and cosponsor of several bills which have been referred to his committee on the subject of social-security benefits. I was very happy to note that the bill, as it comes from the Committee on Finance, contains three provisions which I have sponsored before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. We were very glad to have the assistance of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING SOCIAL SECURITY

Today, just 2 years after the last major amendments were made in the old-age and survivors insurance program, the Senate is considering adjustments in that program to meet the needs of 1952. I find it very gratifying that after 15 years of operation of the old-age and survivors insurance program, there is a growing realization of the importance of that program to the American people and the importance of keeping the program in tune with our changing times. I am glad to see that realization reflected in the very important and essential changes which this social security bill, H. R. 7800, will make in the insurance program—the increases in benefits to take account of rising prices and wages, the increase in the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and the provision of social security wage credits for the men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces in this time of national emergency.

All three of these changes in the insurance program are ones which I have proposed in various bills now pending before the Senate. The benefit increases in the committee bill are very similar to those which would be provided by S. 3079 which I introduced on April 28, 1952. As a matter of fact, I intoduced a bill increasing insurance benefits along these lines nearly a year ago—S. 1983. In discussing my proposal for a benefit increase last year I pointed out.

"The increased insurance payments could be made immediately without changing the contributions or the actuarial status of the system as calculated when the 1950 amendments were enacted. This is due to the fact that increased wages have resulted in an increase in the income to the trust fund that will be more than adequate in the long run to pay the increased benefits."

This is now a generally recognized fact. These benefit increases do not require any change in the contribution schedule of the insurance program and do not change the actuarial status of the fund.

I would like to quote further from my remarks to the Senate at that time:

"Mr. President, I appeal in this Chamber for equity. Thousands of persons have been given cost-of-living increases in wages. I think everyone will agree that this is fair. Surely, then, it is fair on the part of the Government to increase insurance payments. No person or body but the Congress of the United States can increase them. * * *

"These people must eat every day. They must pay the rent. They have to take care of their doctor's bills. They cannot sit around waiting until committees of Congress have gone into the matter when, as a matter of fact, the proposal is a sound one, and money is available to effectuate it. * * *

"Mr. President, there is a great, inarticulate body, a great silent mass among the American people, of more than four million recipients of old-age and survivors insurance, who have no lobbyists here, who have no business agents here to represent them. They have no five-percenters representing them here. The only ones they have to represent them are their respective Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Those statements are still true and I want to emphasize them. If anything there is even a greater need for these benefits increases now than when I urged them a year ago.

The financial plight of our older people today is nothing less than tragic. There are in the United States more than 13,000,000 men and women past 65 years of age. Less than a third of them are able to find even part-time employment. As for the rest: a fortunate minority have savings and dividend income; some, also fortunate, still own their own homes and can rent rooms; some are partially supported by their adult children and other relatives. Most older men and women, however, must look to social security insurance or public old-age assistance as their chief source of dependable income.

Yet, in the face of the highest cost of living in our Nation's history, benefits under social security insurance average only about $43 a month. Not counting luxuries, not counting doctor and hospital bills, not counting even shoes and clothing, can anyone say that $43 a month is enough to live on? Of course it isn't and something must be done at once to increase these benefits. Surely our Government can increase the insurance payments. This is but to ask simple justice.

THE WORK CLAUSE

I am also pleased to see that the committee bill provides for raising the work clause to $100. I proposed this change in the program in S. 3121 which I introduced on May 5, 1952.

PROTECTION FOR SERVICEMEN

In S. 2705, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in which I joined with Senator MURRAY and Senator MAGNUSON, we provided for protection of the servicemen and women now in Korea. It is a matter of great pride to me that this bill now before you incorporates these changes which I have been advocating.

PRESERVATION OF THE INSURANCE RIGHTS OF THE DISABLED

I cannot let this occasion go by, though, without expressing my disappointment at the deletion by the Finance Committee of two additional provisions of H. R. 7800 which were approved by the House, the provision for a waiver of premium for permanently and totally disabled workers and the granting to additional State and local employees the opportunity to come under the old-age and survivors insurance program. I recognize that the Finance Committee does not oppose these provisions and deleted them only because they felt their consideration might delay the much-needed benefit increases and other important program improvements provided by other sections of the bill. I am completely in accord with the objective of speed. It seems to me absolutely essential that these benefit increases be provided for now and without delay. However, I do not believe that prolonged consideration of these additional provisions are really required. They are simple and straightforward propositions which merit serious consideration.

The objections which were raised against the disability provisions in the House were exposed as groundless, either arising from a misinterpretation of the bill's provisions or from a deliberate distortion of the facts. As was pointed out on the floor of the House, the freezing of rights for the disabled is no more—no less—than the waiver of premium Congress has provided for veterans under National Service Life Insurance. The authority provided is the same as in civil service laws, Federal workmen's compensation laws, and the railroad retirement law. The cry of "socialized medicine" raised against the provision has been recognized as a false and fraudulent argument in most of the Nation's press. Typical of the editorials of recent weeks is one which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of June 18. I quote:

"SEEING THE POINT

"A month ago the House shied away from passing a bill increasing the monthly payments to old-age and survivor beneficiaries under the social security system because the cry 'socialized medicine' was raised. It was a fine—that is, a glaring—example of catchphrase thinking. Yesterday the House took up the same legislation again, with only a minor change or two, and approved it. * * *

"There is no reason to regard this as socialized medicine or even a move in the direction of socialized medicine. If the principle of protecting totally disabled beneficiaries is sound, then there clearly must be some means of deciding in a given instance what degree of disability exists. And under a social security system the Government, which controls the payments to beneficiaries, obviously must be responsible for making the decision.

"That is all there is to it. And yesterday Congress managed to see the point. Every now and then that does happen."

I regret the omission of the provision preserving the rights of the disabled. Nevertheless, the Senate cannot and should not delay enacting the vitally necessary changes that the Finance Committee has recommended to us. I urge that the Senate pass H. R. 7800 without delay.

COVERAGE OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

I would like to see this bill give the opportunity to more State and local employees to come under old-age and survivors insurance. In S. 3122, which I introduced on May 5, the opportunity for coverage under old-age and survivors insurance is opened up to college and university employees. Up until now these employees have been excluded from the social-security system because they are covered by State or local retirement systems. This is an inadequate reason. Their colleagues in private colleges and universities now generally have both old-age and survivors insurance protection and supplementary protection under a private system. This is also the plan followed for the employees of nearly 15,000 industrial concerns. Practically all the biggest corporations in America now have pension systems designed to supplement the old-age and survivors insurance system. Yet we continue to discriminate against persons employed in State universities and normal schools. To them, we say, if you are under a retirement system—no matter how inadequate, and many of them are inadequate—you cannot come under old-age and survivors insurance.

I introduced S. 3122 at the request of these State and local university and college people. They want to come under the social-security program. They want to have this basic protection. Under the present situation when they change to a private university or college, they will have social-security coverage but their insurance benefits will be adversely affected by their lack of coverage during the time they taught at the State university.

The fact that State and local employees are barred from social-security coverage is not only a bad thing for the teachers but for the universities and colleges as employers. It puts them at a disadvantage in competing with private universities for the best teaching brains in the country. It also puts them at a disadvantage from a financial standpoint in trying to provide a good retirement plan for their employees. Thousands of industrial employers and nonprofit employers have found it cheaper and better to provide for their employees through a combination of old-age and survivors insurance and a supplementary system rather than through a separate system alone. Both employers and employees in the field of State and local higher education want to come under old-age and survivors insurance. They have every right to it. I believe we should let them have this opportunity.

I hope in this area, too, that either we can amend this bill to provide what S. 3122 provides for, or, in any case, I hope the Senate conferees will accept the House position on this point.

INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR THE NEEDY AGED RECEIVING STATE ASSISTANCE

I have also favored an increase in the Federal share of payments to the States for public assistance. I was a sponsor of the amendment proposed by Senator McFARLAND on July 18, 1951, to increase old-age assistance by $5 a month. I introduced a separate bill, S. 3120, on this matter on May 5, 1952. I am again joining Senator McFARLAND in offering this as an amendment to H. R. 7800.

I believe, however, it is important that improvements be made in our insurance system so that in the long run the need for assistance to the needy will greatly diminish. I look forward to the day when all of our aged will be receiving insurance benefits as a matter of right. But until the Congress improves the insurance program to make this goal possible, I am going to continue to urge increasing the public assistance payments to those who are needy.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING OLD-AGE INSURANCE

I recognize as do other Senators that it is not possible to consider today all the various amendments which would make the basic improvements in old-age and survivors' insurance which are needed. We must pass H. R. 7800 promptly. But important as H. R. 7800 is, we must keep in mind that it falls far short of what is needed to make our insurance program fully effective.

I feel it is important to point out this fact because I do not want any Member of this body to think that H. R. 7800 does a really complete job. What H. R. 7800 does—and it is, of course, essential that this be done—is to keep the program as revised in 1950 in adjustment with changes which have occurred since that time. That is all that H. R. 7800 does. It does not make any of the basic improvements in the program which are clearly needed and which ought to be made as soon as possible.

I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who heads the Finance Committee, and he has assured me that the more fundamental improvements in the program will receive consideration next year.

What are these basic improvements? Well, first of all, there are many more people who ought to be brought into the insurance program. The program now covers about 80 percent of the people who work in paid civilian jobs. An additional 7 or 8 percent are covered by other public retirement systems. A little over 10 percent do not yet have any form of organized insurance protection. Among this 10 percent are self-employed farm operators and those farm and household workers who, though regular workers in every usual sense of the work, do not work for a single employer long enough to meet the strict requirements for coverage that were written into the 1950 amendments. There is no question that these people need the protection of the insurance program. They ought to be given that protection promptly.

Second, further improvements are needed in the benefit provisions of the insurance program. It is not enough merely to adjust benefit levels to increases in wages and prices after such increases have occurred. The benefit structure itself ought to be made responsive to increases in wages and prices. One provision which would help to accomplish this objective is a provision for computing the average earnings on which benefits are based over the worker's best 10 years of earnings, instead of over his entire working lifetime as is now required. The present method of computing average earnings, though reasonably satisfactory now because of the 1950 amendments, is simply not realistic for the long run. Benefit amounts awarded in the future will be diminished by periods of unemployment, by low wages earned early in the worker's life, and by sickness. Many other public retirement programs base benefits on the best 5 or 10 years of earnings, and a similar provision should be adopted for old-age and survivors insurance.

The benefit formula itself should also be revised. Ever since 1939 the formula has provided for paying in benefits a larger proportion of what might be thought of as low earnings than of high earnings. Thus prior to the 1950 amendments the formula was 40 percent of the first $50 of average earnings plus 10 percent of the remainder; at present the formula is 50 percent of the first $100 of average earnings plus 15 percent of the remainder. As wages go up, of course, the amount that constitutes low earnings also goes up. The level of earnings represented by $50 a month in 1939, and by $100 a month in 1950, might be represented by, say, $115 or $120 today. The benefit formula of the program must be adjusted to take these changes into account.

Even more important, the maximum amount of annual wages creditable toward benefits needs to be raised above the present level of $3,600. The $3,600 level is simply not high enough so that most workers can have all of their earnings credited toward benefits. The $3,600 figure should be raised, and raised substantially.

Another change I would suggest in the benefit provisions is one to correct an inequity brought about by the 1950 amendments. Those amendments eliminated from the benefit formula the so-called increment for years of service. As a result, a man now aged 60 will get the same benefit amount after contributing for only 5 years as a man now aged 40 who has the same average earnings and who will contribute for 25 years. This simply does not seem fair to the younger workers, and it is not fair to those workers. Some recognition should be given to length of participation in the system. An increment should be restored.

If these four benefit changes are made—basing benefits on the best 10 years of the worker's lifetime, an increase in the benefit formula, an increase in the maximum wage base, and restoration of the increment—the old-age and survivors insurance program will become the best program in the world providing security against wage losses caused by the old age or death of the family breadwinner. We can do no less.

HOSPITALIZATION

I have introduced one other bill which would greatly improve the old-age and survivors insurance system. This bill, S. 3001, which I introduced jointly with Senator MURRAY would provide prepaid hospitalization up to 60 days a year for everyone receiving old-age insurance who is in need of hospital care. The problem of sickness is serious for the aged. Again and again it wipes out a lifetime's savings overnight. Voluntary nonprofit plans and commercial insurance companies, almost without exception, do not cover people 65 years of age and over. This bill would help not only the aged but the communities in which they live. It would help the hospitals which now often provide hospitalization free of charge or for partial-pay services. It is my hope this bill will be accepted by the Congress as a partial solution to a very critical social problem—sickness in old age.

CONCLUSION

I want to conclude, Mr. President, by urging the immediate passage of H. R. 7800 and then early consideration of further and even more basic improvements in the old-age and survivors insurance program.

The great mass of people of this country have indicated that they want the right to earn their security, to pay their own way and to have the dignity and independence in old age which goes with an earned right. It is heartening indeed at this time in our struggle with totalitarian philosophies to find Americans united in their determination to end poverty at home—by giving each man the opportunity, in the American way, through our Federal insurance program, to earn his own security.

This is the way the American people want it, and this is the answer to communistic charges that the democracies cannot protect their people against want.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I again thank the chairman of the committee for giving me the time to make my statement. I again commend him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc, to the committee amendments on pages 20, 21, and 24.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 2, it is proposed to change the section number from "7" to "5".

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it may be necessary to ask for a change in the title of the bill, but I understand that would have to be done after the bill has been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are several committee amendments remaining to be acted upon.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a minute? May we have the remaining committee amendments stated?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 4, after "(4)", it is proposed to strike out "(A)."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, at the beginning of line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$70" and insert "$100."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 21, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out "$70" and insert "$100."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. At the top of page 32 it is proposed to insert:

(e) In case the benefit of any individual for any month after August 1952 is computed under section 2 (c) (2) (A) of this act through use of a benefit (after the application of secs. 203 and 215 (g) of the Social Security Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) for August 1952 which could have been derived from either of two (and not more than two) primary insurance amounts, and such primary insurance amounts differ from each other by not more than $0.10, then the benefit of such individual for such month of August 1952 shall, for the purposes of the last sentence of such section 2 (c) (2) (A), be deemed to have been derived from the larger of such two primary insurance amounts.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 14, it is proposed to change the section number from "8" to "6."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 21, after the word "may", it is proposed to insert "until June 30, 1954, and thereafter shall."

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

That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has an amendment which he wishes to offer to the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Arizona and agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been recognized and has the floor. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield? I have no objection to the Senator's amendment being adopted. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has stated that he is willing to take it to conference. Perhaps we can dispose of the bill today.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I explain the amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York, provided I do not lose my right to the floor. Because there may be an attempt made to pass the bill this evening, I wish to state that I will not yield for that purpose, for the reason that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has advised me that he intends to discuss the bill at some length. I do not know how long he will take, but he told me he wishes to discuss it at some length. I do not know whether the Senator from Washington intends to offer any amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Oregon that I have sent for the Senator from Washington, who I understand wants to speak on the bill before it is passed.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I wish to make. I assured the Senator from Washington that I shall, as a matter of courtesy, protect his right to discuss the bill before it is passed. That is why I proposed to make my speech on another subject at this time. I shall make my speech as soon as we dispose of the amendment of the Senator from New York, if I may have unanimous consent to yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he may yield to the Senator from New York without losing the floor? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments which really constitute one amendment to H. R. 7800, I have shown the amendment to the Senator from Georgia, and he has no objection to taking it to conference.

I have a statement which I have prepared, dealing with the amendment, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the statement. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

My amendment is a very simple one. Its apparent complexity is due to the fact that our social security laws are complex. All I propose is to amend the pending bill to provide for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands a somewhat more equitable formula for Federal grants for public assistance than is now the case. My proposal would somewhat increase Federal payments to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but would not even begin to place these Territories on a par with the States. In actual effect, my amendment would increase Federal grants to Puerto Rico by a maximum of about $1,800,000 and to the Virgin Islands, by about $70,000. This is a small amount, indeed, compared to the $250,000,000 which is proposed to be paid to the States under the terms of the McFarland amendment.

In 1950, when the last social security amendments were adopted, a formula was written into the law whereby Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were authorized to be given Federal payments of 50 percent of any expenditures for public-assistance payments in the categories of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind. The Federal Government was authorized to match, dollar for dollar, Puerto Rico's own expenditures for these purposes. However, a ceiling was written into our law so that Puerto Rico could not receive in any event more than $4,250,000 and the Virgin Islands $160,000 for all those categories of public assistance.

Puerto Rico has a population of over 2,000,000 in an area whose agricultural economy does not support this number of people. Unemployment is severe. The government and the people have been making Herculean efforts in recent years to expand their economy and to diversify it to give more employment and to raise the standard of living. Those efforts have been called operation bootstrap, and they have resulted in very significant progress.

But as a result of the basic economic situation, the Puerto Rican Government is severely limited in its ability to raise money for public assistance payments. The appropriation for public assistance is running at the level of $3,200,000 annually. There is little or no possibility that this amount can be substantially increased at the present time.

Thus, under the present matching formula, we can give Puerto Rico a maximum of $3,200,000 annually for its public assistance programs, despite the fact that the authorized ceiling now in our Federal law is $4,250,000. The Congress authorized grants up to $4,250,000 to Puerto Rico, but we are giving Puerto Rico only about $3,200,000. For the Virgin Islands, the authorized ceiling is $160,000. But this Territory is receiving only $70,000 annually.

The average monthly public assistance payment to an aged person in Puerto Rico at the present time is $7.53 a month, as against the authorized ceiling of $30 a month.

Think of it, today in Puerto Rico the total payment for an aged person is $7.53 a month. The same average is paid to the needy blind. The average payments for dependent children are actually $9.09 a month.

The number of cases receiving old-age assistance as of recent date was 32,400. The number of cases of aid to dependent children was 22,600. The number of cases of aid to the blind was 656.

But there are 45,000 pending applications for public assistance. There are 13,000 applicants for old-age assistance, 16,000 applicants for aid to dependent children, 700 applicants for aid to the blind, and 14,000 permanently and totally disabled cases. Few of these cases can receive any assistance unless the amendment now offered shall be accepted.

The cost of living in Puerto Rico is actually very little less than it is in continental United States. For an aged person to be forced to live on $7.53 a month, or an average of 25 cents a day, is a shocking situation. I cannot understand how these unfortunate fellow citizens of ours can exist at such a level.

Nor can we shut our eyes to the 45,000 cases of need which receive no payment at all. These are individuals—aged and infirm persons, permanently disabled persons, blind people, and dependent children—who are hungry and needy, who get no help at all from the government. There just is not money enough to help them.

How can we, as fellow Americans, as Members of the United States Senate, close our eyes to these conditions? How can we turn our backs on them? How can we say that we have discharged our obligation to these fellow citizens when we have provided a formula which in practice does not even make available the money which Congress has authorized?

The figures I have cited are official figures. They were supplied me by officials of the Social Security Administration who have just returned from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands where they compiled these statistics. The Puerto Rican government does not have the resources to enable it to increase its total expenditures for public assistance at the present time. Great progress has been made in the past year, but the backlog of need is so great that additional funds are needed if even the present program is to be maintained. The Puerto Rican government wants to increase payments to individual cases, but it desires even more to increase the case load, to do something for the many cases who now receive no payments at all.

There is a Federal law which requires that there be no discrimination as between applicants for public assistance. Yet in Puerto Rico there is, in effect, an unfortunate discrimination based solely on the fact that there are no funds available to take care of all the cases.

The pending amendment would increase the authorized ceiling on the Federal payment to Puerto Rico from $4,250,000 to $5,000,000. This is certainly a modest increase and still leaves the territory at a great disadvantage as compared to the States. In fact, the increase in the ceiling which I propose would not, in any sense, allow Puerto Rico to receive in Federal funds all the money which the change in the formula for the Federal contribution from one-half to two-thirds should bring to the territory. But this amendment certainly will allow more funds to be used to help these unfortunates, these underprivileged, these uncared-for individuals who are our fellow citizens and the citizens of tomorrow.

My amendment changes the basis for the formula to one roughly paralleling that for the several States, but it is one which is still much less liberal. The maximum payment for the aged and the blind authorized in my amendment remains the same as in present law—$30, instead of $50 as in other parts of the country, or $55 as proposed by the Senator from Arizona. My proposed change is in the Federal contribution which would be increased to two-thirds of the first $26 and one-half of the remaining $4 up $30. This is roughly the formula that was in effect in the States in 1946.

But this is, as I said, a theoretical formula. There is no prospect that Puerto Rico can increase its payments to anything like $26, even though that would not be an excessive amount to meet the cost of living in Puerto Rico. Today, as I said, these payments average $7.53 monthly.

I hope that with the funds which would become available under this amendment, Puerto Rico would be able to increase the size of the payments and also to take care of more of the individuals who need to be taken care of.

For aid to dependent children, my amendment provides that the Federal Government will pay two-thirds of the first $16 average per person and one-half of the balance up to $18 average. The maximum payment, which is unchanged from present law, is $18 for the first dependent child, $18 for one adult in each family, and $12 for each additional child. But this again is a purely theoretical maximum. There is no prospect for even approaching it. The change in the formula for the Federal contribution, from one-half to two-thirds, is the real heart of my amendment.

I point out that at the present time the only payments that come from both the Federal Government and Puerto Rico are in the aggregate less than $9 a month. Certainly no child or no mother caring for a child can subsist on that amount.

What I have said about Puerto Rico also applies with respect to the Virgin Islands. The payments actually being made in the Virgin Islands are slightly higher than in Puerto Rico, but they are still far below the limits set in the pending amendment. The number of pending applications is less in the Virgin Islands than in Puerto Rico, and most of the money made available under my amendment for the Virgin Islands, namely, a total of $70,000, would be used to increase the payments to somewhere nearer the level of need.

This figure is based on the fact that $70,000 is approximately the level of present appropriations by the Virgin Islands for public assistance. The present Federal contribution is in the same amount. If my amendment is approved, the Federal contribution to the Virgin Islands would be about $140,000, still below the authorized ceiling of $160,000.

I earnestly hope that this amendment will be accepted by the chairman of the committee and by the Senate, because, in my opinion, the facts are so plain that I cannot believe the Senate, in making provision for the aged and the blind, and for dependent children, in continental United States, will overlook the even greater need of our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2 to strike out beginning in line 19, down to and including the word "and" in line 24, and insert:

"and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance, under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30—

"(A) two-thirds of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $26 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and."

On page 4, line 9, after the word "and", to strike out down to and including the word "and" in line 18, and insert:

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $18 with respect to one such dependent child and $12 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of the expenditures with any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $18—

"(A) two-thirds of such expenditures, not counting so much of such expenditure for respect to any month as exceeds the product of $16 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditure exceeds the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and."

On page 5, strike out lines 1 and 2 down to and including the word "and" and insert:

(c) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 1003 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30—

"(A) two-thirds of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $26 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such months, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and."

On page 7, to strike out all down to and including the word and, and insert:

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30—

"(A) two-thirds of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $26 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and."

On page 7, strike out lines 23 and 24, and insert:

(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective October 1, 1952.

SEC. —. (a) Section 1108 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by

striking out "$4,250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective October 1, 1952.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have agreed to take the amendment to conference. In substance, if not strictly technically, it is an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. The Senator from Arizona has no objection, and I have no objection. I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should say very briefly that the amendment includes in a modified form the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Georgia has been advised by the majority leader that I sought to wait to make my speech until after we had disposed of the pending bill, which the Senator from Georgia has presented on the floor this afternoon. I had hoped that that could be done. However, in view of the parliamentary situation which has developed, when I was advised that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] wishes to speak at some length on the bill before it is passed, I shall now proceed to discuss another subject matter, and the Senator from Washington will then be able to discuss the points which he wishes to make with regard to the pending bill.

Subsequently, during the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech, the following occurred:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in my understanding that a message from the House of Representatives in connection with a bill has precedence?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair will state that there are no official papers with the message from the House at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the message represent the action of the House and is in place of the full papers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until it is documented by all the papers.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope that no Senator will suggest bringing up any other measure until we have a final vote on the pending bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia how long the pending bill will take.

Mr. GEORGE. All the committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I cannot ascertain how long it will take, I shall have to insist upon making the House message a privileged matter. A most important piece of legislation will expire on Monday. There is supposed to be a conference tomorrow, and I do not intend to go to the conference unless there is a yea-and-nay vote to show who believes in controls and who does not believe in controls.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to make a statement as to what I am willing to do in view of these developments. I have sought all afternoon for an opportunity to make this speech. I said earlier that I was going to protect the rights of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who had left the floor. If the Senator from Washington is willing to forego his speech until the bill is passed, if I understand the majority leader correctly, I am perfectly willing to stop my speech at this point for a vote on the bill sponsored by the Senator from Georgia, and then proceed with my speech with the understanding that it will be printed in continuity in the RECORD.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That would be very fine.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I want to accommodate, as best I can, the wishes of the chairman of the Finance Committee as well as the wishes of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and if that can best be done by permitting me to address myself to the social-security bill, after a vote has been taken on the defense-production bill, it will be quite agreeable to me.

Mr. MORSE. With the understanding that I have unanimous consent to proceed with my speech after the vote, I have no objection.

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I make the request that the statement which I wish to offer on the question of social security be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the taking of the vote?

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

The statement submitted by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

For the Senate Finance Committee and particularly for its Chairman, Mr. GEORGE, and for its ranking minority member, Mr. MILLIKIN, I have a profound admiration and respect.

I do not like to take exception to any legislative recommendation which the Committee offers to the Senate. I generally find myself in support of recommendations which the Committee makes from time to time.

I must, however, offer some criticisms of H. R. 7800. These criticisms represent my conviction that no lasting good can result from amending our Nation's social security system which was established in 1935. In my judgment, this system ought to be eliminated as having been unjust and discriminatory in its treatment of the aged population in the United States. I believe that now is the time to consider and take action on a social security system which will provide and give equal consideration to all, rather than to some, of the aged in our Nation.

More than 2 years ago, on May 24, 1950, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 92 calling for the appointment of an independent commission to investigate the Social Security System and report to the Congress recommendations and particulars for a soundly financed, universal coverage, pay-as-you-go system of old-age benefits.

I was moved to present this resolution for numerous reasons.

In my experience our present system was inordinately complex, many people were unjustly treated. The propaganda activities of the Federal Social Security Agency were more than suspect. The trust fund had been raided by the administration and the money used for other things. Numerous competent actuaries had concluded that the system would wind up in bankruptcy. The tendency of the Social Security bureaucrats to strive ceaselessly to expand their authority had roused the liveliest fears that they would eventually get control of our whole economic and cultural life.

I could not, for my life, see why American ingenuity could not devise some honest, straightforward, and equitable system to deal with this problem.

To my mind a universal coverage, pay-as-you-go system was the obvious answer.

In part, at least, my proposal was scarcely new and startling. Sixteen years ago the platform of the Republican Party declared, among other things, that "we approve a pay-as-you-go policy, which requires of each generation the support of the aged and the determination of what is just and adequate."

How to set up such a system was another question and that was the reason for my resolution calling for the appointment of an independent commission to make recommendations to Congress.

My resolution failed to pass, but it was instrumental in the presentation of Senate Resolution 300 which was agreed to a month later on June 20, 1950. This resolution gave the Senate Finance Committee full power "to make a full and complete study and investigation of social security programs" including study of "a pay-as-you-go universal coverage system and the problems of transition to such a system" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 7, p. 8634).

It was my great hope that from this restudy we might receive some simple and clear proposal upon which the Congress could go to work. Many other people had such hopes also: bewildered beneficiaries, irate persons whose benefits for some mysterious reason had been suspended, insurance people, private pension administrators, not to forget harassed and bedeviled legislators.

From time to time I asked for particulars about the restudy. What success had been attained in getting independent experts? How soon could we have the plans? And so forth. But no new action or progress was forthcoming.

A year went by and we had before us a bill (H. R. 2416) dealing with the exclusion from gross income of income from the discharge of indebtedness. Hitched to this bill was an amendment providing for the increase of public assistance grants. On July 18, 1951, I took the floor to discuss this amendment. Over and over again the Congress had been jockeyed by the social security people on Old Age Assistance versus Old Age Survivors Insurance. We must expand the OASI benefits to cut down on the zooming costs of Assistance. We must jack the Assistance payments because of rises in the cost of living. Never would Ewing or Altmeyer or any of the other social-security bureaucrats come clean on where they were going.

In discussion of this amendment a year ago I said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, p. 8364) "the original legislation of 1935 was a horrible mass of contradictions and that further expansion only made confusion worse confounded." I said that I believed that our present law was a cruel cheat that shut great numbers of old people out and would continue to do so. I called again for the recommendations supposedly forthcoming as a result of the restudy and urged as earnestly as I could that no time be lost in pressing the social security investigation.

I ended my discussion last year by repeating once more what I had said long before in 1950 at the conclusion of the debate on H. R. 6000, a brief set of remarks which I have repeated so often since that they have come to be a sort of theme song, shouted—I regret to say—into the teeth of the wind. I said:

"My position is this: If we are to have a social-security system at all, let us have one that freemen can accept with self-respect. Let us accept and act upon this bald truth:

"That our old people, who have done their life's work and have quit, must be helped by those of us who still work. In due time, our children must look after us. Not in the old way of the old folks on the farm, but in the same spirit adapted to the institutions of our day—through taxation. Let us have done with this nonsense of a contributory system, this playing house and calling it insurance.

"I accept wholeheartedly this proposition of having us who work help the old folks who have quit. I stand ready to pay as high a tax as my fellow citizens are willing to pay to put such an honest social security into operation.

"I refused to support H. R. 6000—not to evade a responsibility but rather to accept one.

"No kid stenographer in her first job in Tacoma will ever be able to accuse me of being an accessory to her defraudation when her retirement age finally comes. No down-and-out logger on the skidroad at the foot of Yesler Way in Seattle will be able to accuse me of forgetting his plight. No part-time apple picker in the Yakima and Wenatchee Valleys will be able to say that I did not recognize and seek to admit and save his rights.

"I say once more: If we are to look after some of our old people, we must look after them all; and, if we do this, let us find a way to do the whole job up year by year, starting every January 1 with a clean slate. If our Nation's economy gets pinched, the old folks will be pinched also. If we prosper, the aged will share in the Nation's prosperity. This is as it ought to be.

"But let us have done with the jobbery that for 15 years we have had the crust to call social security" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, p. 8365).

Some weeks ago the Senate granted me a leave of absence for some surgery. I had looked forward to 10 days of easy-going convalescence. No such luck. I did not wish to evade a responsibility undertaken so long ago. I quit my convalescent leave and have come back in order to urge the Senate once more to act before we are so deeply entangled in the present system that we can never escape.

The core of the problem remains exactly what it was. We have an unworkable system, riddled with injustices, backed up by a phony trust fund and on its way to bankruptcy.

The chief provision of the bill increases the benefit rate by $5 a month or by 12½ percent, whichever is the larger. This is usually referred to as the $5 raise.

It is commonly said that the beneficiaries need the $5. Of course they need the $5. But they are not the only ones who need it.

The April 1952, issue of the Social Security Bulletin tells us (p. 27) that there are about 2,600,000 persons receiving old-age assistance. Next, the April 1952 report of the trust fund (p. 12) tells us that we have about 3,500,000 persons 65 and over who are beneficiaries of OASI. (This latter figure is reached by subtracting from the number of OASI beneficiaries the dependent children and widows under 65 now drawing benefits.)

If we add these 2 figures we get a total 6,100,000 persons who are getting money under these 2 programs. But the very same trust fund report also tells us (p. 8) that as of June 30, 1951, there were 12,700,000 persons 65 and over in the country.

In other words, more than half of the old people are left outside.

Are we to suppose that these 6,600,000 left outside, couldn't use $5 a month? They could use $5 as well as other aged.

The 6,600,000 left outside would have in it the people 65 and over who are getting railroad retirement and civil-service retirement pensions but the total of these 2 groups would be less than 500,000 still leaving 6,000,000 outside.

What about the aged people in my own State of Washington? Are all of them covered by social security and will all of them benefit from the passage of H. R. 7800?

According to the closest estimates available to me, there are in the State of Washington about 225,000 men and women 65 and over. Some of these men and women are presently drawing either old-age and survivors insurance or getting old-age assistance. They are drawing these benefits and getting this assistance in varying amounts and according to a set of calculations that will drive you crazy. But they are getting something.

But, according to the nearest figures I can get, there are 102,900 men and women 65 and over in the State of Washington who receive nothing. That is almost half of the total number of old people in the State. Some are still working, some have looked after themselves and don't need to worry. There wil be many others in this indistinct crowd of 102,900 for whom circumstances are anything but pleasing. But the only thing we know for sure is that they are outside the system. I am speaking to and for this great half of the crowd. What are we going to do about them?

Most earnestly I urge the Senate to do something about the forgotten old people in Washington State and the 6,000,000 aged persons who live forgotten throughout the Nation.

We could act promptly and constructively if we only would.

It had been my intention to move to recommit H. R. 7800 in this language:

"I move that H. R. 7800 be recommitted to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate, so amended as to provide for a pay-as-you-go, universal coverage social-security system which will pay a flat benefit to every person in the United States who is 65 years of age or over, and that the Committee on Finance report this amended bill at the earliest possible moment."

I believe in this motion, and hope to see such a motion prevail in the near future. I shall not so move today because of the pressure being exercised to adjourn by Saturday, July 5. But should I be so fortunate as to be reelected in November to a second term in the Senate of the United States, I shall seek an opportunity to work, I trust, with many others, for the approval of a social-security system which recognizes that all of our aged are entitled to the same consideration.

I am not an expert and I certainly do not propose to debate the mathematics of the present social-security labyrinth.

I contend, however, that the following points represent only common sense and, if I may say so, common honesty:

1. A universal coverage, flat benefit, pay-as-you-go system is a simple concept and can be simply administered.

2. The individual recipient must apply for the benefit and his application may be validated in any local agency which the governor of the State may specify.

3. The payment of the benefit checks could be handled by a single Treasury bureau and the transaction should be a relatively simple matter.

4. Such a system sweeps away at a stroke the weirdly complicated and expensive administration we have now. The Social Security Administration presently employs twelve or thirteen thousand persons. Two years ago we were paying a million dollars a year in business-machine rental to tabulate, I suppose, nearly a hundred million wage records.

5. Not only would administration be much simpler under the new system; such a reformation as I have described would deal a body blow, a death blow, to the political and economic ambitions of the bosses of the existent system. Their power lies in the contrived complexities of the system and their control over the cabalistic mysteries which few persons can understand.

6. It may be contended that by such sweeping expansion of the number of benefit recipients that a giant political pressure group would be created. We have got such a group already, and I submit that if there were but one single benefit everyone in the country would be conscious of it and, I would judge, be far more conscious of the total cost than they are today.

7. Such a new system as I have described would be paid for at the year's end. We pay as we go out of the general revenue. We are free of debt. Competent actuaries have warned that the impenetrable tangle of deferred benefits that we have today will lead to bankruptcy of the system. How can these security agency figure jugglers undertake promises due 40 years hence when they can't predict with certainty our economic future, our birth and death rate, and a dozen other factors?

8. Would the annual cash outlay be big? Yes, it would, but we would know what we were doing and where we were going. We don't now.

9. The saving in both money and time in the community in general would be incalculable. I cannot tell the number of clerks, statisticians, and accountants who today are employed in the sterile, profitless, and unproductive labor of keeping social-security records in business offices throughout the land, but the number must mount far, far into the thousands. Imagine the feeling of relief when this burden is lifted.

10. Of course there is the problem of that trust fund. According to the most recent report of the trustees (April 1952) the fund has assets of upward of $14,000,000,000. But we all know that almost all of those assets are Government paper and there's no point in discussing the grief of double taxation again. Millions of people not yet drawing benefits have paid in taxes. They feel they have an equity. Some way must be devised to pay back their equity, pro rata or some way. This may be a troublesome job but it would be better to do it and extract this particular bone that chokes the public throat. We have got to pay something as a penalty for having made a terribly wrong beginning.

These points would constitute the foundation from which a respected and respectable social-security system could be hammered out and established. It would be a system which we could understand and trust. The cost of this system could be accurately determined. We must someday adopt such a social security system if we do really believe in fairness to our aged and if we believe in financial integrity. What must be done sometime we ought to do in our time. I can think of no greater contribution we could make to the future than to replace a system which few people understand and fewer people trust with a system which would always be as honest, good, and reliable as the nation which supports it.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I had intended to make some remarks on the social security measure, but while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber final action was taken on that bill. I now ask permission to make those remarks, and to have them printed in the RECORD prior to final action on that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair understands that the request is that the remarks appear at a prior point in the RECORD, together with a statement indicating that the remarks were made subsequently.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. President, H. R. 7800, the bill we have before us today, would make some vitally needed changes in the old-age and survivors insurance program, affecting the present and future security of millions of American citizens.

The bill would—

First. Increase the insurance benefits;

Second. Liberalize the retirement test;

Third. Provide wage credits under the insurance system for members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency period; and

Fourth. Make several changes to correct inequities and to improve administration.

I deeply regret that the Finance Committee saw fit to drop two very important provisions contained in the House version of the bill.

One of these is the provision which would permit certain State and local government employees to obtain old-age and survivors insurance coverage without giving up the protection of their present retirement systems. The provision in the present law which excludes all members of retirement systems from old-age and survivors insurance coverage has prevented many groups who want old-age and survivors insurance coverage from obtaining it. Moreover, it has resulted in the dissolution of retirement systems by a number of groups which wanted coverage and took the only way open to obtain it. The provision which the House adopted to correct this situation would continue the exclusion of the groups that still want to be excluded, elementary and secondary school teachers and policemen and firemen, but would give other retirement system members the chance to decide for themselves through a referendum, whether they want old-age and survivors insurance coverage. I believe that was a good provision and I wish it had been retained.

I also regret the dropping of the provision which would preserve the full retirement and survivors' rights of workers who are permanently and totally disabled before they reach age 65. This so-called waiver of premium provision which was thoroughly debated and overwhelmingly adopted by the House of Representatives would prevent many thousands of workers from losing all rights to benefits when they become disabled. It would prevent additional hundreds of thousands of workers from having their retirement benefits reduced $5, $10, or even $40 a month by excluding periods of permanent total disability from their benefit computations.

It is true that an atmosphere of controversy was created by those in control of the American Medical Association concerning the waiver of premium provision for permanent and total disability. But their opposition to this proposal is misguided. The House which was at first stampeded by the AMA opposition reconsidered the question and voted for this proposal by the overwhelming vote of 361 to 22. This would not have happened had there been anything to the AMA's position. As Mr. KEAN, Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee from New Jersey, pointed out in the House debate, the American Medical Association just does not represent the ordinary doctor on this issue. He said that he had talked to doctor after doctor about this proposal and they all agreed with him that the provision in the bill was a good thing and they all disagreed with the AMA. As a matter of fact, all six doctors who are Members of the House voted against the American Medical Association on this issue.

Anyone can see that there is no truth to the AMA's charge that this provision is socialized medicine. This is a waiver of premium provision just like the Congress provided in the National Service Life Insurance program. Because a handful of political doctors in the American Medical Association hierarchy want to make it appear to be something it is not is no reason to consider this proposal a controversial one. It is not controversial among intelligent men as soon as it is understood.

Twice within 2 years the lower House has sent us a bill containing a conservative, judicious, reasonable provision intended to answer the pleas of the unfortunate disabled whose rights are impaired or lost under the present system. In 1950 the House sent us a provision in H. R. 6000 that would have permitted payment of a man's social-security benefit before 65 if he became permanently and totally disabled. In addition, the 1950 provision preserved the rights of such a person to his old-age benefit and the rights of his widow and dependents to survivor benefits.

The Senate Finance Committee has also received recommendations favoring such a program from an advisory council composed of outstanding citizens appointed when the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was chairman of the Finance Committee. This council, headed by the late Edward Stettinius, Jr., and with Sumner Slichter, the famous economist, as associate chairman, represented labor, business, and government, and expert and professional opinion. They, too, recommended a cash benefit program for the permanently and totally disabled after a thorough study of all sides of the question.

Proposals for disability insurance were also considered at length by the Senate Committee on Finance during the 1950 hearings. Because of this long consideration of the general subject of disability it does not seem necessary to me to delay longer in putting into effect this much more limited proposal of a waiver of premium.

Mr. President, there will be bitter disillusionment among the thousands of seriously disabled persons who had hoped and prayed that the provision preserving their insurance rights would be included in this bill. These tragic and helpless persons—some blind, many with cancer, many bedridden, and many more confined to their homes with incurable chronic ailments—these unfortunate sufferers ask us just one question. Why must they lose rights they have earned under the old-age and survivors insurance program? Why?

I venture to say that every single Member of this body is agreed that the misfortune of disability should not count against these persons when we come to figure their social-security benefits. But still we are going to continue cutting their insurance benefits in half. And for some, we will wipe out their rights entirely.

They ask us just one question. "Why?" Why in all fairness and decency will we not let them submit their doctor's certificate to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance so that the fact of their disability can be established for the record?

We have provided this right under veterans' insurance. Why not under OASI? We have provided much fuller rights to railroad workers and to civil-service workers under their retirement programs. Why not under OASI?

I will tell the Senate the answer we shall have to give our constituents this summer when they ask "Why?" The political hierarchy of the AMA says waiver of premium does not belong in an insurance program. Believe it or not, that is what they telegraphed to every Member of the House of Representatives on May 17. I quote:

American Medical Association objects to disability provisions for following reasons:
1. It does not belong in insurance bill.

Please note, the political AMA does not say that it is medically impossible or medically impractical to establish the

fact of disability for purposes of waiver of premium. The political AMA says that in its political judgment this provision does not belong in an insurance bill. The truth is that thousands of doctors are conducting disability examinations all over the country, every day, for hundreds of life insurance companies and for scores of public and private retirement systems. Waiver of premium is a standard, everyday type of insurance provision. It does not involve any medical care. It does not involve any control over doctors. It is essential to any good insurance or retirement program. Waiver of premium is all—absolutely all—the House of Representatives provided for in H. R. 7800. I hope the Senate conferees will accept the House provision on this point because I believe the members of this chamber will not be satisfied to let the record testify to the fact that we have become confused about an issue so simple. I do not think that we want the record to show that we have been bowled over by a barrage of false charges laid down to suit the political motivations of the AMA hierarchy.

Mr. President, over 62,000,000 people are insured today under old-age and survivors insurance. The value of this protection for every insured person is potentially at stake.

Mr. President, this Congress has repeatedly strengthened and improved the Nation's social insurance system because we believe that program is a bulwark of individual initiative and of our American way of life. Less than 2 years ago we brought 10,000,000 more people under the system so that today about 80 percent of the persons who work for a living are helping to contribute to their own future security through payroll and self-employment contributions.

When a man contributes to this program for years and years, it is in the hope and expectation that it will help to sustain his independence in old age and the independence and security of his loved ones. He either owns his own home, or hopes to. His savings may be modest, but he intends to manage somehow, God willing. He does not look forward to the prospect of local relief or public assistance when he becomes too old to work.

Now let us see what happens to this man's social security if he is unfortunate enough to suffer a severe stroke, or become blind, or otherwise so seriously disabled before 65 that he cannot continue in his job. We say to him: Use up your savings and, if need be, sell or mortgage your home. Your plight, the AMA would have us say, is not properly the subject of social insurance.

"All right," the man says, "it is going to be tough, but I will try to get along until I am 65. I do not think I will be able to hold out, but I will try. Just do not take my social security away from me. And do not make my family suffer because of my bad luck."

How can we face this man and tell him that we have been advised by the AMA not to even protect this man's status for old-age and survivors insurance benefits? If we are concerned about the mounting costs of public assistance, how can we tell this man that the dependency of his family is not a matter of our concern?

Mr. President, we have established a program of Federal old-age and survivors insurance and have demonstrated our concern for the adequacy of these benefits. The waiver of premium proposal addresses itself purely and simply to the adequacy of existing benefit rights. I submit, Mr. President, that the provision is an appropriate and necessary measure to correct a shameful deficiency in the present method of computing benefits. The provision belongs in an insurance bill. It belongs in this bill.

The American Medical Association opposes the disability provision in an insurance bill because they say it is "socialized medicine." Representative DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, categorically denies this allegation. Representative KEAN, a Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, vigorously denies it.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Chairman of the Finance Committee, when asked during the debate on the 1950 amendments whether disability insurance involved socialized medicine said he did "not think that is a valid objection" to the proposal (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 7, p. 8094).

Now what is the AMA position on disability insurance and examining individuals who are permanently and totally disabled.

The American Medical Association has been officially on record for some 10 years as supporting the viewpoint that it is the responsibility of a Government agency to certify the fact of disability. This is in contrast to the statement of its board of trustees, which recently adopted a contrary position when it opposed H. R. 7800. The House of Delegates of the American Medical Association—the governing body of the organization—on September 17, 1938—as reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association of September 24, 1938, page 1216—adopted the following recommendation of the Reference Committee on Consideration of the National Health Program:

> Under recommendation V on insurance against loss of wages during sickness: In essence, the recommendation deals with compensation of loss of wages during sickness. Your committee unreservedly endorses this principle, as it has distinct influence toward recovery and tends to reduce permanent disability. It is, however, in the interest of good medical care that the attending physician be relieved of the duty of certification of illness and of recovery, which function should be performed by a qualified medical employee of the disbursing agency.

The following statement was published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, issue of December 11, 1945, page 953:

> COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF EARNINGS DUE TO SICKNESS
>
> The first proposal in the President's program and in Senator Wagner's measure is compensation for loss of earnings due to sickness. The American Medical Association through its house of delegates has consistently favored such insurance.

As recently as October 1947 the house of delegates adopted the position, with respect to chronic illness, that:

> Social security measures to maintain income such as disability insurance, old-age insurance, and public assistance are likewise of vital importance. (Journal AMA, October 11 and October 18, 1947, p. 436.)

These official statements of the house of delegates have never been rescinded, nor has the house of delegates taken any action inconsistent with them.

Why then does the AMA continue to fight against helping the disabled?

I have been interested in the social security program from its inception. Over the years I have introduced many bills to greatly expand and improve our Federal social security system. I am for this bill because it is a step in the right direction. Actually, much more is needed to make the old-age and survivors' insurance program the real bulwark of economic security this Nation has a right to expect it to be. I hope we will not wait long to take much greater strides toward this better program.

Mr. President, the 2 years that have elapsed since passage of the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act have brought renewed support across the Nation and in this Congress for the contributory principles of social security. I have heard no serious complaints about the coverage extension and other improvements voted by us at that time. On the contrary, everywhere I go doctors, lawyers, dentists, farmers, and others ask me why they have been left out of this system.

It is heartening to find labor, business and the public in all walks of life supporting the principles of contributory social security. We have here a method—an American method—that fosters individual initiative and that helps people to help themselves. This method deserves our support and our closer attention. It is a bulwark to our way of life.

The people of this country want the right to earn their social security. They want the independence in old age that comes from having helped to pay for their benefits, the dignity that comes from an earned right. Old-age and survivors insurance is a means of preventing dependency integral to our system of wages and self-employment earnings. As each man works he earns not only wages. He also earns rights to social security. Because the benefits are variable and wage related, security becomes a reward for work. This is a conservative, constructive approach to the problems of dependent old age. It avoids the stigmas and the economic and political dangers of a system of hand-outs or of indiscriminate pensions.

The first social security bill I introduced with Senator Wagner and Representative DINGELL was in 1943. We reintroduced our proposals in 1945, 1947, and 1948.

When we first introduced our bill the opposition called it the American Beveridge plan. This was the first step in an attempt to defeat the proposal. It

was given a foreign name so as to make it seem that we were just copying a foreign proposal. But since our plan was an American plan, this attempt to stop interest in our proposal was not successful.

When we introduced our original bill, and on each successive occasion when we introduced a new bill in a new Congress, we expressed the hope that the bill would provide a basis for constructive thinking and legislation in a field where it was sorely needed. During 1943 and 1944 our proposals were the target of a most widespread campaign of opposition, almost unprecedented in volume and in character. I have often witnessed the use of false and misleading propaganda for political purposes and the use of extravagant charges in order to defeat legislation, but I never knew an opposition quite so unprincipled as the campaign which was conducted against the legislation which we introduced.

We recognized, however, that every important proposal to advance the public welfare has always met opposition at first from groups who care only about their own selfish interests. Usually they are satisfied with the status quo, and are opposed to any change whatsoever. Free public education, child-labor legislation, bank-deposit insurance, universal suffrage, the Federal income tax, and other measures to safeguard the general welfare of the public were all bitterly opposed when they were first suggested. The opposition which we faced when we first introduced our social-security bill never shook our faith in the need for social security or in the fundamental soundness of our proposals. I believe that we have been vindicated. The 1950 social-security bill contained many things which we advocated several years ago.

Practically all Members of the Senate in 1950 supported the provisions for improvement of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, for the extension of its coverage and liberalization of its benefits. I am delighted that the minority members of the Senate Finance Committee supported the 1950 bill. But I should like to recall to the attention of the Senate that in 1935, when the question of old-age insurance first came before the Senate, a Republican-sponsored amendment offered by Senator Hastings, of Delaware, sought to eliminate the old-age insurance program from the bill. His amendment was defeated, 15 to 63.

When the social-security bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in 1935, seven of the Republican members of the committee signed a minority report in which they opposed the establishment of the old-age insurance system. Speaking of the insurance program they said as follows:

> These titles impose a crushing burden upon industry and upon labor.
>
> They establish a bureaucracy in the field of insurance in competition with private business.
>
> They destroy old-age retirement systems set up by private industries, which in most instances provide more liberal benefits than are contemplated under title II. (Conference committee report on H. R. 7260, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 615, pp. 43–44.)

Not a single one of these fears expressed by the Republican opposition has come to pass. The philosophy of fear is frequently used to try to defeat progressive legislation, but after the legislation has been put into effect and has been made workable by a Democratic administration the Republicans come around and support it as if they were the original friends of the program who had gotten it enacted into law.

I do not want my remarks to indicate criticism of anyone. I am just trying to bring out the facts. Every time we on the Democratic side have advanced progressive social legislation it has been repeatedly criticized, in the beginning by conservative groups and representatives of the Republican Party, but later on the Republicans see the light and begin to defend what we have done and to take credit for trying to do the job bigger and better than we have.

Of course, I recognize that this is an inevitable human tendency. I believe those of us who are in favor of social legislation must recognize the fact that we are going to get a lot of criticism when we first advance proposals, but that as time goes on we shall get more and more support, and, finally, after our proposals are enacted, those who first opposed them will begin to see their merit.

One of the very fine provisions in the 1950 amendments was the one which for the first time includes small-business men under the insurance program. In 1943 I was chairman of a special committee to study problems of American small business. In conjunction with former Senator Capper, our committee published a study called Small Business Wants Old-Age Security.

That was the first time there had been any real study of the problem of covering small-business men under the Federal OASI program. I am very proud of that study. I am proud of the fact that the committee of which I was chairman recognized the problem and indicated, 7 years in advance, how social-security protection could be extended to persons in business for themselves.

One reason why I have long been in favor of national social legislation such as old-age and survivors insurance is that it helps small business. Contrary to the false statements, that are sometimes made, that national social legislation hurts small business, I am convinced that workmen's compensation, accident and health insurance, old-age insurance, and unemployment insurance help small business to retain its employees against the competition from big business, and also help small business by maintaining purchasing power for families, so that they can buy merchandise at their local grocery, drug store, and hardware store, can pay for tickets to their local movie, and can pay their doctor and hospital bills.

In the bill which former Senator Wagner and I introduced on June 30, 1943, we included a provision for the coverage of all self-employed businessmen, and that provision was repeated in every insurance bill that we introduced thereafter. We did not get very much support in 1943, 1945, or 1947 from any of the Republican Members of the Congress for our proposal, but I am deeply gratified that now the Members of the minority have come around to seeing that we had a sound idea.

In the bill we introduced in 1943, we included a provision for giving wage credits to individuals while they were in military service. We repeated this provision in our succeeding bills. Although the Congress did not see fit, for 7 years, to go along with this provision until 1950, when it included wage credits for persons who served in the military service during World War II we are all agreed today to an extension of it to present-day servicemen.

I have consistently supported social security and full-employment legislation, because I believe that such legislation will help us to preserve our free enterprise system. I believe that if we are to have a dynamic economy people must have an opportunity to work at rates of pay that will sustain a rising standard of living, and that there must be common protection against the causes of insecurity which face people who work for a living.

The program of full employment and social security under a free enterprise system, which I have advocated during these past years is not going to come in the United States of its own accord. If we want that kind of program and want to put it in operation we must plan for it, we must work for it, and we must fight for it, against the opposition of those who are constantly trying to defeat our proposals.

I believe that we are going to go forward to improve our wages, increase our employment, and raise our standard of living. As we do this, we can provide social security for our people without impairing incentives or placing too great a burden upon the productive members of our society. If we are to act as a humanitarian, intelligent, democratic Nation, we must make adequate provision for those in our country who become sick, disabled, aged, or unemployed, or who die prematurely. We must continue to improve our social security program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes."

SENATOR McMAHON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have received numerous inquiries from Senators regarding the health of my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] about which there is much concern. I am glad to advise the Senate that I have encouraging reports from the doctors and from Mrs. McMahon. The doctors say that the Senator should be out of the hospital within a week or so. I trust he will be back on his feet within 2 weeks or less, or at least that he will be out of his sickbed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the leading editorial, entitled "McMAHON'S Candidacy," published in the Bridgeport Sunday Post on June 22, 1952.

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

McMAHON'S CANDIDACY

Senator BRIEN McMAHON, candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, is having a hard time of it these days, campaigning from a sickbed in his Washington home.

The senior Connecticut Senator has been ill a month with a sacroiliac condition, a most unpleasant ailment which has kept him from his duties in the Senate as well as his important post as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. For a man of Mr. McMAHON'S energy and numerous activities, to be confined to his home with illness, is aggravating, to say the least.

The Senator was unable to attend the recent Democratic convention in Hartford, when the State's 16 delegates were pledged to him. Mr. McMAHON read a stirring address to the convention from his bed, in which he offered a five-point program for peace.

This included appointment of a commission to "rethink the twin problems of world disarmament and world development." He would, if President, deliver a formal note to Stalin, demanding appointment in Russia of a similar commission to study and prepare a campaign against weapons and want.

The Senator would wage peace by bringing together heads of states within the U. N. Security Council to consider development of the world while at the same time disarming it.

But he would also order the production of hydrogen bombs in four figures, to prevent war and win us time to wage peace. Finally, he would substitute cheap atomic and hydrogen fire power for expensive, conventional fire power to reduce taxes and balance the budget while we wage peace. In his address he pointed out that we cannot go on indefinitely spending fifty and sixty and seventy billions of dollars a year on defense without threatening the backbone of our economy.

We hope Senator McMAHON will be fully recovered in time to head his delegation in Chicago on July 21, and repeat to the huge assembly of delegates as well as to millions by radio and television his powerful and progressive plan for dealing with the Communist empire and his tactical proposals to win back the peace.

Republicans as well as Democrats who have a high regard for the distinguished Connecticut Senator wish him well at this time, hoping he will be fully recovered, long before convention time, so as to be on hand when the presidential nominations are being offered.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senate may now take action on the request of the House for a conference with the Senate on the amendment of the House to the Defense Production Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no objection, with the understanding that a quorum call will be continued after the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has spoken.

Mr. McFARLAND. We cannot make any such stipulation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then I object to discontinuing the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to have the situation distinctly understood. I want the American people to know, in no uncertain terms, about the bill which was passed by the House today. I want to be instructed, as a humble Member of this body, as to what I shall do tomorrow in the conference. I expect to be instructed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that probably a quorum can be announced, because a sufficient number of Senators are present.

Mr. MAYBANK. If a quorum is present, then let us go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Taft
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for an announcement?

Mr. MORSE. Provided I do not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] wishes a yea-and-nay vote on the question of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the defense production bill, and the request of the House for a conference. So I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber. The Senator from Oregon, of course, has the right to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the majority leader and the Senator from South Carolina understand that a vote can now be taken.

I understand that it is a privileged matter, and I shall certainly cooperate by yielding the floor for the purpose of considering the privileged matter.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for his attitude and his graciousness.

Mr. MORSE. I have repeatedly said that I would not interfere with the consideration by the Senate of any privileged matter. I repeat that statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of my good friend from Oregon. We have spent many a long night together on the floor of the Senate. I appreciate his willingness to go along.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I remind the Presiding Officer that we have an agreement, my remarks will be printed in continuity in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House on the defense production bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAYBANK. The message has been laid before the Senate. I move that Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the motion is acted upon, may we have an explanation as to what action the House took on this bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately, I may say to my good friend from California, it may be a long time before the House amendment is printed, and Senators would not have access to it. So I have moved that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, do we know what action we are taking here? What are we doing?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is about to send the bill to conference.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the motion include disagreement to all the House amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What are those amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is but one amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How do we know what it is? Is the Senate not entitled to some information?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, we know that the Senate did, and we know we want the bill the Senate passed.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose there is some concern, Mr. President, about what sending the bill to conference and disagreeing to the amendment of the House may involve, so far as future action of the Senate is concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite agreeable that the bill go to conference, notwithstanding the fact that the action taken by the House on many individual items is quite consonant with proposals I offered in the form of amendments on the Senate floor. My desire was not consummated here. I, of course, expect the House conferees to give a good account of themselves, and that the Senate conferees, who share the views that we expressed when the bill was here, will do likewise.

That matter, of course, must necessarily be adjusted in conference. If I were to express a personal viewpoint, I would hope that the Senate conferees would concur in all or most of the action that has been taken by the House. But, notwithstanding that, we will still have an opportunity to vote on the conference report when it comes from conference, and it will be subject to rejection or acceptance, as each individual Senator may see fit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will appoint the following conferees——

Mr. MAYBANK. I regret that I am going to have to ask for the yeas and nays. I ask that my friends in the Senate give me a vote of confidence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is too late for that. The Chair has already announced the decision.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Taft
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The action on this matter has been completed except that the Chair has not yet appointed the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The Chair appoints the following Senators conferees on the part of the Senate: Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. IVES.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may know what business will be considered tomorrow——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we have not yet had a yea-and-nay vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no way to get a yea-and-nay vote now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the situation. The Senator moved to disagree to the amendment of the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees. The Senator asked for the yeas and nays, and then withdrew his request. The vote was taken, and there is no way, now, by which a yea-and-nay vote may be had.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Would a motion to reconsider be in order?

Mr. MAYBANK. I intend to have a yea-and-nay vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The only way to get one is to move to reconsider.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina insists upon a yea-and-nay vote, I ask unanimous consent that the action just taken by the Senate be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move that it be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing to lay on the table. The Senator from Arizona asked unanimous consent that the vote just taken be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the end of it.

THE PASSPORT DIVISION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to direct my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 6, I made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I criticized the State Department for the procedures it is following in the Passport Division, to wit, that in the main those procedures do not permit a Member of Congress, an elected representative of the people, to find out the reasons and the evidence, if any, in support of those reasons, for denying to an American citizen a passport.

In my speech on June 6, I deplored that procedure in the State Department, making the point that although obtaining a passport is not a matter of absolute right, it is a very precious right which no American should be denied unless good cause can be shown and that substantial evidence exist justifying a denial of the passport.

I said in my speech on June 6, and again on June 13, and I repeat today, that I do not want any person to receive a passport if the evidence discloses that that person is a bad security risk.

I tried to make clear—although I am inclined to believe Mr. President, that we are living in the day in which so much emotion prevails in the thinking of so many people that it is impossible to make such a point as this clear, especially to those who want to believe what they want to believe—that there is no one in the Senate who is more opposed to subversive activities and more opposed to communism, or who hates communism more than the junior Senator from Oregon.

The procedural check on discretion for which I am standing in the Senate on this issue in my judgment is so important to the preservation of some of the basic concepts of American justice, that I intend to continue to raise my voice in protest of what I consider to be the truly un-American practices of the State Department in regard to the Passport Division procedures, I shall do this irrespective of any criticism that may be heaped upon me and irrespective of any attempt that may be made, as is being made by some persons, to smear me because I dare to defend and advocate what I think is a very precious American safeguard against the exercise of arbitrary power by mere men—men who apparently think it is all right to change our Government from a government by law into a government by men exercising arbitrary power.

I charged on June 6 and again on June 13, and I charge again today, that

in my judgment Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, is so guilty of improper conduct as an administrator, by sustaining and supporting the perpetuation of the Passport Division's procedures regarding the issuance of passports, that I consider him unfit to continue as Secretary of State. It is my opinion that one who will tolerate and defend a procedure which does not permit of a review of the exercise of discretion by an administrator in the State Department, one who has not set up an independent group to pass judgment in review on the question of whether substantial evidence exists for the denial of a passport, is a Secretary of State who has so lost his perspective of basic American rights that he should be removed from office.

Mr. President, I know how harsh that statement is, but let me say that if the time ever comes in our country when we, as Senators, remain silent when a high official of our Government seeks to defend—as did Dean Acheson the other day in his press conference in regard to this matter—a procedure which does not permit of a review, by an independent tribunal, of the exercise of discretion which results in denial to American citizens of basic rights without a clear showing of the evidence which exists in support of the decision, then I believe we shall be encouraging the spreading of what I regard a very dangerous trend in the administration of our Government, namely, Government by unchecked, arbitrary discretion of mere men.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I incorporate here today, by reference, every statement I made in my speeches of June 6 and June 13, as my answer to Dean Acheson as to whether I have changed my opinion regarding any statement he has made since those speeches were made by me. The answer to him is "no."

In my speech of June 6, I referred to "Professor X." I did not know the person concerned, and I do not know him now, except through correspondence which I shall place in the RECORD this afternoon. At his request, as the Senate will see from a letter which I received from him under date of June 20, it is his desire that his name be publicly known. Hence I shall report his name, and I shall proceed to discuss the communications I have before me in regard to his problem with the Passport Division of the State Department and with the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson.

His name is Prof. Linus Pauling, of the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif. Under date of June 23, 1952, I wrote Professor Pauling the following letter:

JUNE 23, 1952.

Prof. LINUS PAULING,
California Institute of Technology,
Pasadena, Calif.

DEAR PROFESSOR PAULING: Thanks very much for your letter of June 20.

I don't know what more, if anything, I can do in regard to your passport problem, but I shall be glad to make specific reference to your case by name in the Senate. Although I do not know you personally, I am satisfied from the letters of endorsement of you which I have received from very responsible people in Oregon, some of whom I know very well, that your case is deserving of the personal attention of the Secretary of State, in the absence of any independent review board to pass judgment upon denial of your passport.

I am glad to have your affidavit, which I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, let me make clear that I do not know Professor Pauling. I have never seen him. I would not know him if he were to walk into this Chamber at this moment. I know very little of the background of Professor Pauling. I have not the slightest idea of the organizations to which he may belong.

It may very well be—in fact, I believe I would have to say that I would be surprised if it were not so, although I do not know it to be a fact—that probably one basis for the denial of his passport is that he may belong or may at one time have belonged to an organization which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. There may be no basis in fact for my expression of the view that that might possibly be the case, for I do not know whether it is the case. But I have tried to figure out, by reading between the lines of the communications I have received from the State Department in regard to this case, what may be the basis for the refusal to issue a passport.

Of course, Mr. President, not one of those communications gives me any statement of fact as to why the passport has been denied, other than the usual, general statement that for reasons satisfactory to the State Department, it thinks this passport should be denied. I say I do not know what may be the facts behind the denial, but I have tried to put two and two together. I am inclined to guess that apparently in this case we are dealing with a university professor who at some time might have belonged, or so far as I know may still belong, to an organization generally known as a front organization.

If he does belong to such an organization, I certainly do not condone it, Mr. President. So I wish to make clear that so far as Professor Pauling is concerned, I hold no brief for him, insofar as what his record may show the facts to be.

All I say is that Professor Pauling is entitled, as is any other American citizen, to have his passport case reviewed by an independent board, to have it pass judgment on whether evidence exists justifying denial of a passport by the Passport Division of the State Department.

As I have said before, Mr. President, the denial of a passport does great damage to an American citizen. The denial of a passport in effect ruins the reputation of an American citizen in a great many circles. In fact, Mr. President, it is difficult for me to imagine how anyone could say that the denial of a passport is not necessarily a reflection on the character or reputation or standing of an American citizen. I believe that the denial of a passport, if there is not good cause for that denial, does irreparable damage to the reputation and character standing and rights of an American citizen.

That is why I am so insistent that a check be established in the case of the exercise of discretion by the State Department in refusing to issue a passport. I place primary responsibility for the failure of the State Department to provide for a checking procedure in this matter on the desk of Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, who in my judgment has the authority, within the administrative power already granted to him under the law, to provide voluntarily for a procedure which would permit of a review of the decisions of his Passport Division by an independent committee or tribunal, and which would provide the citizen himself with the fair procedures which I believe are so essential if we are to have in the United States what amounts to trial by our peers. I understand it is said in the State Department that, in view of the 1950 Subversive Activities Control Act, the State Department officials have no discretion about this matter. If they reach the conclusion that an individual, such as Dr. Pauling, for example, belongs to some organization which, within the spirit and intent and meaning of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is considered a so-called subversive organization, Mr. President, I want to say in reply to that allegation on the part of the State Department, if I am correctly informed that it is one of their allegations, that there is nothing in the act of 1950 which prevents the Secretary of State from setting up a review procedure to pass judgment on whether his Passport Division, or any official within the State Department, had adequate and substantial evidence upon which to base a finding or to reach a conclusion as to whether the facts supported the inference or the judgment that a given individual being denied a passport was or was not a member of an organization which in the opinion of the Passport Division would justify a denial of the passport.

I do not intend so to speak, Mr. President, as to let Mr. Acheson or any of his subordinates off that hook, because they are hung on that hook; and as long as they are hung on that hook, they cannot successfully deny the major premise of my case; and the major premise of my case, I repeat, is that justice and a fair trial require the adoption of a procedure which will permit a review of the exercise of judgment on the part of the Passport Division and those working with the Passport Division, as to the existence or nonexistence of good cause for the denial of a passport.

Mr. President, I now turn to the letter which I received from Dr. Pauling under date of June 20, 1952. I shall read certain excerpts from the letter:

I am grateful to you for your letter of June 14, and for the tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 and June 13. I had seen only a very brief report in the local paper about your speech on June 6, and I am glad to read the whole speech.

I think that it is an admirably clear and powerful presentation of the problem. I had not seen the text of the telegram from

the members of the faculty of Reed College. It is similar to strong letters of protest that have been sent by individual faculty members and groups of faculty members in a number of other institutions, copies of which have been sent to me. I can hardly believe that the Department of State can continue to refuse to issue a passport to me, with no statement of the reasons or the charges against me, that would permit me to offer effective opposition.

I have not yet received from the Secretary of State any answer to my letter of May 16 and my two later letters. It is over a month since my new request for a passport was sent in. I have plane reservations for my wife and me for July 16, less than a month from now. Since I have been elected president of honor of the section on the biogenesis of proteins at the Second International Congress of Biochemistry, to be held in Paris July 21–26, 1952, I should like very much to be present at this scientific meeting—this section of the meeting deals, of course, with the branch of science to which I have been devoting myself most vigorously during recent years, proteins and their structure.

I digress from the letter for a moment, Mr. President, to say that on the basis of the communications I have in front of me, from great scientists, I judge that Doctor Pauling is one of the great chemists of the world in the field of proteins, with a world-wide reputation of being one of the outstanding scientists in the field of biochemistry.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we should be very certain that a scientist of his standing, with the world-wide reputation that he has in the field of science, is not denied a passport to participate in a scientific meeting in Paris and in London, unless very good cause can be shown for believing that this man is subversive. And let me say about Dr. Pauling, as I would say about any other individual, if there is evidence that he is subversive, then the junior Senator from Oregon would be among the first to insist that he be denied a passport. Why all the secrecy about this? Mr. President, I am becoming very much frightened about the adoption of an attitude on the part of so many in Government and so many within our citizenry in respect to this matter of hush-hush, this attitude that we must act with the greatest serecy in such matters as determining whether facts exist which justify the denial of a passport.

We must be on guard against that, Mr. President. Let me say that when a government starts functioning on the basis of the principle of hush-hush and secrecy, and its administrators seek to justify a failure to make public disclosure, a start is made down the road toward a police state.

Mr. President, the frightening thing to me about the growing tendency in this country of ours to justify a denial of public disclosure of the reasons behind governmental acts affecting the rights of individual citizens, is that such technique itself is totalitarian. I do not think we should be so foolish or so excited in our endeavor to defeat communism as to adopt communistic methods ourselves. One of the police state weapons of communism, denying freedom and liberty to the people of the Soviet Union, is the adoption of the same technique of operating behind a cloak of secrecy. Where the public security, where the survival of our country is at stake; where we have before us in a given case a matter which involves top secret information the disclosure of which would constitute aiding and abetting the enemy, let the record speak for itself, so far as the position of the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I have supported in the committee, as I have on the floor of the Senate, the principle that secret information of that type must be kept secret. In that kind of a situation, Mr. President, the interest of national security is paramount. In all other cases, however, we must protect the rights of an individual citizen from star chamber proceedings which, if not stopped, will deny to that citizen his precious right of freedom. He must be given an opportunity to answer specific charges made against him, to confront his accusers, to examine his accusers—yes, Mr. President, he must be guaranteed all those basic procedural rights which, under the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, have always been the essential criteria of protection to an individual citizen of his right to a fair trial.

We have gone far afield in this country by the development of administrative law procedure, in denying American citizens a fair trial. A fair trial was what was intended by our constitutional fathers and what the people insisted upon when the Bill of Rights was adopted.

That is what we are denying in connection with this passport problem when we do not give an American citizen the right to have his case reviewed on the facts, or when we take away his right to be confronted by those who bring charges against him, and his opportunity to make reply. We must stop this trend in denying these in the field of administrative law in which the Passport Divisoin operates basic rights.

(At this point a message from the House regarding the Defense Production bill was received; debate ensued on that bill, for which Mr. MORSE yielded, and also for the passage of House bill 7800, all of which debate and proceedings appear elsewhere in today's RECORD.)

Mr. MORSE. I return to the reading of the letter of June 20, which I received from Dr. Linus Pauling, of the California Institute of Technology:

As I stated in my letter of June 3, even if a passport were not to be issued to me that would permit me to attend the meeting in Paris (perhaps to prevent me from seeing again the professors of the University of Paris who were good enough to confer upon me the honorary degree of docteur de l'université in the fall of 1948), I should still like very much to go to England alone, in order to participate in the discussion meeting on the physical chemistry of proteins that has been arranged by the Faraday Society for August 6 to 8 in Cambridge, and to discuss problems of protein structure with the various British scientists who have been working vigorously in this field.

May I say that the only part of your speech of June 6 to which I might offer objection is your selection of the letter X, rather than some other symbol, to refer to me.

I judge that whatever else this writer may be, he also has a rather refreshing sense of humor, even concerning himself, which I think is always a good characteristic for any man to possess. He says:

In algebra, as you remember, x is used to refer to an unknown quantity—usually the letters a and b are used to refer to known quantities. I am not, however, an unknown quantity. I have not tried to keep anything hidden in any way. I have been willing to answer any questions that the Secretary of State might care to ask me—in fact, I have emphasized my willingness in my letters to him, which he has not answered. I wish accordingly that you had used one of the letters in the first part of the alphabet in referring to me. Let me say, however, that I have no objection to your referring to me by name. My character has already been damaged (I would not say assassinated, because I hope that there is some chance of its being restored to full vigor); and now any statement that you make about me, referring to me by name, will be helpful to me.

I feel much concern that you should have been smeared with the tar of Communist association. I have accordingly prepared an affidavit, bringing up to date my sworn statement that I am not a Communist, never have been a Communist, and never have been involved with the Communist Party. I enclose it.

I have before me what appears to be an affidavit in proper form. It is on the letterhead of the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena 4, and is dated June 20, 1952. It reads as follows:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, June 20, 1952.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am not a Communist. I have never been a Communist.

I have never been involved with the Communist Party.

LINUS PAULING.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of June 1952.

IDA A. RITCHIE,
Notary public in and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

My commission expires April 8 ,1953.

Returning, now, to Dr. Pauling's letter:

I have offered to come to Washington, to answer questions, if the Secretary of State desired me to do so. Let me say that I feel strongly enough about the passport matter to be willing to make a trip to Washington, at any time during the coming month, if I could be helpful to you in your effort to improve the passport procedures. Please let me know if there is any information that you would like me to give you—if you yourself have any questions that you would like to have answered, with respect to my interest in politics and my political activities, be assured that I shall do my best to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

LINUS PAULING.

P. S.—You may have known my uncle, J. U. Campbell, who was circuit judge in the region around Oregon City for many years, and then was justice of the Supreme Court, and finally chief justice of the supreme court of the State of Oregon.

Let me say that I knew Justice Campbell very well. In fact, he was the chairman of the board of justices of the Oregon Supreme Court which gave me

my bar examination. He was a distinguished member of the bar and the judiciary of the State of Oregon, and one of our fine citizens. So far as I know, the entire family which Dr. Pauling mentions in his letter represents one of the finest families in the history of our State. Many of the members of the family have been outstanding State leaders. I would say, to the extent labels can characterize ideologies, it was a very conservative family in the field of politics, but a family which was devoted to the highest traditions and principles of American patriotism. Although I cannot speak of Dr. Pauling himself, because I do not know him personally, this afternoon I certainly can witness the fact that the members of the Campbell family to which he refers in his letter are as fine and patriotic citizens, in my judgment, as ever lived in the State of Oregon. He goes on to say:

My paternal grandfather lived in Oswego.

Oswego is a short distance from Portland.

My mother's father, Linus W. Darling, was postmaster and sheriff in Condon, Gilliam County, in the 1880's, and then moved to Portland, where he practiced law until his death in 1909. My father was a druggist in Condon and in Portland. He died in 1910.

Mr. President, I have read the excerpts from the letters into the RECORD, first because I believe a reading of the excerpts into the RECORD draws the issue with the State Department, so far as secrecy is concerned. Dr. Pauling himself is perfectly willing to have a pubic disclosure of the fact that he is the individual to whom I referred in my speech of June 6 as Professor X. I believe that Dr. Pauling is entitled to have the State Department publicly disclose why it is that it denies him a passport.

If there is a basis for denying him a passport, I want the State Department to know that it will have my support. If there is not a basis, supported by evidence, for denying him a passport, then I think that if we are going to protect the freedom and rights of the American people we should insist upon a type of procedure which will reverse the State Department, so that in such cases, if innocence is established, passports can issue.

Under date of June 3, 1952, Dr. Pauling sent a letter to the Secretary of State, which reads as follows:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, June 3, 1952.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my letter to you of May 16, 1952, I requested that a passport be issued to me to permit me to travel to England to take part in scientific meetings and to discuss scientific problems, especially the problem of the structure of proteins, with my British colleagues.

I have during the past year considered the possibility of taking part in the International Congress of Biochemistry, to be held in Paris on July 21–27, 1952. I am interested in particular in the symposium on the biogenesis of proteins that is to be held at this congress.

I have now received notice that I have been elected honorary president of this symposium.

I should like to be present at this International Congress of Biochemistry, and to have the opportunity of discussing scientific questions with the biochemists who will be present at the congress. I ask accordingly that consideration be given to the possibility of issuing a passport to me to permit me to take part in this International Congress of Biochemistry in Paris, as well as the Faraday Society meeting in England, to be held on August 6–8, 1952. My proposed travel to Paris, as well as that to the British Isles, as discussed in detail in my letter of May 16, 1952, would be purely for scientific purposes.

I have also been invited by the Institute International de Chimie Solvay to take part in the Ninth Solvay Congress, to be held in Brussels during 1 week early in April of 1953, and I have accepted the invitation. A Solvay Congress is held every third year, and the participants, 25 in number, are invited from all over the world. The subject of the Ninth Solvay Congress is Proteins, excluding their biological properties, and I have been invited to lead the discussion on the structure and configuration of proteins. I ask that consideration be given at the present time to the possibility of having the passport that is issued to me be valid for the travel to Brussels next spring, in order to permit my participation in the Ninth Solvay Congress. This travel would also be purely for scientific purposes.

In case that it is your decision not to issue me a passport to permit travel for scientific purposes to the British Isles, Paris, and Brussels, I ask that consideration be given to the issuance of a passport to me permitting travel this summer to Paris and the British Isles, or, if that is not approved, to the British Isles alone, as requested in my letter of May 16, 1952.

Let me repeat my offer to answer any questions that you may wish to ask me.

Sincerely yours,

LINUS PAULING.

Mr. President, I submit that the letter, coming from an American citizen to the Secretary of State, was deserving of an answer.

It will be noted that in a letter which I received from Dr. Pauling under date of June 20, 1952, he stated that up to the time he wrote the letter he had not received an answer to his letter to the Secretary of State either of June 13, or of May 16.

Under date of June 20, 1952, I received a letter from Dr. Pauling, as follows:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, June 20, 1952.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You may be interested to see the copy of the letter that has been sent by Professor Arne Tiselius to the Secretary of State. I also enclose, as representative of many letters of which copies have been sent to me, a copy of a letter sent by the professors of the Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago.

If it would help you to have copies of all of the letters of this sort that have come to my attention, I shall prepare them.

Sincerely yours,

LINUS PAULING.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks a copy of the letter which Dr. Pauling sent to me under date of June 20, 1952. The letter was sent to him by Dr. Arne Tiselius, Ph. D., D. Sc., M. D., Nobel laureate, president of the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry.

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

UPPSALA, SWEDEN, *June 12, 1952.*

To the SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., United States of America.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of writing to you to express my concern about the difficulties which have arisen for Prof. Linus Pauling, California Institute of Technology, in obtaining a passport to go to Europe in order to take part in important scientific conferences. This concern is shared by scientists all over the world. No doubt you are aware of the fact that Professor Pauling is one of the leading scientists of our time, well known for his epoch-making contributions to the modern development of chemistry. His recent work on the structure of proteins—a result of many years of painstaking investigations—is of the utmost importance to chemistry, medicine, and the science of life. It will certainly be one of the main subjects at several scientific meetings the next few months, among them the second International Congress of Biochemistry in Paris, July 21–27, 1952. I cannot believe that it is in the interest of the United States that the man who has the credit for these discoveries and who greatly deserves the gratitude of mankind, should be prevented from establishing personal international contacts, which are essential for the development of a field of the utmost importance for the welfare of human beings.

Respectfully yours,

ARNE TISELIUS,
Ph. D., D. Sc., M. D., Nobel Laureate President of the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter, dated May 22, 1952, addressed to the Secretary of State by Joseph E. Mayer. First, I shall read an excerpt into the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The enclosed letter has been signed by all the full professors of the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago except one who is not an American citizen. They are:

There is listed in the letter from Mr. Mayer the names of great American scientists familiar on every university campus as being among not only the greatest scientist in our country but men of great international scientific reputation.

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

MAY 22, 1952.

The Honorable DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The enclosed letter has been signed by all the full professors of the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago except one who is not an American citizen. They are:

Prof. Samuel K. Allison, director, Institute for Nuclear Studies; member, National Academy of Sciences; director, Metallurgical Laboratory (atomic bomb), Chicago, 1942–44.

Prof. Herbert L. Anderson, Institute for Nuclear Studies; physicist, Metallurgical Laboratory, Chicago, 1942–44; and Los Alamos, 1944–46.

Prof. Enrico Fermi, Institute for Nuclear Studies; Nobel Laureate, 1938; member, National Academy of Sciences; Metallurgical Laboratory, Chicago, 1942–44; Los Alamos, 1944–46.

Prof. Willard F. Libby, Institute for Nuclear Studies; member, National Academy of Sciences; Manhattan District Project, Columbia, 1942–45; member, General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission.

Prof. Joseph E. Mayer, Institute for Nuclear Studies; member, National Academy of Sciences; member, Scientific Advisory Committee, Ballistic Research Laboratories, United States Ordnance Department.

Prof. Edward Teller, Institute for Nuclear Studies; member, National Academy of Sciences; Manhattan District Project, Columbia, 1941–42; Metallurgical Laboratory, Chicago, 1942–44; Los Alamos, 1944–45 and 1950–51.

Prof. Harold C. Urey, Institute for Nuclear Studies; Nobel Laureate, 1934; member, National Academy of Sciences; Director, Manhattan District Project, 1940–45.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH E. MAYER.

The letter attached to the letter written to the Secretary of State by Mr. Mayer reads, in part, as follows:

MAY 22, 1952.

The Honorable DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: The scientific community has been deeply shocked by the statement that Prof. Linus Pauling, American citizen, former president of the American Chemical Society, and professor of chemistry at the California Institute of Technology has been refused an American passport for travel to a meeting of the Royal Society in England.

Most of the scientists of America feel that they know Linus Pauling. All of us know his scientific work. Many of us who sign this letter have known him with varying degrees of intimacy for very many years, and have discussed with him not only scientific matters but subjects of social and political import. Probably none of us have agreed with him in all his subjects. We have all found reason to respect his scientific opinions. Most, if not all of us, have disagreed with his political views, and some of us may have found occasion to regard them as not even worthy of the high regard we have found necessary for his scientific viewpoints. But no one of us, nor any with whom we have talked, has questioned his integrity and sincerity nor his essential loyalty to the United States.

Mr. President, I digress from the letter long enough to say that, as I intimated earlier, I do not know Professor Pauling; I never have met him. The only things I know about him are those set forth in the communications I have before me here this afternoon. The Senate will have all of them, because, Mr. President, believe me, knowing how widespread is the technique of smearing, these days, against liberals generally, I intend to place in the RECORD everything I have in this case. It will speak for itself and it will show that in this case I am making a fight, not for an individual, but for the principle that any American citizen, be he Professor Pauling or any other American citizen, who is denied a passport is entitled to know the reasons for that denial, is entitled to have an opportunity to answer the charges, and is entitled to have the decision reviewed in accordance with our sound principle of judicial checks by a third, independent party or group. That is what I am fighting for.

So, Mr. President, in view of the comments made in the paragraph of the letter to which I have just referred—a letter received from these great scientists at the University of Chicago—and having lived for a great many years in the academic world, and being somewhat familiar with faculty people, and knowing, as I have said, from my experience over the years, that many faculty people are idealists and theorists, and often are not very practical, especially when it comes to the rough-and-tumble problems of politics, and even though I do not know this man, yet I have a suspicion that probably he is not as scientific in the field of politics as he is in the field of chemistry.

Mr. President, I suppose some persons may misunderstand the observation I shall now make, because except for the statement I make at this point, the RECORD will not show that I make it with a smile on my face; but I have often marveled how some of my friends on the scientific faculties of our great universities—men who are trained in the scientific techniques of laboratory work, and are trained in cause and effect and the effects of cause and the application of sound reasoning in the field of science—seem to have so much difficulty in transferring that training into the field of social science. Frequently we discover that in the field of social science they are not very scientific at all. In that field we often see them fail to exercise the keen reasoning they exercise in the laboratory and in connection with their research in the field of pure science.

So, although I may be doing Professor Pauling an injustice, yet I believe it is perfectly all right for me to give voice to a "hunch" in view of what these scientists at the University of Chicago say in the paragraph of their letter which I have just read, in which they refer to the discussions they have had with Professor Pauling in regard to political matters, and political views, and to say that probably in this case we are dealing with a man who is highly theoretical in the field of political science, even though he thinks he is standing for principles of pure political science.

I also have a suspicion that if I participated in the political discussions to which these University of Chicago scientists have referred, and in which they say they have participated with Professor Pauling, I probably would sign a similar letter, and probably would say, as they say in their letter, that—

Most, if not all of us, have disagreed with his political views, and some of us may have found occasion to regard them as not even worthy of the high regard we have found necessary for his scientific viewpoints.

I think that was very tactfully put, Mr. President. However, the important sentence is this one:

But no one of us, nor any with whom we have talked, has questioned his integrity and sincerity nor his essential loyalty to the United States.

Mr. President, that is what I think should be investigated; that is what I think we should find out about.

If it is true that the State Department is questioning Professor Pauling's essential loyalty to the United States, then I think we should find out what is the evidence and what are the facts on which the State Department bases such a conclusion. That is my point.

I continue to read from the letter:

We have all been long convinced that the world is deeply enmeshed in a desperate struggle between the forces of evil repression and those of freedom and liberty. Those of us who sign this letter have had no doubt that the Russian Government has represented the evil in this conflict. We have always hoped that the Government of the United States would stand clearly on the side of freedom and liberty. We cannot reconcile with this hope the withdrawal of passport privileges without trial, without a hearing, and without recourse to an appeal, on the suspicion that the political opinions of a citizen are not those of the majority of the Nation.

How well put, Mr. President, by that group of scientists at the University of Chicago. How clearly they have expressed the principle for which I am arguing in connection with this entire issue regarding the procedures of the Passport Division of the State Department. That group of scientists at the University of Chicago have, in one sentence, stated my case when they write that—

We cannot reconcile with this hope the withdrawal of passport privileges without trial, without a hearing, and without recourse to an appeal, on the suspicion that the political opinions of a citizen are not those of the majority of the Nation.

Then they go on in their letter to say:

Our main plea in this case is a matter of pure principle.

That is mine, too, Mr. President—not a plea for Professor Pauling as Professor Pauling, but a plea for the principle involved in connection with the question of whether in a democracy it is safe to permit unlimited, arbitrary, discretionary power to be used in such a way as to deny a passport to an American citizen without a hearing and without an appeal, resulting in irreparable damage to him, if in fact there is no sound basis for denial of a passport.

These scientists at the University of Chicago go on in their letter to say:

The principle of freedom is that a man is innocent of wrongdoing until proven guilty before a jury of his peers of a violation of a law of our land. Professor Pauling is a man of international fame. It is essential for the maintenance of what remains of our free world that free interchange of ideas within this world be maintained. The travel of citizens of the free countries within this free community is an absolutely essential requirement of this freedom. Since Professor Pauling is not guilty of violation of our laws, we see no justification for suspension of this fundamental necessary freedom.

But even aside from our interest in the principle of freedom we are incredulous of the reason given for withholding the passport: that it "is not in the best interests of the United States" to grant the passport.

That is the only reason anyone can obtain from the State Department, Mr. President. All we can ascertain, when we try to learn the factual basis for the denial of a passport to Professor Pauling, is that it "is not in the best interests of the United States" to grant the passport.

I say that is a police-state method; I say that is putting into practice a policy of dark secrecy, which, if not checked, can be so developed as to threaten government by law in the United States.

Mr. President, it reminds me of playing a game of skull and dagger. In my judgment those in the State Department who are denying passports in such cases as this, and who refuse to give any evidence as to why they are refusing to issue a passport, are jeopardizing the security of the United States much more, in my opinion, than are those to whom they deny the passport.

If the American people knew of good reasons for denial of a passport, there is no doubt that they would support the refusal to issue a passport to such persons, once those reasons were publicly disclosed—as they should be disclosed. If such persons are subversive, we should know it; and in that case the American people, in the exercise of public opinion, will take care of such persons. But the State Department itself, by resorting to this totalitarian technique, that is characteristic of communism and fascism, really is striking a blow at government by law in the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. MAYBANK For the purpose of permitting the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House requesting a conference with the Senate on the defense production bill.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to finish the reading of this letter?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this letter from these Chicago scientists goes on to say:

> We cannot believe, with the greatest stretch of our imagination, that any reason can exist which would make the granting of a passport of so great harm to this country as its withdrawal.
>
> We are well aware that information, or the suspicion of information, of which we are not informed may be in governmental files. Those of us who think that we know Pauling well cannot believe that any really detrimental facts exist. Those of us who know him less well may be less sure of this. But none of us can imagine circumstances by which the granting of a passport can be one-tenth so harmful to the interests of this country as the creation in the world of this "cause celebre" that its withholding has done. What harm, what information, what tales could Professor Pauling take with him to England, even were he so inclined, that can compare in damage to the incredible advertisement that this country forbids one of its most illustrious citizens to travel? We ask you respectfully, Mr. Secretary, that this decision be reversed.

I may say to these University of Chicago scientists that I do not go as far as they go in the last paragraph of the letter. If in those files there is evidence that justifies the denial of a passport to Pauling, I do not want him granted a passport. What I do want for Dr. Pauling is an independent review by a board, such as the Subversive Control Board, appointed under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which I asked in my bill be given jurisdiction to pass judgment on appeal cases. I asked that such a board determine whether there is a justifiable basis for denying a passport after looking at the evidence. I say that Pauling or any other citizen, even a guilty one, Mr. President, is entitled to be confronted by the evidence against him, an opportunity to have that evidence reviewed, and the privilege on his part, in keeping with the meaning of a fair trial, to have that evidence passed upon by an independent appeal board.

Mr. President, earlier I stated that I intended to place in the RECORD this afternoon all material from my file relating to the Pauling case, so that all will know the limits of my connection with it.

From my files, under date of May 26, 1952, there is a letter from George Barton, of Reed College, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to register vehement protest concerning the denial of a passport to Dr. Linus Pauling for a lecturing trip to London. I know the man, his family, his work and the subject of his lecture, none of which are subversive and it was a considerable shock to me to find that one whom I and any thinking American consider to be one of the finest of citizens should have such action taken against him.
>
> I don't know what you can do, but I do hope that you will investigate the case and transfer my protest into the proper channels. Dr. Linus Pauling is a great American and it must be with great joy that Uncle Joe reads of the reaction that victimizes him.
>
> Thank you.
>
> GEORGE BARTON,
> *Reed College.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I find in my file a letter under date of May 23, 1952, which I received from Dr. Pauling. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

> CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
> *Pasadena, May 23, 1952.*
>
> Senator WAYNE MORSE,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have again submitted to the Department of State my application for a passport, to permit me to make a trip for scientific purposes to the British Isles during July and August of this year.
>
> Details about my application are given in the enclosed copies of my letter to the Secretary of State and my letter to the President. I am sending you these letters to keep you informed about the matter. I have not as yet received an answer to either of them.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LINUS PAULING.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my file is a copy of a letter dated May 16, 1952, which Dr. Pauling sent to the Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

> CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
> *Pasadena, May 16, 1952.*
>
> The SECRETARY OF STATE,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to ask that a passport be issued to me, to permit me to travel to England to take part in scientific meetings and to discuss scientific problems, especially the problem of the structure of proteins, with my British colleagues.
>
> On January 24, 1952, I requested a passport for this purpose, especially in connection with the discussion meeting on the structure of proteins arranged by the Royal Society of London for May 1, 1952. I was told in a letter dated February 14 that a passport was not being issued to me. After my appeal for reconsideration, I was told by telephone, on the afternoon of April 28, that the previous decision had been upheld, and I was accordingly not able to go to England to participate in the Royal Society meeting, and to discuss scientific problems with British scientists.
>
> The problem of the structure of proteins is considered to be one of the most important scientific problems under investigation at the present time. It is important not only to chemistry but also to biology and medicine. For a number of years I have been attacking this problem, together with my colleagues in the Gates and Crellin Laboratories of Chemistry, and we have made some discoveries, especially during the last year or two, that seem to be significant. The most effective attack on this problem that is being made in other places is that of Prof. Sir Lawrence Bragg and his collaborators in the Cavendish Laboratory of the University of Cambridge. Other British workers, in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, the University of Leeds, and other laboratories in England, are also working vigorously on this problem. The time has come when it might well be of considerable significance to the progress of science for me to have detailed discussions with these British workers on the problem of the structure of proteins.
>
> The importance of the protein problem is indicated by the fact that, although the Royal Society discussion meeting was held as recently as May 1, 1952, the Faraday Society has also scheduled a discussion meeting on the physical chemistry of the proteins, in Cambridge, England, for August 6–8, 1952.
>
> I am now planning to spend a month in the British Isles this summer, in order to attend this meeting and to participate in scientific discussions, especially on the structure of proteins, with British scientists. My wife and I propose to travel to England by air (New York to London) at some time after July 15 and to return to the United States by air (London to New York) after approximately 4 weeks in the British Isles. This proposed travel is purely for scientific purposes. I plan to participate in the discussion meeting of the Faraday Society on the physical chemistry of the proteins. It is probable that I shall give scientific talks at universities or laboratories, on the structure of proteins or other phases of my scientific work; a possibility is that I could present at this time the Friday Evening Discourse on the Structure of Proteins that I was scheduled to give before the Royal Institution of Great Britain on May 16, 1952. I shall discuss scientific questions, in particular the problem of the structure of proteins, with Sir Lawrence Bragg and other British scientists. My wife and I propose to obtain information about the use of my

books (which are all scientific books) in the British Isles, and to gain knowledge useful in the preparation of future editions of the books. Our only other activities will be the ordinary social intercourse with friends and acquaintances and a small amount of sightseeing for pleasure.

When my earlier request for a passport was denied the statement was made that your Department was of the opinion that my proposed travel would not be in the best interests of the United States. I am strongly of the opinion that my proposed travel to the British Isles, purely for scientific purposes, would in fact be in the best interests of the United States, and that the statement does not constitute a reason for refusing me a passport. I ask accordingly that if my present request for a passport be denied I be provided with a statement of the reason for the action.

I have just received a letter from the Executive Office of the President announcing my selection as participant in the Panel on Research of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation. It is necessary for me, in serving on this panel, to come to Washington for a meeting of the panel on May 26, 1952. I shall be busy on this day, but available the following day, Tuesday, May 27. I ask that you let me know if there are any questions that you wish to ask me, in order that I could come to your office to answer them in person on May 27. I shall be staying at the Hay-Adams House, and on May 26 I can be reached at the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, 901 Sixteenth Street NW.

Sincerely yours,

LINUS PAULING.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is also in my file a copy of a letter written by Dr. Pauling, apparently under date of May 16, 1952, addressed to the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, May 16, 1952.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On February 29, 1952, I addressed a petition to you that, as President of the United States, you rectify the action of the Department of State in refusing a passport to me, by arranging for the issuance of the passport. I mentioned that you had honored me 4 years ago by the award of the Medal for Merit, given for my services to the Nation between 1940 and 1946 and stated on the certificate, bearing your signature, to have been awarded for extraordinary fidelity and exceptionally meritorious conduct. I mentioned that I had applied for the passport in order to visit England to take part in scientific meetings and discussions, in particular the discussion meeting of the Royal Society of London on the structure of proteins, scheduled for May 1, 1952. I mentioned that I am a loyal and conscientious citizen of the United States, who has never been guilty of any unpatriotic or criminal act. I stated my confidence that no harm whatever would be done to the United States by my proposed travel, and my fear that, on the contrary, announcement of the denial of a passport to me would do damage to the United States. I mentioned that I am well known in Great Britain because of my scientific work; that I am a foreign member of the Royal Society of London, an honorary member of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, an honorary member of the Chemical Society of London, and the recipient of honorary degrees from the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London. I stated that through these connections, and through my services 4 years ago as George Eastman Professor at the University of Oxford and as scientific lecturer at other universities, I have become personally acquainted with many distinguished men of science in Great Britain, and that I felt that these men would consider the denial of a passport to me to be unjust, and that their opinion of the United States would be adversely affected.

Presumably through your intervention, the earlier decision not to issue a passport to me was reconsidered by the Department of State, and I was permitted to have personal interviews with some representatives of this Department. I regret to say, however, that the decision was made, and communicated to me by telephone on the afternoon of April 28, that the earlier decision would be upheld, and that accordingly I was prevented from participating in the discussion meeting of the Royal Society on the structure of proteins, and from discussing scientific problems with my British colleagues.

The letters that I have received from England show that my fear that the opinion of the United States held by distinguished men of science in Great Britain would be adversely affected was justified. An illustration is provided by the letter to the editor of the London Times by Sir Robert Robinson, former president of the Royal Society, which appeared in the May 5 issue.

I have now applied to the Department of State for a passport to permit my wife and me to spend approximately 1 month in the British Isles this summer, from about the middle of July to about the middle of August. Our proposed travel is purely for scientific purposes. My own work on the problem of the structure of proteins, a problem that is important to biology and medicine as well as to chemistry, has reached the state where it is highly desirable that I engage in personal discussions with Sir Lawrence Bragg and other British scientists who are working actively in this field. I plan also to take part in the discussion meeting on the physical chemistry of the proteins that has been arranged by the Faraday Society for August 6–8, 1952, in Cambridge, England. Except for ordinary social intercourse with friends and acquaintances and a small amount of sightseeing for pleasure, my wife and I plan to participate only in scientific discussions with British scientists on this trip.

It is my conviction that the proposed travel is in fact in the best interests of the United States, and that the refusal of a passport to me, preventing the proposed travel during July and August 1952, would constitute the unjustified interference by the Government not only with the freedom of a citizen but also with the progress of science, and would in fact be seriously harmful to the best interests of the United States. Accordingly, not as the recipient from you of the highest honor that is given by the Nation to a civilian but as an individual citizen, I appeal to you to interest yourself in this matter, and to arrange that my request for a passport receive proper consideration.

Yours respectfully,

LINUS PAULING.

Mr. President, for the benefit of those who may wish to read my record in this case, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point copies of letters which I have sent to Dr. Pauling, because those letters speak for themselves. They show very clearly the impersonal attitude I have taken in connection with any correspondence I have had with Dr. Pauling. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a letter which I sent to Dr. Pauling under date of June 14, 1952.

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

JUNE 14, 1952.

Prof. LINUS PAULING,
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

DEAR PROFESSOR PAULING: This supplements my letter of May 23 relative to your passport problem. Enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 and June 13. You will find that they supply in detail the situation which I encountered when I made inquiry of the Passport Division in your case.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter under date of June 14, 1952, which I wrote to Prof. Frank Fussner, of Reed College, Portland, Oreg., in regard to the Pauling case.

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

JUNE 14, 1952.

Prof. FRANK FUSSNER,
Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR PROFESSOR FUSSNER: This supplements my letter of May 23 relative to your inquiry concerning Professor Pauling's passport problem.

Enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 and June 13. You will find that they supply in detail the situation which I encountered when I made inquiry of the passport problem in Professor Pauling's case.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of my letter to Mr. George Barton, of Reed College, under date of June 14, 1952.

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

JUNE 14, 1952.

Mr. GEORGE BARTON,
Reed College, Portland Oreg.

DEAR MR. BARTON: This will supplement my letter of May 26 relative to your inquiry concerning Professor Paulin's passport problem.

Enclosed are tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6 and June 13. I believe that you will find the speeches contained therein to be of interest.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mrs. R. B. Shipley, Chief of the Passport Division of the State Department, under date of June 2, 1952.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 2, 1952.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Department has received your letter of May 23, 1952, regarding the refusal of passport facilities to Prof. Linus Pauling.

In view of the confidential nature of the passport files the Department is not in a position to furnish detailed information concerning the facts which were the basis for its decision in the case of Professor Pauling. It may be said that the refusal of the passport was made after most careful consideration by the officers of the Department who found no other course open to them.

There is enclosed for your information a copy of a press release dated May 24, 1952, setting forth the Department's policy with regard to the refusal of passports in certain categories of cases.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. SHIPLEY,
Chief, Passport Division.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter under date of May 26, 1952, which I wrote to Mr. George Barton, of Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

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

MAY 26, 1952.

Mr. GEORGE BARTON,
Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. BARTON: I have your letter of May 20 addressed to me in reference to the case of Prof. Linus Pauling.

I have requested the State Department to advise me as to the reasons for its refusal to issue a passport to Professor Pauling. As soon as I have received a reply from the State Department I shall communicate with you again.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter which I wrote to Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, under date of May 23, 1952. It is a letter to which I have already referred in my speech of June 6, but I think it also ought to be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

MAY 23, 1952.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the past few days, I have received inquiries concerning the alleged refusal of the Department of State to issue a passport to Prof. Linus Pauling, of the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

It is my understanding that Professor Pauling had desired to make a trip to England. If the passport was, in fact, refused I would appreciate being advised of the reason for such action. Needless to say, if the information which the State Department has, discloses that he is a security risk, I agree that he should not receive a passport. However, in view of the inquiries I have received, I think it might be helpful if a recheck were made in order to insure that an injustice has not occurred.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the letter from myself to Prof. Frank Fussner, of Reed College, Portland, Oreg., under date of May 23, 1952.

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

MAY 23, 1952.

Prof. FRANK FUSSNER,
Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR PROFESSOR FUSSNER: This will acknowledge your recent wire which was addressed to me by 49 members of the Reed College faculty with respect to the matter of Prof. Linus Pauling. I am addressing this letter to you inasmuch as your name was the first of the 49 listed on the wire.

I have made inquiry of the State Department as to the reasons for the refusal to issue a passport to Professor Pauling. As soon as I have heard from the State Department, I shall communicate with you.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter which I wrote to Professor Pauling, under date of May 23, 1952.

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

MAY 23, 1952.

Prof. LINUS PAULING,
California Institute of Technology,
Pasadena, Calif.

DEAR PROFESSOR PAULING: This will acknowledge your letter of May 12 advising me of the State Department's refusal to issue you a passport.

I have made inquiry of the State Department as to the reasons for its refusal to issue the passport. As soon as I have received the requested information, I will communicate with you.

I appreciate the very kind remarks set forth on the last page of your letter. I assure you that I receive my full share of the opposite type in my work at this office.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter referred to in the previous letter, just inserted in the RECORD, a letter which I received under date of May 12, 1952, from Dr. Pauling, in which there is enclosed a statement by Dr. Pauling with regard to his passport problem.

I ask unanimous consent that both the letter and the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, May 12, 1952.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you as a native Oregonian, because my daughter, a student at Reed College, has told me that some of the faculty members of Reed College have submitted a protest to you against the action of the Department of State in refusing me a passport.

In order to give you additional information about the matter, I send you herewith three documents which I have prepared. One describes some of the circumstances of the refusal of the passport to me. The second is a copy of my earlier letter to President Truman. The third is a copy of a statement that I made last year about my political beliefs, and which I then made under oath before the committee mentioned in the statement.

One aspect of the refusal of the passport to me disturbs me considerably. It was not until I made a personal visit to Mrs. Shipley, and was sent by her to her superior officer, Mr. Boykin, only 6 days before the date of my scheduled departure for England, to take part in the Royal Society conference on protein structure, that I was given any information whatever about the reason for the refusal of the passport to me. The information that Mr. Boykin then gave me was very vague, but it was enough to permit me to submit some documents to him which I hoped would bear on the matters that were troubling the Department of State. This date, April 21, also represents the first time that it was indicated to me that I could submit documents to the Department of State and have the matter reconsidered.

I have received a number of letters from members of the Royal Society expressing their indignation. Sir Robert Robinson, former president of the Royal Society of London, has written me that he sent a strong letter of protest against the action of the Department of State to the London Times, and that it was published in the Times May 5. I have not seen this letter.

Let me take this opportunity to tell you that my wife and I, who are both native Oregonians, have a feeling of pride that our native State should be represented in the Senate by a man of such great ability and integrity as you possess. Let me also say that if at any time some question involving science should arise with which I could be of possible help to you, I should be very glad to attempt to be of help.

Sincerely yours,

LINUS PAULING.

STATEMENT BY LINUS PAULING, APRIL 29, 1952

I had planned to make a trip to England, accompanied by my wife, in order that I might take part in a conference of the Royal Society of London on the structure of proteins, and also present a discourse before the Royal Institution of Great Britain. I have been informed by the State Department that a passport is not being issued to me since the Department of State is of the opinion that my proposed travel would not be in the best interests of the United States.

It is my opinion that my proposed travel, solely for the purpose of taking part in scientific discussions in Great Britain, would in fact be in the best interests of the United States. On the other hand, I believe that the refusal of a passport to me is not in the best interests of the United States, and that it involves the unjustified interference by the Government with the freedom of action of a citizen of the United States.

When I was first informed of the decision of the Department of State, 2 months ago, I wrote to President Truman and to the Department of State, asking that the decision be reconsidered. On April 21 a State Department official said to me that the decision had been made because of suspicion that I was a Communist, and because my anti-Communist statements have not been sufficiently strong, and he suggested that I provide the Department with some evidence. I then submitted to the Department of State my statement, made under oath, that I am not a Communist, never have been a Communist, and never have been involved with the Communist Party, as well as some other documents. I was then notified on the afternoon of April 28 that the original decision not to issue a passport to me had been upheld.

I surmise that the action of the Department of State is the result of the McCarran Act. The damage done to the Nation by the refusal to permit me to attend scientific

meetings in England must be attributed to the McCarran Act, and is an argument for the repeal of this act.

I am a foreign member of the Royal Society of London and an honorary member of the Royal Institution of Great Britain. One year ago Prof. Robert B. Corey and I announced that we had discovered the structure of some proteins. The Royal Society of London arranged for a conference to be held on this subject. Because I was unable to attend at the time originally set, which conflicted with a meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, of which I am a vice president, the date of the Royal Society conference was changed to May 1. I also accepted an invitation from the director of the Royal Institution of Great Britain to speak before the Royal Institution on May 16 on the subject of the structure of proteins. Aside from this, my wife and I had planned to visit universities in London, Oxford, Cambridge, and Leeds, in order to talk with scientists there about the structure of proteins and other scientific problems, and I had accepted an invitation to be guest of honor at a reception to be held in London by the Society for Visiting Scientists.

Originally we had planned also to go to France, to take part in an International Congress on Biochemistry in Paris. We also had planned to go to Toulouse, in order that I might receive from the University of Toulouse an honorary doctor's degree that had been granted to me some years ago. Later we decided to restrict the trip to England and to return to the United States after the scientific meetings in London and the visits to British universities.

During recent years my work on the theory of resonance in chemistry has been under attack in Russia. Russian chemists have been forbidden to make use of this theory in their scientific work. The action of the State Department in refusing me a passport represents a different way of interfering with the progress of science and restricting the freedom of the individual citizen. In my opinion, it reflects a dangerous trend away from our fundamental democratic principles upon which our Nation is based.

FEBRUARY 29, 1952.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Four years ago I was honored by the award of the Medal for Merit, given for my services to the Nation between 1940 and 1946. The two accompanying documents, bearing your signature, are the certificate and the citation for this medal. I am proud to have received the Medal for Merit, which is stated on the certificate to have been awarded for extraordinary fidelity and exceptionally meritorious conduct.

Last week I received from Mrs. R. B. Shipley, of the Passport Division of the Department of State, a letter containing the sentence "In reply to your letter of January 24, 1952, you are informed that your request for a passport has been carefully considered by the Department. However, a passport of this Government is not being issued to you since the Department is of the opinion that your proposed travel would not be in the best interests of the United States."

I applied for a passport in order to visit England to take part in scientific meetings and discussions. I had been invited by the Royal Society of London to participate in a discussion meeting on the structure of proteins, to be held on May 1, 1952. This is a subject to which I have recently made contributions; and when my obligation to attend the spring meeting of the American Philosophical Society, of which I am vice president, prevented my accepting the invitation to the Royal Society discussion meeting at the time originally set for it, the date of the meeting was changed to May 1 by the Royal Society, in order to permit my attendance.

I have also agreed to present a Friday evening discourse before the Royal Institution of Great Britain on May 16, 1952.

The only other activity that I propose on this trip, aside from visits to universities and laboratories for discussion of scientific questions, is attendance at a ceremony at the University of Toulouse, in France. Two years ago the honorary degree of docteur de l'universite was conferred upon me by this university, and I was notified that the ceremony of presenting the diploma would be held when I found it convenient to come to Toulouse.

I am now writing to ask you, as President of the United States, to rectify this action, and to arrange for the issuance of a passport to me. I am a loyal and conscientious citizen of the United States. I have never been guilty of any unpatriotic or criminal act. I am confident that no harm whatever would be done to the Nation by my proposed travel. On the contrary, I feel sure that the announcement of the denial of a passport to me, preventing my attendance at the Royal Society Conference on May 1, would do damage to the United States, and that the denial of the passport would not be in the best interests of the United States.

I am well known in Great Britain, because of my scientific work. I am a foreign member of the Royal Society of London, an honorary member of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, an honorary member of the Chemical Society of London, and the recipient of honorary degrees from the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London. Through these connections, and through my services 4 years ago as George Eastman professor at the University of Oxford and as scientific lecturer at other universities, I have become personally acquainted with many distinguished men of science in Great Britain. I fear that these men would consider the denial of a passport to me to be unjust, and that their opinion of the United States would be adversely affected, and for this reason I address this petition to you.

May I ask that the two accompanying documents be returned to me?

Yours respectfully,

LINUS PAULING.

STATEMENT BY LINUS PAULING, NOVEMBER 14, 1950

Yesterday I was ordered by subpena to appear as a witness before the senate investigating committee on education of the State of California. I testified for over 2 hours, mainly about my reasons for objecting to special loyalty oaths involving inquiry into political beliefs. I also emphasized my convictions about the importance of security regulations for workers on classified projects—to be applied, however, in such a way as to do the minimum of harm to those who are considered to be poor security risks.

My own political views are well known. I am not a Communist; I have never been a Communist; I have never been involved with the Communist Party; I am a Rooseveltian Democrat; I believe that it is of the greatest importance that citizens take political action in order that our Nation not deteriorate.

My basic concept of democracy is that no one man is wise enough to make the fundamental decisions determining the course of the Nation, but that the correct decisions are made by the people as a whole. The political opinions of the people can be represented by a distribution curve. If one end of the curve is suppressed, as by political pressure on a minority, the decisions made by averaging the remainder are wrong, by the democratic criterion. I am convinced that the constitutional provision of freedom of political belief is designed to preserve the basic democratic procedure of obtaining the average of opinions of all citizens, and that when this principle is violated our democracy is seriously endangered.

It is my conviction that special loyalty oaths that involve inquiry into political beliefs constitute a violation of the fundamental principle of our democracy and hence endanger our Nation. We all agree that the secret ballot is essential to the working of the democratic system—the ballot must be secret in order to protect the voter from pressure by employers or people in political power. The protection of the secret ballot would be nullified if unscrupulous public officials were free to inquire into the political beliefs of the voters, and accordingly the citizen must be protected against inquiry into his political beliefs.

So long as the Communist Party remains a legal political party in the United States, inquiry into membership in this party constitutes inquiry into political beliefs. It is my conviction accordingly that the imposition of a special loyalty affirmation such as that require by the regents for employees of the University of California, which involves inquiry into political beliefs, violates this fundamental constitutional principle of our democracy.

I stated to the Senate Investigating Committee that in my opinion the loyalty affirmation requirement of the university had done far more harm than good. I said that I was convinced that the teachers whom I knew personally who had refused to sign had done so because of their principles, their strong convictions about freedom of political belief and the danger to our Nation that accompanies the imposition of political tests, and that great harm had been done through their persecution. I also pointed out that the earlier witnesses before the committee had testified that they believed that Communists would sign these loyalty oaths without compunction, and that these oaths could not be considered effective in controlling communism.

I am not opposed to loyalty oaths in general. I have voluntarily taken many loyalty oaths in connection with my services to the Nation. I would voluntarily take the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the State of California if I were to become an officer of the State. None of these pledges of loyalty involve inquiry into political beliefs.

In testifying before the Committee, the application of the principle of freedom of political belief caused me to refuse to answer the question about membership in the Communist Party. It was made clear through questions by Senator Dilworth that I considered the Communist Party to be a political party, and that I refused to answer because of principle.

I think that there is no inconsistency in my preparing this voluntary statement and also having previously made voluntary statements about my political beliefs, and my objecting on principle to being required to make a statement. I believe that a citizen has the right to announce his political beliefs if he desires, and that also he has the right to keep them to himself if he desires. I believe that, in order to protect our constitutional rights, everyone should refuse to permit inquiry under pressure into his political beliefs.

I may say that I am not personally sympathetic to the extremes of belief and policy that I understand some Communists to hold; but I feel that we must stanchly support the basic principles of our democracy, including the right of people to hold even extreme political beliefs. We must at the same time do our duty as citizens by striving to improve our social and political system.

LINUS PAULING.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I try very hard to be fair to all sides involved in an issue. I think I would be less than fair—even though I think it is a very unkind and very unfair column—if I did not ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a column which appeared recently in the press, written by Victor Riesel, entitled "Americans Aid Red Propaganda," in which Mr. Riesel says some very unkind things about the junior Senator from Oregon because of the stand which I have taken with regard to the procedures of the Passport Division. I would be less than human if I did not say that the Riesel column hurt my feelings very much. I expect this kind of an attack in my work in the Senate. Anyone who believes in standing for what he thinks is a sound principle, irrespective of the individuals who may be involved, may expect such attacks. I was disappointed that Mr. Riesel would say such unkind things, because I thought he knew me better. In fact I thought he had a higher regard for me than he indicates in this column, because in recent years he has on two different occasions invited me to write a guest column for him while he was away on vacation, which I was very glad to do. He seemed to appreciate it. At least, the correspondence which I received from him at the time does not seem to indicate that he then held the view of me which he expressed in this column.

In fairness to Mr. Riesel I am satisfied that if he would take the time really to study the position of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the principle he is seeking to defend in connection with this passport problem, he would change his views, as expressed in this column, in regard to the justification for the stand which the junior Senator from Oregon has taken. Nevertheless, I think it is only fair that his view be presented, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks this highly critical column about me, written by Victor Riesel under the heading "Inside Labor: American aid Red propaganda."

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

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

AMERICANS AID RED PROPAGANDA

NEW YORK.—There are Americans—if you can still find the charity in your soul to call them that—now fellow-traveling across Europe, Russia, and Sovietized China, helping our military enemies devise and hurl spearheaded propaganda at the United States. This is propaganda aimed at making even more fanatic the doped-up Communist troops so they can kamikaze themselves and take as many American boys as possible with them into death on Korean mountainsides.

This is propaganda skillfully whipped up to keep high the morale of enemy nations now supplying the soldiers to kill our young draftees in Korea.

To get abroad, to make themselves available for briefing in Moscow, to be able to sit as "American representatives at Peking peace conferences" under American flags, and to charge that their fellow Americans are using horrible vermin and germ plague bombs on Korean and Chinese women and children, these Americans, whose names I give you shortly, have lied to our State Department Passport Division.

They have misrepresented their destinations. They have used aliases. They have betrayed their land. And just as the overworked State Department Passport Division, without an effective security screening or policing system, begins to crack down on such noninnocents abroad, along comes a United States Senator to attack the Passport Division and complicate the lives of those of us who are trying to expose the enemy.

This Senator, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, reacts in the typical professional liberal style. The Senator sneers at the Passport Division's efforts to keep these Sovieteers from going abroad. He shouts about unchecked powers. He wants a review board. When that happens the fellow travelers might just as well build themselves a bridge across; sea and air travel couldn't carry the load. And the Senator takes this position like all professional liberals. Not that he's pro-Soviet. He's just got to be a militant.

Let's look at some who have managed to sneak passports through the State Department. Most of them are financed by the American Committee To Survey Trade-Union Conditions in Europe.

This outfit, first exposed here a year ago, is run by Irving Charles Velson and Esther Letz, two notorious Sovieteers, friends of high Russian officials.

There is another outfit, a peace committee without a formal name. Two of the men it sent abroad are youngish John Darr, in his early thirties, and John Adams Kingsbury, a former New York City welfare commissioner. Only a few weeks ago they arrived in Peking with expired United States passports. Senator MORSE might like to know (or would he?) that they were hailed by the enemy press there as delegates from the United States to the coming Asiatic peace conference.

Dr. Kingsbury has been propagandizing abroad against his own country for 2 years now. All this time he has been ducking American consuls who want to pick up his passport. On arrival in Peking he was placed on the platform of a special preparatory conference to set up the agenda for the Soviet-run intercontinental Asiatic and Pacific peace conference. He sat amid the enemy, the very enemy directing the slaying of our young GI's.

Then the doctor made a speech—just a few days ago, June 15. He hailed the leadership of Mao Tse-tung. And his colleague, John Darr, did other work on the peace conference and on us.

Soon all Asia was being told by the Peking radio that here were Americans admitting our atrocities, Senator MORSE. And I can show you, Senator, American Communists who are in the Near East and all through South America who are dispatching across the world similar horrendous hooey against us from their comfortable and expensive hotel suites.

The Passport Division, even in this sweltering season of thronging vacationers who travel for pleasure, is trying to stop only the enemy propagandists. It's difficult. Now comes the Senator to shout about unchecked powers.

That isn't liberalism, Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Only an excerpt or two will give the Senate some indication of Mr. Riesel's unfriendly attitude. He points out that there are those seeking passports who should not receive them. He makes clear that he considers them subversives. I wish to assure Mr. Riesel that in each and every one of such cases, when the evidence shows that there is a basis for denying a passport, I think the passport should be denied.

The point I would have Mr. Riesel keep in mind is that I am seeking to have a review of the evidence, in keeping with the sound American principle of reviewing and checking decisions which affect the rights, freedoms, and liberties of the American people. I would be very much surprised if Mr. Riesel did not agree with that principle. If he accepts that principle, then I should think he would be willing to agree with me that it ought to be applied even to individuals who he and I might agree were not individuals for whom we necessarily would have a very high regard.

Our problem, when we talk about applying the principles which safeguard American citizens, is that we have no right to choose which individuals we shall grant such protections to, and which individuals we will deny such protections to. We must apply justice equally and uniformly. We must keep faith with the principle of equality of justice before the law. I think we are making a great mistake in this time of crisis, when we are confronted with a serious problem involving a Communist threat around the world, when we at home express—and I think that is what we are really doing—a fear so far as the efficacy of our own safeguards of liberty is concerned. I have no fear of the efficacy of those safeguards.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I commend the Senator for his statement. The Senator read a letter from Mrs. Shipley. I am acquainted with a few persons in the State Department. I hope the Senator has an appreciation of what the situation is in that Department. Mrs. Shipley is only a clerk in that department.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the last sentence.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mrs. Shipley is only a clerk employed in the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. The letter speaks for itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon to read the letter again.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to do so. The letter which I received from Mrs. Shipley under date of June 2, 1952, reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Department has received your letter of May 23, 1952, regarding the refusal of passport facilities to Prof. Linus Pauling.

In view of the confidential nature of the passport files the Department is not in a position to furnish detailed information concerning the facts which were the basis for its decision in the case of Professor Pauling. It may be said that the refusal of the passport was made after most careful consideration by the officers of the Department who found no other course open to them.

There is enclosed for your information a copy of a press release dated May 24, 1952, setting forth the Department's policy with regard to the refusal of passports in certain categories of cases.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. SHIPLEY,
Chief, Passport Division.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad that the Senator from Oregon reread the letter, because it was a little hard for me to hear in this part of the Chamber. All that she said is what the Department has said. Am I correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is all that the letter said. The letter speaks for itself. I assume it represents the position of the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, returning to the column by Victor Riesel—and it presents a point of view which I believe is held by a great many people—he says:

There are Americans—if you can still find the charity in your soul to call them that—now fellow-traveling across Europe, Russia, and Sovietized China, helping our military enemies devise and hurl spearheaded propaganda at the United States. This is propaganda aimed at making even more fanatic the doped-up Communist troops so they can kamikaze themselves and take as many American boys as possible with them into death on Korean mountainsides.

This is propaganda skillfully whipped up to keep high the morale of enemy nations now supplying the soldiers to kill our young draftees in Korea.

To get abroad, to make themselves available for briefing in Moscow, to be able to sit as "American representatives at Peking Peace Conferences" under American flags, and to charge that their "fellow Americans" are using horrible vermin and germ-plague bombs on Korean and Chinese women and children, these Americans whose names I give you shortly have lied to our State Department Passport Division.

They have misrepresented their destinations. They have used aliases. They have betrayed their land. And just as the overworked State Department Passport Division, without an effective security screening or policing system, begins to crack down on such noninnocents abroad, along comes a United States Senator to attack the Passport Division and complicate the lives of those of us who are trying to expose the enemy.

This Senator, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, reacts in the typical professional liberal style. The Senator sneers at the Passport Division's efforts to keep these "sovieteers" from going abroad. He shouts about "unchecked powers." He wants a review board. When that happens, the fellow-travelers might just as well build themselves a bridge across; sea and air travel couldn't carry the load. And the Senator takes this position like all professional liberals. Not that he's pro-Soviet. He's just got to be a militant.

Mr. President, I digress to say that this is an interesting chain of false assumptions on the part of Mr. Riesel. I wish particularly to point out that I am at a complete loss to follow his line of reasoning, if one wishes to call it that, in which he suggests or seems to imply that a review of the decisions of the Passport Division in appeal cases would of course result in building a bridge for what he calls these subversive characters, which would permit them by sea and air travel to spread their propaganda abroad.

I do not know where he got the idea that I am in favor of granting a passport prior to a judgment of the appeal board, and I certainly have made as clear as I can by the use of the English language that if there is any evidence on any individual which justifies characterizing him, as Mr. Riesel does in his column, I would stand shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Riesel in insisting that a passport be not granted to that individual.

But of course, what Mr. Riesel is overlooking is the very basic American principle of reveiw of discretionary power. We can assume, because he does not challenge it, that Mr. Riesel is aware that at the present time when the Passport Division reaches its decision in regard to a passport it is a final decision, insofar as any review by an independent board is concerned.

I would not wish to think—for I have a very high regard for Mr. Riesel—that he would like to sustain a proposition that the Passport Division is infallible and incapable of making a mistake and always is correct in the decision it reaches in denying a passport.

Mr. President, the denying of a passport relates to what I have previously pointed out is a precious American right to which a citizen is entitled, unless there are good grounds for denying the passport; and I should think that Mr. Riesel would join forces with me, rather than castigate me, in trying to protect this right for the individual citizen.

I hold to the point of view that one of the great strengths of our democracy is to be found in the principle that the Government must always be kept the servant, not the master, of the people. We have developed our concept of judicial checks on the decisions of administrators of government, so as to guarantee to the American people that their Government will remain their servant, and will not be their master. We cannot protect that principle if we simply take the position that it is to be applied only to those whom we like, only to those whom we believe to be innocent.

I would suggest to Mr. Riesel that he reflect on another basic principle of American jurisprudence, namely, that if we are to preserve American liberty to its fullest—and if we do not preserve it in full bloom, it will wither and die—then it is much better that a guilty man escape now and then the application of the legal restrictions upon him, rather than to have a single innocent person wronged by his government. We shall never protect the American people from the growth of tyranny and police-state methods, Mr. President, unless we always safeguard the principle that has been taught throughout our history, namely, that for our own safety as free men and women, we must follow a procedure which protects the innocent and guarantees full protection to the innocent, and that it is better to have a guilty person escape the law now and then, rather than to have one innocent person wronged by the administration of the law.

So I would say to Mr. Riesel, knowing him to be as patriotic as I am, that I believe he should reflect upon the principles I am defending in the debate on this issue, for if he will reflect on them, I do not believe he can escape the conclusion that we can protect the security of the United States from any of the designs of subversive elements within our population who may be seeking to obtain passports, and at the same time we can provide for a check upon the presently existing discretionary power on the part of the Passport Division of the State Department, by providing for a review of its decisions by the Subversive Activities Control Board under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as set forth in the bill I have introduced in the Senate.

Mr. President, to return to the column by Mr. Riesel, let me point out that in it he says—

Let's look at some who have managed to sneak passports through the State Department. Most of them are financed by the American Committee To Survey Trade-Union Conditions in Europe.

This outfit, first exposed here a year ago, is run by Irving Charles Velson and Esther Letz, two notorious "sovieteers," friends of high Russian officials.

Mr. President, I do not know about that. I never heard of them until I read Mr. Riesel's column. If those persons are of the type that he says they are, I still remain at a loss to understand why Mr. Riesel fears that a review, upon appeal, of a decision by the Passport Division of the State Department will make it possible for any such Soviet characters or subversive characters as Mr. Riesel mentions in his column—assuming that he is correct in his accusations against them—to obtain passports.

A review of the decisions of the Passport Division will not result in the granting of passports to persons who do not deserve them; but, on the contrary, that procedure will strengthen the hands of the Passport Division in the cases in which substantial evidence exists to warrant or justify the denial of a passport. It will strengthen Government by law, and it will check the arbitrary exercise of discretion. Mr. President, in my judgment it will make very clear to the subversive elements in the United States that we can make our system of checks and balances work successfully—the system under which the mere decisions of Government administrators must be subject to review, upon appeal, in the instances in which those decisions go to fundamental American rights, freedoms, or liberties.

I return to Mr. Riesel's column. In it he points out, further, that—

There is another outfit, a "peace committee" without a formal name. Two of the men it sent abroad are youngish John Darr, in his early thirties, and John Adams Kingsbury, a former New York City welfare commissioner.

Mr. President, let me say that I know nothing about them, and I never heard of them until I read Mr. Riesel's column.

I read further:

Only a few weeks ago they arrived in Peking—with expired United States passports. Senator MORSE might like to know (or would he?) that they were hailed by the enemy press there as delegates from the United States to the coming Asiatic peace conference.

Mr. President, what in the world has that to do with the principle of my proposal for a review, on appeal, of a decision of the Passport Division, where a citizen feels he has been wronged by a denial of a passport, and asks to have the evidence on which the denial allegedly was based reviewed, so as to see whether it is substantial evidence and justifies the denial of a passport?

If ever I read a nonsequitur argument, it is Mr. Riesel's argument which I have just read, in which he refers to one Darr and one Kingsbury, and then in a none-too-kind spirit asks the rhetorical question—

Senator MORSE might like to know (or would be?) that they were hailed by the enemy press there as delegates from the United States to the coming Asiatic peace conference.

Let me assure Mr. Riesel, to change his rhetorical question into a direct answer by me, that if the gentlemen to whom he refers there are of the type that he says they are, I favor strengthening the procedures which will prevent their getting out of the United States; but I would not do it by star-chamber procedures. I would do it in keeping with what I believe is the rich meaning of the American judicial process based upon the Bill of Rights. Even if those persons are the kind of human vermin that Mr. Riesel says they are, I would see to it that they had an opportunity to have a hearing on appeal.

Then, Mr. President, believe me, unless good cause could be shown why it would endanger the security of the Nation to make public the findings, I would broadcast the findings to the people of the United States. I believe that is the way to treat such human vermin as Mr. Riesel describes, if they are guilty of the things which he says they are guilty of. In other words, let us bring them out into the open, under the penetrating light of public opinion. But let us not follow a course of action which tends to drive these subversives underground. Let us keep faith with the type of procedure that you and I, Mr. President, would like to have applied to ourselves if we were subjected to a charge which I believe is just about as bad as any which could be leveled against anyone, namely, the charge of disloyalty to one's government.

We, too, Mr. President, would want an opportunity under our system of jurisprudence to meet the charges and to insist that the presumption of innocence be guaranteed to us, unless the evidence could be presented substantiating the charges. It will be realized that when we start applying this principle for which I am speaking, not to such human vermin as Riesel describes in his column, but to American citizens of our own acquaintance, it then becomes clear that it is our duty to see to it that these protections are guaranteed.

Mr. President, let me tell you, in this period of hysteria and high emotion that is sweeping this country, we had better remember the old maxim, "Except for the grace of God," the individual charged might be ourselves, because I do not know who is safe any more in America from smear attacks. I know the best way to meet the smear attacks; I know the best guaranty we can give to our people to protect them from smear attacks is to guarantee them these procedures about which I am speaking, which would offer them an opportunity to establish their innocence, and in a fair hearing where they would be confronted by their accusers, and where their accusers would be charged with the responsibility of sustaining their burden of proof.

Victor Riesel goes on to write:

Dr. Kingsbury has been propagandizing abroad against his own country for 2 years now. All this time he has been ducking American consuls who want to pick up his passport. On arrival in Peking, he was placed on the platform of a special preparatory conference to set up the agenda for the Soviet-run intercontinental Asiatic and Pacific peace conference. He sat amid the enemy, the very enemy directing the slaying of our young GI's.

Mr. President, if those are the facts, and I assume they are, Victor Riesel does not deplore them any more than does the junior Senator from Oregon. But I am at a complete loss to understand the causal relationship between these comments of Mr. Riesel and my proposal that there be an appeal procedure set up in the State Department for the handling of passport cases on appeal. That appeal procedure has no causal relationship whatever to whatever chain of events made it possible for Dr. Kingsbury to get out of this country. In fact, I think it could be argued that under the procedure that I propose it conceivably would have been more difficult for Dr. Kingsbury to get out of the country. Again, I say this paragraph in Mr. Riesel's column is a non sequitur. Returning to his column, I read:

Then the doctor made a speech—just a few days ago, June 15. He hailed the leadership of Mao Tse-tung. And his colleague, John Darr, did other work on the peace conference and on us.

Soon all Asia was being told by the Peiping radio that here were Americans admitting our atrocities, Senator MORSE. And I can show you, Senator, American Communists who are in the Near East and all through South America, who are dispatching across the world similar horrendous hooey against us from their comfortable and expensive hotel suites.

I do not doubt it, and I do not think they ought to have received passports. I am as much opposed to their getting out of the country as is Victor Riesel. Then again, I say, Mr. President, what in the world has the activity of those individuals who are out of this country to do with my proposal that there should be an appeal procedure set up in the State Department under the jurisdiction of the Subversive Control Board, created under the Subversive Control Act of 1950, which will review on appeal those decisions of the Passport Division regarding which disputes have been raised? Absolutely no relationship at all, Mr. President, is the answer.

And so we find Victor Riesel deploring the activities of alleged Communists and Soviet agents, and seeking to smear me with the charge that my proposal to provide a sound checking procedure for reviewing the discretionary decisions of the Passport Division, somehow, some way, has a causal connection with the fact that somebody by the name of John Darr, or someone by the name of Dr. Kingsbury is carrying on some subversive activities somewhere in the Orient or in South America. It is not becoming to Victor Riesel to engage in that sort of journalism; and I regret that he has done so.

The last paragraph of his column reads as follows:

The Passport Division, even in this sweltering season of thronging vacationers who travel for pleasure, is trying to stop only the enemy propagandists. It is difficult. Now comes the Senator to shout about "unchecked powers."

That isn't liberalism, Senator.

Mr. President, I have a very simple question to ask Victor Riesel: Are these powers unchecked or are they not? The answer is that they are unchecked. The burden of my case, the essence of my argument, is that I think it jeopardizes the liberty and the rights of any American citizen to permit the State Department to exercise finality of decision in the granting or denying of a passport without an appeal procedure under which a fellow American citizen will have an opportunity to have the decision of the State Department reviewed on appeal if he wishes the opportunity to present evidence showing that no just cause exists for denying a passport.

That is the burden of my argument.

I say, Mr. President, that if we want to protect freedom in this country, then my colleagues in the Senate of the United States ought to join me in the adoption of a provision such as that which I have introduced which will guarantee that protection, because without it I say we ourselves are adopting police-state methods; we ourselves are forming a partnership with Stalin himself in denying a fair trial, a fair hearing, and a public disclosure in cases of dispute over whether just grounds exist for the denial of a passport.

I now come to the closing point of my argument, the Lattimore case.

May I say that I hold no brief for Owen Lattimore. I do not know him. Anything I know about him is what I have read in the newspapers or have read in connection with hearings which have been held in the Senate.

I have always said that Owen Lattimore, as any other American citizen, is entitled to the benefit of a presumption of innocence in respect to charges which have been made against him, until his guilt has been established. I assume, and shall continue to assume, Mr. President, that if Owen Lattimore is a subversive person, if there is any basis in fact for the charge that he has been acting in a manner which makes him a bad security risk in the United States, there is ample law on the books to bring him to justice. It was done in the Hiss case, Mr. President. I think it is rather interesting that the prosecutions of Owen Lattimore, if we want to use that term, have been limited up to this time to congressional hearings, with all the remarkable flexibility of procedural privilege going along with congressional hearings. In fact, only the lateness of the hour causes me to do no more than to mention it in passing. Not only a great opportunity is ours, but a great opportunity which we have not fulfilled as yet, to improve the proceedings of congressional investigations so that the investigations which in recent years

have become quasi judicial, at least, in name, so that some of the same safeguards about which I have been speaking, protecting the presumption of innocence and guaranteeing to the citizen an opportunity to be confronted by those who testify against him, to cross-examine them, to make a full and complete statement of his own case, and be protected by the benefit of counsel, shall be adopted as requirements of congressional procedure in the handling of congressional investigations.

Something tells me, Mr. President, that there is a growing demand in this country for an improvement in our congressional investigating procedures. But, be that as it may, and returning to the Lattimore case, I want to say that up to this time prosecutions have been limited, and, so far as I know, on the record, in spite of all the charges, the presumption of innocence has not been overcome in this sense: I think a similar record made before any court in this country would result in a sustaining of a motion by counsel to dismiss the charges.

I think he should be tried in court if there is any evidence in existence that will support the accusation that he is a subversive person.

I make these statements, Mr. President, because I well know—if there is any doubt about it, visit my office 3 or 4 days from now and read the incoming mail—I know that even my mentioning on the floor of the Senate the name of Owen Lattimore will cause many unthinking persons to jump to the conclusion that WAYNE MORSE defended Owen Lattimore in connection with charges that have been made against him. But let the record show that I did not because I do not know enough about either the charges or about Owen Lattimore to justify my making the statement by way of judgment of either the charges or the man. But I do claim that, as a lawyer, I know something about fair procedure.

If one wants any evidence, Mr. President, as to the soundness of the position I am taking for the adoption of some procedure that will place a check upon the arbitrary discretion of the State Department in connection with passport cases, take a look at the recent happening in the so-called Lattimore case. It is very shocking, if what I read in the press constituted an accurate statement of what had transpired. It is my understanding of the press account that the State Department, without any contact whatsoever with Lattimore, but based upon a charge or accusation made by a citizen to an investigating officer of our Government that Owen Lattimore was seeking to escape from the United States and fly to Russia to participate in subversive activities, issued instructions to customs officers and customs offices in the United States to watch out for Owen Lattimore. If he was found at any point of exit seeking to leave the country, he was to be apprehended, because the State Department would not grant him a passport.

Still without getting in touch with Owen Lattimore, I understand from the press—and that is the complete limit of my understanding of the matter—the State Department broadcast the information to the world. The devotion of the State Department to secrecy is rather paradoxical, is it not? But when they wanted to smear somebody, they forgot all about the policy of secrecy.

Mr. President, I say that even if the facts were just the opposite, even if investigation showed that Lattimore had such intentions and plans as the State Department announced he had, by the statement they made to the press the other day, under our system of American justice they first ought to have brought the accused before them. Mr. President, it is neither right nor safe to permit any department of Government to play such havoc with the reputations and the rights of American citizens, I care not who they be. After all as Senators have heard me say before, it is the procedures which Government applies that determine substantive rights. Unless procedures protect substantive rights, there are no substantive rights. What good is a man's reputation once it has been smeared and destroyed? All the apologies, all the retractions, yes, Mr. President, even in the case of private suits, all the damages that are paid, can never reestablish a broken reputation. As far as public opinion is concerned, a broken, destroyed reputation is a Humpty Dumpty. It cannot be mended; it cannot be built up again.

Our Government, if it is to remain our servant and not our master, must never be allowed to commit the type of wrong which, if the newspapers are correct, was committed in the Lattimore case.

So that there may be no misunderstanding of my view, I want it clearly understood that I even think it was shabby procedure for the State Department to make the announcement it made in the Lattimore case before checking into the matter with Lattimore himself. If it is true, as the newspapers report, that the information upon which the State Department relied in sending its instructions to the customs officers and immigration officials was false information, then a double injustice has been done to Lattimore. In my opinion, it was an injustice not to have communicated with him in the first instance to check on whether or not he denied any such allegation, and in the second place, it certainly was an injustice to publish such accusations without making certain that they were true.

If anyone does not understand the application of the principle I am fighting for on this issue, let him look at the most recent episode in the Lattimore case. Oh, yes, if—and I underline the word "if"—the announcement made the other day by McDermott, the State Department press relations officer, is true, the Department disclosed to the public that it had issued instructions to customs and immigration officers of our country to be on the lookout for Lattimore. But if there is no basis in fact for the accusations that were made, on the foundation of which the State Department took the action it did, then no doubt the officials of the Government responsible for such arbitrary action ought to be disciplined in whatever way it is possible to discipline, under existing Government rules and regulations.

But what I consider very important is that we learn a lesson from this episode. The lesson I think it teaches is that those who apparently have assumed infallibility on the part of the Passport Division of the State Department now know, in a case that has been publicly disclosed, that such a reputation for infallibility is unwarranted. I suggest that if the newspaper accounts of what happened in the Lattimore case represent an accurate statement of the facts, it is fair to argue that the case justifies at least a suspicion that possibly there are some decisions of the Passport Division that do not receive public disclosure. The findings and conclusions in those decisions may be as unwarranted as the findings and conclusions by the State Department in the last episode of the Lattimore case appear to be.

So I close with a little message to Dean Acheson: "Take a look, Mr. Acheson, at this last episode in the Lattimore case. Take a look at the procedures of the Passport Division, and then get out your notes—which I hope you still have—in the freshman courses you took at the Harvard Law School, on Procedure, in which you were taught, if you learned, that under our system of American justice, inherent in a fair trial is the right to appeal and review of the evidence, a right, Mr. Acheson, which you are denying in the State Department. So long as you continue to deny it I shall continue to say that you, Mr. Acheson, are guilty of maintaining an un-American procedure in your own department; and so long as you do I shall continue to say I think you are disqualified for public service."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow; and, because of the unanimous consent agreement which has been entered into with respect to the limitation of debate, that the morning hour be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may know what the pending business will be tomorrow, after the vote is taken on the veto of the immigration bill, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7313, the legislative appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. It is our hope that we shall be able after the passage of the legislative appropriation bill, to dispose of House bill 5426, to consolidate all laws relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

After that, if the Korean veterans' bill is ready, we may take up that bill.

We expect to take up Calendar No. 1514, Senate bill 2592, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

We may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1671, House bill 5767, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements, which is the so-called fair-trade bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Can the Senator tell me when the Senate is likely to consider the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall try to give the Senator an answer to that question tomorrow.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have previously asked whether it was likely that the Senate would be in session on Saturday of this week.

Mr. McFARLAND. Considering the program I have outlined, if the Senate expects to adjourn by a week from Saturday, I think there should be a Saturday session, unless something happens to enable us to dispose of a great many bills tomorrow. I do not expect the Senate to be able to do that.

Mr. WELKER. Then it is safe to assume that the Senate will work on Saturday?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is, unless we can dispose of the agenda and get caught up.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it the Senator's suggestion that we might adjourn a week from Saturday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not only suggesting it; I say that we expect to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. I say, God bless the Senator for those kind words.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, what time will the Senate meet tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock.

Mr. CASE. Will the first vote be on the President's veto of the immigration bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understand, the second vote will be on the Reserve bill. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there seems to be some doubt as to the program. The first business will be to dispose of the Presidential veto of the immigration bill. The time for consideration of that is limited to the period between 12 o'clock and 2:30. The legislative appropriation bill has already been made the unfinished business. Following the vote on the veto message, we shall dispose of the legislative appropriation bill. Then we shall take up the Reserve bill. If the Korean veterans' bill is ready, we shall take it up next. Then we shall take up the fair-trade bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am interested in a District of Columbia bill, Calendar No. 1664, H. R. 5768. It is very necessary that the bill be passed soon. If it is not, the boxing commission of the District of Columbia will not be able to function after the 30th of this month. I do not believe there will be any opposition to the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. So far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to its consideration now. I believe I asked that it be passed over to enable Senators to study it, but I am willing to have the Senate pass on the bill immediately.

REGULATION OF BOXING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1664, H. R. 5768. It will not take long to dispose of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5768) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to which amendments offered by Mr. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina were agreed to on June 21, 1952, as follows:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "licensed", to insert "professional"; in line 10, after the word "licensed", to insert "professional"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "contest", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That no person holding or conducting any amateur boxing contest under the jurisdiction and with the sanction of the District of Columbia Association of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States shall be required to pay to the Commission any such sum which includes receipts derived from the sale, lease, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights relating to any such amateur boxing contest."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the committee unanimously and without amendment. Amendments proposed by the Senator from South Carolina were agreed to on June 21, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The message also announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5678) entitled "An act to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BRIDGE AT SUMMIT, DEL.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for just a few moments to a matter of unusual importance to the people of Delaware and to many others residing along the eastern seaboard.

We are all concerned in improving our bridge and highway systems in the interest of better transportation facilities for the millions of motorists who annually use the routes between Maine and Florida. A great bulk of this traffic passes between Washington and New York. I know that many Members of the Senate have driven over this route frequently.

In order to meet requirements of these expanding traffic loads, the State of Delaware last year completed a new four-lane bridge which spans the Delaware River and connects with the great State of New Jersey.

More recently New Jersey opened its magnificent new turnpipe, and now traffic flows faster and safer between the Delaware bridge, across New Jersey, and into New York City.

In our adjoining State of Maryland to the west, the new Chesapeake Bay bridge will shortly be finished, thereby adding another modern link to the north-south traffic system.

Additional efforts are under way to connect the Chesapeake Bay bridge and the Delaware River crossing by highways of a turnpike caliber.

Unfortunately, however, a serious obstacle is preventing satisfactory completion of these connecting routes.

That obstacle is an inadequate bridge which spans the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del.

Several weeks ago a collision of two vessels, sinking one in the narrow canal not far from this bridge, halted all traffic in that vital waterway. Now that the sunken ship has burned out, the engineers are going to attempt the costly task of raising it so that water-borne commerce can again move.

One of the contributing factors to inadequate safety in the canal is poor vision caused by various bends and by such structures as the Summit Bridge.

As if this was not enough, an abutment supporting one end of the bridge gave

way some months ago and required a lengthy closing of the span for repairs.

Yesterday, Mr. President, with summer road traffic at the height, the abutment on the other side of this bridge was found to be dangerously weak and now the structure has been closed again for an indefinite period of time. Long and costly detours are facing motorists who have used the bridge not only for pleasure but for business. Resort areas along the Delaware River and Bay are to be confronted with serious hardships.

The prohibition of vehicles over the Summit Bridge is a blow to the whole traffic pattern between north and south. I assume that the engineers propose to patch up the weakened abutment and hope that further erosion will not sooner or later cause the whole structure to collapse.

Mr. President, the only answer to this problem is replacement of this inadequate crossing with a high-level fixed bridge of four lanes, so that the traffic capacity can be met and so that the present obsolete structure—a continuing danger to vessels passing through the canal—can be removed.

For months now I have had legislation pending to accomplish this objective. In spite of the fact that the Department of Commerce has given the bill a favorable report, the Department of the Army has so far refused to recommend any more than a two-lane crossing. Mr. President, a bridge of only two lanes is not adequate to meet our present, not to mention our future, needs.

If Delaware shared proportionately in Federal grants to the amount of taxes which are collected, I would be more reluctant to ask the Senate's support of this measure. But, in spite of the fact that well over half a billion dollars in Federal taxes were collected in my State last year, the amount of public-works funds which we have received has been practically nothing. As a matter of fact, although Congress appropriated an amount of $122,000 to dredge an inlet in the lower part of my State in order to insure the livelihood of fishing interests in that area, the funds were deleted by Executive order.

Therefore, Mr. President, I take this occasion to again urge the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee to consider S. 483 and to promptly report it favorably to the floor.

Construction of a new bridge at Summit, Del., is not a measure intended for Delaware only. Rather, as I have attempted to emphasize, it is a major factor in the continued development of our whole bridge and highway system from Maine to Florida.

NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under new reports, in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, be considered en bloc at this time. I exclude from my request the nomination to the Renegotiation Board, which was adversely reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the nominations is adversely reported.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not include the nomination which was adversely reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the majority leader is not requesting that the nomination which was adversely reported be confirmed.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for making the statement on the record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To clarify the situation, the Chair will state that Executive Calendar No. 683, message No. 133, covering the nomination to the Renegotiation Board, is excluded from the request of the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 36 (80th Cong.), and Public Law 625 (80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel

Franklin B. Cooper, MC, O443126.

To be major

Frederic E. Simpson, MC, O391271.

To be captains

Nicholas G. Bottiglieri, MC, O1704963.
Harold R. Widdowson, MC, O2028216.
Irving Wikler, MC, O966304.

To be first lieutenants

Asdrubal Arzola, MC, O411664.
Cecil F. Clement, Jr., DC, O1182542.
John F. Cornely, MC, O2203692.
Eugen W. Eberlin, MC, O986952.
William C. Hurt, DC, O945364.
Jack F. Wisman, MC, O2096738.

To be second lieutenants

Diana B. Amoss, WAC, L1010387.
Ann V. Awdukewich, WAC, L1010437.
Therese E. J. Bissen, WAC, L1010393.
Moray J. Black, WAC, L1010394.
Ethel M. Bridgeforth, WAC, L1010419.
Doris A. Carr, WAC, L1010461.
Dorothy L. Crook, WAC, L1010550.
Joann Elliott, WAC, L1010399.
Vivian Farland, ANC, N792745.
Ruth J. Geer, WAC, L1010392.
Mary J. Grimes, WAC, L1010444.
Shirley R. Heinze, WAC, L1010431.
Dorothy M. Holtz, ANC, N805554.
Nancy M. Hopfenspirger, WAC, L1010386.
Marcella E. Huggins, WAC, L1010465.
Eleanor P. Hutchins, WAC, L1010425.
Mary V. Jackson, WAC, L1010480.
Margaret M. Jebb, WAC, L1010447.
Jeanette Johnson, WAC, L1010404.
Miriam J. Johnson, WAC, L1010466.
Maida E. Lambeth, WAC, L1010432.
Mary E. Lerche, WAC, L1010467.
Rachel R. Malone, ANC, N901198.
Dorothy I. McCarthy, WMSC, M2911.
Harriet J. McKinley, WMSC, M2912.
Geraldine T. McNutt, WAC, L1010468.
Martha R. Meacham, WAC, L1010433.
Patricia G. Mitchell, WAC, L1010450.
Katsuyo Nanchi, ANC, N805333.
Doris D. Polk, WAC, L1010453.
Pollie L. Rawlinson, WAC, L1010374.
John K. Read, MSC, O986736.
Mar-gret A. Rupp, WAC, L1010454.
Edna A. Sargent, WAC, L1010474.
Florence T. Saunders, WAC, L1010473.
Elizabeth R. Smith, Jr., WAC, L1010476.
Nancy V. Smith, ANC, N805117.
Margaret A. Snyder, WAC, L1010573.
Dorcas A. Stearns, WAC, L1010456.
Mary C. Strain, WAC, L1010477.
Clauda M. Surratt, WAC, L1010478.
Ruth B. Walsh, WAC, L1010371.
Mary E. Waters, WAC, L1010457.
Elizabeth J. Wilde, WAC, L1010458.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army, in the grade of captain, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification.

Joseph B. Messing, O932394.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship, and subject to physical qualification:

Stanley D. Callas, O2102261.
Jerald R. Cureton, O1915224.
Alphonsus L. Doerr, O2103458.
George D. Edwards, O1873502.
Donald M. Hayes, O2041849.
LeRoy P. Houck, O2103389.
William R. Howard, O1541572.
John F. Hurdle, O996224.
Foster C. McCaleb, Jr., O1915225.
Eugene P. McKeown, O1873503.
Robert W. Neidlinger.
William W. Richardson, O1915229.
Mervin H. Schwartz, O1873504.
Victor J. Slominski, Jr., O2103399.
Vincent C. Sweeny, O2102263.
Henry T. Uhrig, O2042052.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

William E. LeGro, Jr., O2210053.
Sterling T. Post, Jr., O2203020.
Bertram L. Zartner, O2208001.

To be second lieutenants

Ralph O. Benefield, O2206563.
Stephen J. Borys, O1688792.
Jack A. Bump, O1918441.
James W. Clawson, O1873152.
David O. Cochran, O987874.
Conrad G. Conley.

Orris F. Haynie, O1115626.
Alvin S. Jacobs, O2003075.
Robert J. McCaffree, O1883661.
John E. McGlone, O1878758.
Carlisle R. Petty, Jr., O2030506.
Kenneth R. Rogers, O2104126.
John I. Smith, O1878923.
William J. Storey, O1881534.
James G. White, Jr., O2204475.
Earle C. Williams, O2004312.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Curtiss M. Bailey	John H. Lewis
Parry Barnes, Jr.	William J. Lillis
Herbert J. Bickel, Jr.	Alfred C. Malmgren
Clarence A. Brest, Jr.	Raymond F. McGuire,
Earl N. Bridgman, Jr.	Jr.
George C. Broome, Jr.	Richard J. McManus
Lawrence E. Bryan	Samuel Meyer
James M. Catterson, Jr.	John C. Meyers
	Russell J. Mittelstadt
Herbert J. Cooke	Glenn Petrenko
Francis W. Cotten	Galyn D. Pownell
Elton J. Delaune, Jr.	Laurence H. Reece,
Eddie C. Dixon	Jr.
William J. Dunlap,	John J. Repko, Jr.
O1914881	Victor M. Robertson,
Edward R. Dyer, Jr.,	Jr.
O1872775	John J. Sandhaas, Jr.
Eugene W. Ennis	Edmond P.
Arlen L. Fowler	Schexnayder
Donald J. Funk	Wilbur D. Stites,
Robert M. Garrison,	O2104252
O1874386	Albert G. Stefanik
Robert C. Gaskill	Joseph M. Stevenson
Merle R. Greene	Clarence E. Stiefel,
Jeremiah B. Hawkins	O2003117
Ross F. Hawkins, Jr.	Randol C. Tucker
John R. Hennigan,	Frank D. Turner, Jr.
O1914636	Fred H. Walton, Jr.
Carl L. Hooper, Jr.	Harold T. Webb
Jack P. Huddle	Medicus S. Williams,
William E. Jenkins	Jr.
Charles P. Jones	Thomas R. York
Jack J. Jumper	Joseph E. Zaice
Richard L. Laybourne	Alfred W. Zielonka

The following-named distinguished military students 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 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Joseph G. McGlade
Gerald A. Ramthun

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States effective August 7, 1952, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Lee P. Moore, O1182197.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy retired, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term expiring June 30, 1956. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Phelps Phelps, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Angus Ward, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be consul general of the United States of America

Julian F. Harrington

To be consuls of the United States of America

William J. Barnsdale
Eugene V. Prostov

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty and ever-blessed God, who hast revealed Thyself as the Supreme Intelligence, we pray that we may begin, continue, and end each new day with a greater confidence in Thy wise and beneficent purposes.

May all who represent our beloved country in the affairs of government be guided in some special way by the eternal truth and wisdom and righteouness of God.

Give us the glad assurance that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide. To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise and glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 19[illegible], and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II"; and

S. 2198. An act relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens," with an amendment as follows: On page 14, strike out line 18.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 25, 1952, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy;

H. R. 5990. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; and

H. R. 7340. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT BETTENDORF, IOWA

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8194) to amend an act approved May 26, 1928,

relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this comes to the floor with the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act approved May 26, 1928, is hereby amended by adding at the end of the section the following: "Any State or public agency or political subdivision thereof that may have originally constructed said bridge as assignee of the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, and any State or public agency or political subdivision thereof that may have succeeded to the rights of such assignee and that may have taken over or acquired said bridge, is hereby authorized, and subject to approval of the pertinent plans by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army, to enlarge and reconstruct said bridge and approaches, including the construction of a separate but adjacent span across the Mississippi River and approaches thereto with interconnections with the original span, and to continue to charge tolls for transit over such bridge as so enlarged and reconstructed, subject to the limitations expressed in section 3 hereof, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches as so enlarged and reconstructed under economical management and to provide a sinking fund to amortize the cost thereof including interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of completion of such improvements, and after a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge and adjacent span shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls in accordance with such arrangement as may be mutually agreed upon by the public agency or political subdivision then owning said bridge and the State highway departments or other appropriate authorities of Iowa and Illinois, and, in connection with any such enlargement and reconstruction of said bridge and approaches thereto, shall have the right and power to enter upon and acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property as may be needed upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings for such condemnation shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 5 of the act approved May 26, 1928, is hereby amended by striking out all of said sentence after the words "operated free of tolls" and inserting in lieu thereof "in accordance with such arrangement as may be mutually agreed upon by the public agency or political subdivision then owning said bridge and the State Highway Departments or other appropriate authorities of Iowa and Illinois."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

GRANTING TO KAISER STEEL CORP. CERTAIN RIGHTS OF WAY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent-in-fee to certain other public lands, 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 2, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and insert "That such rights-of-way be subject to existing rights in conflict therewith and shall be subject to reversion to the United States if the rights-of-way are abandoned or not used for a continuous period of 7 years by said corporation or its successors in interest: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall attach and impose such further conditions on said rights-of-way, and promulgate such rules and regulations as he shall deem appropriate, consistent with the use of said rights-of-way for the purposes prescribed in this act."

Page 3, line 25, after "less", insert ": *Provided,* That such patent shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of all deposits of minerals together with the right of the United States, its agents, permittees, lessees, or assigns to enter upon, prospect for, mine, and remove such minerals under the laws of the United States and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further,* That said property shall revert in fee to the United States in the event that said property is not used for a continuous period of 7 years as a camp site or mill site or for other incidental purposes in connection with the mining operations of said corporation or its successors in interest."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are these Senate amendments?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added some additional reservations which grant certain rights-of-way to the Kaiser Steel Corp. These amendments have been cleared with the author of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who is the author?

Mr. ENGLE. The author of the bill is the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. The amendments have been take up with the minority side of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I heard the amendments read, they were more restrictive than the original bill?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no opposition on the part of either the Republican or Democratic side?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California if these rights are permanent rights inuring to the Kaiser Steel Corp. or are they only temporary rights?

Mr. ENGLE. They are temporary rights that can become permanent by a certain period of time, and the Senate put in the reservation which includes mineral rights.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 3268 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3268 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The tax imposed under this section shall not apply for any period beginning after June 30, 1952, with respect to any bowling alley, billiard table, or pool table maintained exclusively for the use of members of the Armed Forces on any property owned, reserved, or used by, or otherwise acquired for the use of, the United States if no charge is made for their use."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "(a)", insert "of the Internal Revenue Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill would exempt from the $20 a year occupational tax bowling alleys and billiard or pool tables where they are used exclusively by members of the Armed Forces on United States property and there is no charge for their use.

In the usual case, these alleys and tables are operated from profits derived from ships' service stores and post exchanges. Profits from these stores and exchanges are devoted to recreational programs for members of the Armed Forces, and the occupational taxes reduce funds available for these purposes.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO DISTILLED SPIRITS AND ALCOHOL

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6366) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the

receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification, and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this bill would enable rectifying plants to receive and store in bond distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines pending tax payment, and remove it for rectification and bottling, or for bottling without rectification, and to produce gin and vodka in bond.

At the present time rectifiers must pay taxes on these items before they receive them. Since rectifiers must keep on hand a sufficient supply of spirits, alcohol, and wines to carry on their operations, they have large amounts of capital tied up in taxes. Most large rectifiers are also distillers and operate liquor warehouses which are situated near their rectifying plant. Thus, they suffer no great disadvantage in complying with the requirement that all liquors brought to their rectifying plant must be tax-paid. However, those rectifiers who are not situated near the places of storage and tax payment must invest considerable capital in liquors which must be tax-paid and then shipped to them. This means that small rectifiers with limited capital and rectifiers located at some distance from bonded warehouses are working under a competitive disadvantage. This bill would alleviate this disadvantage by permitting rectifiers to establish in-bond departments, in which untax-paid liquors may be stored. To insure that only the amount of spirits, alcohol, and wines are kept on hand which are necessary to carry on operations, the bill provides that the tax must be paid on these products at the time of their withdrawal or within 1 year from their deposit in the in-bond department.

The bill also authorizes the use of untax-paid neutral spirits or alcohol produced at a proof of 190° or more in the production of gin or vodka in a separate part of the in-bond department, which would be designated as the "special process room." Distillers at the present time are permitted to use untax-paid spirits of their own production in manufacturing gin and vodka. This bill would provide equal treatment for rectifiers, and also, due to the loss of spirits which normally occurs in the manufacturing of gin and vodka, would relieve rectifiers from having to pay taxes on spirits which are lost.

The Treasury Department advised the Committee on Ways and Means that it had no objection to the enactment of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subchapter A of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by changing the designation of part IV to part V, and by inserting a new part IV as follows:

"PART IV—IN-BOND DEPARTMENT OF RECTIFYING PLANTS

"SEC. 2896. Withdrawal of spirits, alcohol, and wines in bond.

"(a) General: The Secretary may in his discretion, upon a showing of necessity, and upon the execution and filing of notices and bonds, authorize any qualified rectifier as defined in section 3254 (g) to withdraw and transfer in bond distilled spirits from any registered distillery, including fruit distillery (such registered distillery and registered fruit distillery being hereinafter referred to as "distillery") or internal revenue bonded warehouse, alcohol from any industrial alcohol plant or bonded warehouse, and wines from any bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom, to a separate portion of his rectifying plant (hereinafter referred to as the in-bond department) which shall be set apart and, except as provided in section 2897, used exclusively for the receipt and storage of such distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines pending tax payment and removal for rectification and bottling and packaging subsequent to rectification or for bottling and packaging without rectification.

"(b) Security of premises: The in-bond department shall be securely constructed and shall be separated from other portions of the rectifying plant or contiguous premises as regulations shall prescribe. Permanent storage tanks not located within a room or building, such as are authorized at bonded warehouses, may in the discretion of the Secretary be approved as a part of the in-bond department.

"(c) Control: The in-bond department of a rectifying plant shall be under the control of the District Supervisor of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division district in which the rectifying plant is located, and shall be in the joint custody of the storekeeper-gauger and the proprietor thereof, and shall be kept securely locked and shall at no time be unlocked or open or remain open except in the presence of such storekeeper-gauger or other person who may be designated to act for him. The keys to all Government locks shall remain at all times in the custody of such storekeeper-gauger or in the custody of the district supervisor or such other person as may be designated by the district supervisor.

"(d) Transfers to in-bond department: Distilled spirits may be transferred from any distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse, alcohol may be transferred from any industrial alcohol plant or bonded warehouse, and wines may be transferred from any bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant in approved containers and pipelines, as regulations may provide. The quantity of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines transferred to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant when added to the quantity of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines on deposit in such in-bond department shall not be in excess of that required to meet the needs, for not more than 1 year, of such plant or of one or more additional plants operated by a subsidiary or affiliate on contiguous premises.

"(e) Payment of taxes:

"(1) Basic taxes: The taxes imposed by sections 2800 (a) (1) and 3030 (a) shall, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), be paid by the rectifier at the time of withdrawal of the distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines from the "in-bond department" of the rectifying plant in which they were deposited.

"(2) Time limitation: The tax imposed on distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines deposited in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant shall be due and payable 1 year from the date of deposit therein unless earlier withdrawn: *Provided*, That in no event shall the total period of storage of distilled spirits in a bonded warehouse and in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant be in excess of the 8-year period prescribed by section 2879 (b).

"(f) Bond: Every rectifier intending to provide an in-bond department for the receipt and storage of untax-paid distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines for the purposes authorized by this section, or for the receipt, storage, and use of untax-paid alcohol for the purposes authorized by section 2897, shall, upon filing with the Commissioner his notice of such intention, and before withdrawing any untax-paid distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines from any place of manufacture or storage, execute a bond in the form prescribed by regulations, conditioned that he shall faithfully comply with all provisions of law relating to the duties and business of a rectifier, and shall pay all taxes and penalties for which he may become liable. The said bond shall be in a penal sum not less than the sum of: (1) the amount of the tax on distilled spirits (including gin and vodka), alcohol, and wines on deposit or on hand in the in-bond department of the rectifying plant and in transit thereto at any one time, plus (2) the amount of the tax on rectified products that the rectifier will be liable to pay in a period of 30 days: *Provided*, That the penal sum of such bond shall not exceed the sum of $200,000. The provisions of section 2815 (c), (d), and (e) shall so far as applicable apply to bonds required under this subsection.

"(g) Transfer of unused spirits, alcohol, and wines: Untax-paid distilled spirits (except gin and vodka subject to the tax imposed by section 2800 (a) (5)), alcohol, or wines on deposit in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant for which the rectifier has no use, upon discontinuance of the plant or other reason, may be transferred to an internal revenue bonded warehouse, an industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, or a bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom, respectively, as regulations may provide.

"SEC. 2897. Production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka.

"(a) Authorization: Any duly qualified rectifier who has provided on his rectifying plant premises an in-bond department in accordance with section 2896 may, under regulations, use neutral spirits or alcohol produced at a proof of 190° or more in the production of gin or vodka in a separate portion of such department (hereinafter referred to as the special process room) which shall be set aside and used exclusively for the purpose. The special process room shall be separated from other portions of the in-bond department or other contiguous premises and shall be constructed and secured as regulations shall provide.

"(b) Manufacturing process: The manufacturing process employed in the production of gin or vodka in the special process room shall be such as that authorized at registered distilleries and by which the spirits or alcohol shall pass through continuous, closed stills, tanks, pipes, and vessels until the finished gin or vodka is deposited in locked receiving tanks located in such room.

"(c) Payment of taxes: The taxes by section 2800 (a) (1) and by section 2800 (a) (5), if any, shall be paid by the rectifier at the time of withdrawal of the gin or vodka from the receiving tank in the Special Process Room and such gin and vodka shall, upon tax payment, be immediately removed from the in-bond department.

"SEC. 2898. Loss allowances.

"The provisions of sections 2901, 3113, and 3039 shall, insofar as applicable, apply in respect of losses of untax-paid distilled spir-

its (including gin and vodka), alcohol, and wines, respectively, occurring in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant or in transit thereto or therefrom.

"SEC. 2899. Regulations.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part."

EXTENSION OF OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2913 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "or in-bond department of a rectifying plant" following the world "warehouse" wherever it appears in such section.

(b) Section 2914 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "or in-bond department of a rectifying plant" before the comma following the word "warehouse."

(c) Section 3107 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "or to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant for beverage purposes only."

EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as restricting or limiting other provisions of the internal revenue laws.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 8, after line 7, insert the following:

"(d) Section 2878 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out 'Except as provided in section 2883' at the beginning of the section and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as otherwise provided by law.'"

Page 8, line 11, insert the following new sentence: "The provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 shall be applicable to all functions vested by this act in any officer, employee, or agency of the Department of the Treasury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Has unanimous consent been granted for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. I know there is considerable opposition to certain elements in it.

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.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. 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. 111]

Aandahl	Evins	Prouty
Abernethy	Fenton	Reece, Tenn.
Addonizio	Fisher	Richards
Albert	Frazier	Sabath
Allen, La.	Gore	Sasscer
Anderson, Calif.	Havenner	Steed
Aspinall	Herlong	Stigler
Bates, Ky.	Kennedy	Stockman
Beckworth	Lyle	Sutton
Burdick	Mansfield	Tackett
Carlyle	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carnahan	Nelson	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Welch
Dawson	Pickett	Wickersham
Dempsey	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8370, Rept. No. 2316) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8210, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that sections 111 through 114, ending at line 10 on page 11 of the bill, be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to be offered at this time?

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the committee adopted, tentatively at least, the Cole amendment which provided for individual ceilings on price control. This amendment has a lot of things in it that I am sure the Members are not familiar with or I am sure they would not have adopted the amendment. In view of that, the chairman of the committee requested Governor Arnall, for whom I am sure the House has a high regard, to comment on what that would mean in regard to enforcement of price ceilings, and I should like to read what Governor Arnall has to say about it. He said this:

It is my considered judgment that an amendment of this kind——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have not gone into this too thoroughly, but I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is against the rules of the House, which control the rules of the committee, to read letters from other than Members of Congress. We have been propagandized enough on this bill already.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Michigan objects to the reading of the letter, the question will then be put to the members of the Committee of the Whole for a decision. Does the gentleman object to the further reading of the letter?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; at this time I do object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the gentleman from California be permitted to proceed with the reading of the letter?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 103, noes 102.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. BOLLING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 141, noes 113.

So Mr. McKINNON was permitted to proceed with the reading of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the membership. I am sure there are many Members who are very desirous of getting all the information they can.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I suggest the gentleman read the entire letter.

Mr. McKINNON. The letter reads as follows:

It is my considered judgment that an amendment of this kind, if adopted, would throw a costly monkey-wrench into the food price-control machinery. It would come close to making it completely unworkable. Its effects can be simply stated:

For the consumer it would mean higher food prices. For small food retailers it

would mean real hardship. And enforcement of food price ceilings would become impossible.

More about each of these points in a moment. But first let me emphasize my belief that it is absolutely essential for the House to follow the lead of your committee and reject any attempt to put the Herlong amendment on an individual mark-up basis.

Individual mark-ups would raise food prices. That is why some food organizations and particularly big chain grocers want to use them. They don't like uniform mark-ups for groceries, and they don't like dollars-and-cents ceilings on beef. They want individual mark-ups because that way they will get higher prices.

I don't need to tell you that food prices are too high right now. They are over 13 percent higher than they were before Korea and in the areas where we don't have controls they are going still higher, heading toward an all-time high. I just cannot believe that Congress will take any action which would raise food prices even more.

I want to give you just one illustration of what individual mark-ups might mean. Safeway Stores, Inc., is one of the food organizations principally interested in this amendment. This company has filed a protest claiming that our dollars-and-cents ceilings for beef are too low. They have asked for higher beef prices, saying that their mark-ups before Korea were higher than present ceilings allow.

We have looked at the proposed prices in the Safeway protest, and this is what we find would happen to retail beef prices if we gave Safeway the individual mark-ups it claims it is entitled to:

(a) Round steak would go up 10 cents a pound in Portland, and 12 cents a pound in Dallas.

(b) Ground beef would go up 3 cents a pound in Portland and in Dallas.

(c) Chuck roast would go up 10 cents a pound in Portland and 4 cents a pound in Dallas.

I have given figures for the cities for which Safeway has given us the information. You can bet your bottom dollar that you would have similar results in Chicago, Birmingham, Miami, Boston, and Detroit.

It may be argued that Safeway's mark-ups are lower than they claim. That may well be, but how are we going to check it? I don't believe Congress is going to give us an appropriation to quintuple our enforcement staff so we can find out whether the individual mark-ups, which hundreds of thousands of sellers are using are the ones they are entitled to.

What kind of control will we have over beef prices if every seller has his own ceiling, and if the consumer has no way of knowing what that ceiling ought to be? The enforcement problem alone is enough to show that food ceilings dependent on individual mark-ups are completely undesirable.

Who is pushing for individual mark-ups? The big grocery chains. We haven't heard any such demand from the small retailer. On the contrary, this amendment will hurt the small retailer.

Right now a small retailer finds his ceiling for a beef cut by looking at the dollars-and-cents table in our regulation. He finds his ceiling for a can of peas by adding to his invoice cost a fixed mark-up set out in our regulation. In order to get his ceiling he doesn't have to have any records except his current purchase invoices; he doesn't have to dig out old records and labor through a series of mathematical computations; and he doesn't have to file anything with OPS.

If this proposal goes through, he will have to go back to his old records—if he has them—and determine his individual mark-ups on between 1,000 and 3,000 items and file pricing charts with OPS.

Most small retailers, according to the testimony of their own representatives, just do not have such records. The few small retailers who do have the records will be justifiably angry at the work, the nuisance, and the red tape which this proposal means.

Individual mark-ups are all right for some distributive trades where prices are stable and where records are available. But even in such businesses, mark-ups must be based on some date near the time when the regulation is issued. You simply cannot get records on individual mark-ups for the period before Korea, as this proposal requires.

We recently had an experience showing how small-business men feel about ceilings based on individual mark-ups. A retail liquor regulation provided that liquor retailers should esablish their ceilings by adding individual mark-ups as shown by their records. We got so many complaints from liquor retailers about the amount of work that this required that we had to revise the regulation to put retail liquor dealers on a uniform mark-up basis.

In the retail grocery field, it is virtually out of the question to maintain effective price control on an individual mark-up basis. Prices fluctuate from day to day, and selling price records are not generally available.

On previous occasions, we have shown that present ceiling-price regulations are designed to give grocers their traditional mark-ups. The margins now permitted them were fixed on the basis of the best information available as to pre-Korea practices. And we are about to complete a survey to determine whether adjustments—either upward or downward—are in order.

Approval of the individual mark-up provision is, therefore, neither necessary nor desirable. It would only lead to high prices for chain groceries and needless red tape for small retailers.

On top of the unnecessary labor with which businessmen would be saddled, there would be confusion twice confounded. OPS does not have the staff to check the individual filings required by this proposal. Nor could it possibly have enough enforcement people to check on compliance.

I am confident that if Congress is informed of the consequences of this high-food price, red-tape amendment, it will be overwhelmingly defeated. This is no time to raise the prices of food to housewives or to make the small-business man go through mountains of red tape just to satisfy a few food organizations.

I hope that you will call these considerations to the attention of the House if the individual mark-up amendment is offered on the floor.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS ARNALL.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the House decided by a teller vote to permit the reading of this letter. I submit that the letter should be read in its entirety; that is the point of order I make.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the decision made by the Committee. The Committee made the decision that the gentleman could read the letter within the time allotted to the gentleman of 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I did not hear it so stated when the motion was put, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question put to the Committee had nothing whatsoever to do with the time to be consumed by the gentleman from California. The Chair recognized the gentleman from California for 5 minutes; the question arose as to whether or not he could within that 5 minutes time read extraneous papers.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, when I objected to the reading of the letter I did not know what it contained. I had no idea what was in the letter; I merely thought that this Committee of the Whole should protest as strongly against lobbying on bills by administrative agencies as by any other segment of our economy.

It would be lamentable—now that Safeway is mentioned I shall mention Safeway—it would be lamentable if Safeway Stores were to be given 5 minutes on this floor to tell you why there should be these individual mark-ups; that is what we have legislative committees for.

Mr. Arnall appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and if he proved anything to the committee it was that Mr. Arnall in his position as Administrator of OPS is merely a public relations man and is not administering OPS.

I wish that the watchdog committee which we set up under this bill 2 years ago would ask Mr. Arnall how many hours he has spent at his desk in the last 2 months.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I cannot.

Mr. O'TOOLE. How many has he spent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Ask the press.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I am asking you.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They will tell you; they told me. The watchdog committee is set up for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this is an all-time job, this stabilizing of the economy of the United States, if it is to be done through direct controls. Mr. Arnall, as well as Mr. Putnam, showed a lamentable lack of information in respect to fundamental economics; not as much as you would expect the corner grocerman to have in respect to his business.

I attended a forum down at the Statler Hotel in which Mr. Arnall and Mr. Putnam spoke. Mr. Arnall convinced all of us that he was so lost in a labyrinth of red tape in his own office he did not know what he was doing. There were five-hundred-and-some-odd divisions, the heads of which he did not know, he could not recall their names and did not know them when they walked into his office. But you cannot get acquainted with the heads of all these divisions by making speeches all over the United States, and this letter that was read today is evidence of the fact he is in there not doing his job necessarily as Administrator but is more interested in lobby-

ing for continuance of controls than he is in the application of these controls under the direction of the Congress. That is why I object to that letter. Under the circumstances, with the man's lack of knowledge of the fundamentals of economics, in view of the fact he is at his desk so seldom, I did not think he should have the right to assume this Congress would give too much credence to his views on pending questions.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for quite a long time and this is the first time I have ever seen a point of order made objecting to the reading of a letter that was pertinent to the consideration of a bill. I never expected it and least of all from the very able senior minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but with all his faults I have a deep affection for him.

The gentleman did not attack the letter; he attacked the Administrator, Governor Arnall. Well, I consider that just a Republican statement about a Democratic official. Mr. Arnall gave some very good reasons why you should not adopt the Cole amendment. The gentleman who just made the statement in reference to that did not say a word about the letter, but made an attack upon the Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words as to what is going to happen if the House adopts the Barden amendment. The greatest purchaser in the United States or in the world of goods and services is the Government of the United States. In 8 months after Korea you appropriated $35,000,000,000 for defense, but because of inflation that shrunk in purchasing power to $28,000,000,000. We are appropriating $3,500,000,000 a month for defense. Before long it will go to $4,500,000,000, I am informed, and next year there will be appropriated $60,000,000,000. What will be the result of taking the price ceilings off of the strategic and critical materials that this Government has to purchase? There will be a spiraling rise and there will be supplemental appropriation after supplemental appropriation to make up the difference. The Government will lose billions of dollars if price ceilings are taken off, and the Government has no way to protect itself any more than the individual consumer. Because of that rise and because of the lack of purchasing power of our money there will be an increase in taxation for we have to get the materials.

When you vote on the Barden amendment I want you to think of that. Do you want to cripple the defense effort? Many people think we ought not to be making any defense effort; that we ought not to look to the future; that we ought to stick our heads in the sand as the ostrich does; see nothing, hear nothing, and know nothing.

I believe it would be a tragic mistake to take these ceilings off at this time and subject the Government to the will of the producers in the things it needs. There is no law on the statute books that will protect the Government; it has no means of protecting itself except by the action of this Congress. I want you to consider that when you come to vote on the Barden amendment, which I hope will be shortly.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that we cannot finally adopt an amendment in this Committee without having the Members once again attempt to bring it back upon the floor and discuss it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to this letter written on June 18 by Mr. Arnall to the chairman of our committee. The letter was written long before the House started consideration of the amendment which I offered. That is No. 1.

No. 2. The letter, in my judgment, is a flamboyant effort to deceive, to prejudice, to mislead, not only the membership of this body, but the people of the Nation. I want to show why and talk about the letter itself. Mr. Arnall says, "It is my understanding that some large food organizations are urging that the Herlong amendment be changed."

No. 3. Mr. Arnall knows and every person in the OPS knows as well as every person on the Committee on Banking and Currency knows that it is not just the large food organizations which are insisting upon this change. It is every retailer in this country. Every retailer, large and small, retailers who are in chain organizations, retailers who are independent, every single one of them have asked that this amendment be adopted by the House. And, why?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the grocery business.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In the grocery business as well as other retailers. Why? Because every other retailer and wholesaler in the country has the relief which the grocers have asked for in the Herlong amendment and in the Cole amendment. The other businesses believe in fairness and justice. Mr. Arnall says that for small retailers it would mean a real hardship. The small retailers have asked for the Cole amendment and are continuing to ask for it. Why? Because the other retailers of the country have the right to have a historical, individual mark-up. All should be in the same class.

Mr. Arnall further says:

> Who is pushing for individual mark-ups? The big grocery chains. We haven't heard any such demand from the small retailer.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this as strongly as I can: That is an untruth and Governor Arnall knows it is an untruth.

The Governor further said:

> If this proposal goes through, he will have to go back to his old records.
>
> Right now a small retailer finds his ceiling for a beef cut by looking at the dollars-and-cents table in our regulation.

Who fixes the price of groceries today? It is the supermarkets, the large grocery stores, of course, and the chains. Those prices are fixed by competition. Hundreds of items are selling under ceiling prices today. They are fixed by the large grocers, of course. Why? Because they have the opportunity to buy in greater amounts. The small grocery must meet those prices in order to stay in business. All the small grocer asks for is that he be permitted to have his individual historical mark-up in order that he may have the same type of profit that he had prior to Korea. Is not that fair? Is there anything unjust about it? He merely wants to be treated the same as other retailers.

I ask this question: If individual mark-ups are fair and proper for all other wholesalers and retailers, why are they not fair for this one group? This question has not, and will not be answered by Mr. Arnall or anyone opposing my amendment.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, never before in the history of the world has one nation carried the same measure of responsibility for the whole future of mankind that the United States carries today.

At a time when the threat to civilization comes from a highly organized and powerful ideological force, whose world plan is to divide man from man, class from class, nation from nation, the existing situation in the steel industry is a serious reflection of the weakness of this country in face of such strategy.

It has not been easy for me to reach the conclusion that I will support the amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 to request the President to use the provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. I do so however because of a fundamental belief in the democratic procedure of legislation. The law of the land, passed by Congress by a majority vote, must be given every opportunity to function. To suggest that the law should not be invoked because it may not be obeyed is to undermine the confidence of the Nation in the effectiveness and the whole process of the legislature.

This decision is made on a basis of what I believe to be right and not on a basis of expediency. It is made too in the interest of upholding the decision of Congress and with no thought for the possible loss of the votes of labor supporters who like myself have come honestly to feel that certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have become divisive and will continue to drive a wedge between labor and management.

Mr. Chairman, a standard has been set for our action in this House by our late respective colleague, James N. Wadsworth, at whose funeral it was said that he was a man "shorn of cheap expediency."

I am reminded of his prophetic words in 1943 when he addressed a Philadelphia audience after a showing of the Forgotten Factor. These are his words:

> The crisis, so far as our institutions in this country are concerned, will not end with victory on the field of battle. New difficulties will confront us—complications extraordinary; and if we do not work together with each other, but work apart, distrusting each other, we may tear down everything that we hold sacred in this country after we have defeated our country's enemies.
>
> The crisis is not tapering off. The going will be tougher before it is easier. It is

going to strain all our strength and demand all our spirit. We shall do the task so infinitely better if we do it together, hand in hand, trusting one another, having faith in one another.

At times it seems to me if our Nation is to endure, we must be resolute in sacrificing our selfishness for our country. Otherwise, we will sacrifice our country for our selfishness.

The issues at stake today go far beyond the immediate one, whether Congress should suggest to the President alternative methods of approach to the deadlock in the steel industry, with its causing suffering to all those involved and serious curtailment to the defense program.

The main issue is the challenge to us—the elected representatives of the people—to create the atmosphere in which men of divergent points of view can find unity in the highest interests of the Nation. That is the answer to the deadlock in steel. That is the answer for this Nation in a time of crisis.

The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act may be invoked; the economic and social systems of the country may be changed; the terms of contracts, wage agreements, and methods of collective bargaining can be altered; but without a new spirit no contribution will have been made toward bridging the chasms of bitterness and mistrust which divide and weaken this Nation. In a recent airline strike here in America, one of the contestants stated, "Bitterness gets so high no reasonable problem can be discussed."

If America is to fulfill its destiny as the defender of freedom and democracy, industry—labor and management together—must assume a new commitment to lay the foundations of unity in the Nation. This can only be born out of a fundamental change of heart on both sides.

Right across the world today thousands of ordinary men, leaders of labor and management alike, are finding a new factor which can be applied immediately, however difficult economic or national conditions may be, which creates unity of hearts and minds. This is no theory. From personal experience I know of the mass of evidence demonstrating the efficacy of this simple yet forgotten factor.

Negotiations opened by honest apology from both sides and continued with an adherence to the principles of absolute honesty, absolute unselfishness, and the simple idea of what is right instead of who is right, by men who have decided to seek the guidance of God in their lives, are producing a new industrial relationship and the answer to division.

Recently in this country there have been many remarkable instances. A labor leader, with statesmanlike qualities, solved the difficulties in his own company. Then with a new-found sense of responsibility and a conception of the true function of industry, was instrumental in bringing an answer to another industry. When asked to address a group of leading American industrialists, he said:

It is the function of labor to anticipate the needs of management in the best interests of the Nation, and so it is for management to meet the needs of labor. I still fight for the interests of labor, but decisions reached on the basis of what is right mean a fuller and more satisfying life for labor and management. An industrialist recently talked "of the steely selfishness of management which produced the bitterness of labor," and went on to say: "All my experience convinces me that without widespread trust and confidence we face industrial chaos. We cannot trust unless we become trustworthy, and that demands change and acceptance of moral standards."

I am reminded of a great American, a world statesman, who has said:

Human nature can be changed, that is the root of the answer. National economies can be changed, that is the fruit of the answer. World history can be changed, that is the destiny of our age.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, if the President sees fit to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in this emergency, we shall have a so-called cooling-off period of 80 days. These days are a time of grace giving both sides an opportunity to apply the new factors here discussed. In my judgment only on the assumption that these factors will be given trial can our request of the President be justified.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that Governor Arnall is one of the best administrators in Government today. He is one of the few administrators I have found who is aware of the fact that many of the bureaucrats in the various departments are very contemptuous of the people and the rights of the people, and especially so of their elected representatives to whom the people come when they have problems with those departments. I think I would be remiss if I did not say that Governor Arnall, when I have called on him with a problem from a constituent, has been very alert to solve that problem and find an answer for it. I have never called down there when I have not found him at his desk. But I would like to say this: Any administrator must do some public-relations work by the very nature of the job he has. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan that I visited the office of another administrator last November in Paris—an administrator by the name of Eisenhower. I found that his office was crowded with employees and policymakers whose names he did not know, and I found that he was frequently away from his desk on public-relations missions, not only in the immediate vicinity of his office but all over the world. Of course, then, he was busy, too, on another mission plotting in a not so public way with certain sections of the Republican Party. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan, he was busily engaged most of the time with the eastern internationalist wing of that party to steal the nomination from the very Republicans who have carried the banner of the Republican Party through 20 lean years. I might say further that, in my opinion, the mumbo-jumbo artists who are managing Mr. Eisenhower's campaign care nothing for him or his principles. They merely want to use his name, if possible, as a springboard to power. Does anyone think that the Eisenhower bureaucrats are superior to bureaucrats in general?

Specifically, on this amendment—the Cole amendment—I am interested in the small retailer. I am interested in decontrol as soon as it is practicable and possible to decontrol. But I have served on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have not had one letter from one small retailer—not the first letter—in support of the Cole amendment because, as was pointed out here, there is no small retailer who has the records and the bookkeeping facilities to find out what his markup would be if the Cole amendment is adopted.

Any small retailer who has any knowledge of price-control law will tell you how it is far more simple and more expedient and that he would rather have a dollar-and-cents mark-up so that he would know exactly where he stands.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Is it not true that in the rather lengthy hearings which our committee held, no representative of a small-business group appeared before our committee and asked for the Cole amendment? We had in our committee two statements; one from a Mr. Bauer, head of the Retail Meat Dealers' Association, and a Mr. Draft, of the National Association of Retail Grocers, who both made statements to the committee, but neither asked for the Cole amendment nor desired the Cole amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think that is essentially the fact. I think that this is essentially a chain store amendment. They are the people who will profit by this amendment.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The committee heard from the retailers in the distribution of milk, did they not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And Mr. Arnall heard from them, too, did he not, and he will not give them their mark-up.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman in that feature, but that has nothing to do with this retail food business.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is a part of the mark-up in the price of the commodity, whatever business the man may be in.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think there is a big problem in the mark-up on milk, but I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] believes for a minute that the Cole amendment will give any relief in that situation. I think there is a real problem there which the small milk dealer has against the big chain dealers, but this amendment will not give any relief to him.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] I would say that both of those organizations represent small retailers and

both of them in their statements support the theory on which the Cole amendment was adopted. That is the individual, historical mark-up.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman I have talked to some small retailers about this, and they tell me they do not have the facilities to determine the mark-up under the Cole amendment.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House should be aware of this particular fact in reference to the letter that the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] read to us a few minutes ago. The gentleman read it to the House, and as I understood it, and probably as many of you understood it, as if it were an expression of the Director of OPS written to the chairman of the committee yesterday on some action which the House had taken on the bill before us yesterday. That is not true.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. In just a moment. After I have made my statement I will yield.

The fact of the matter is that the letter was written on June 18 by the Director of OPS to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in anticipation of some action that the committee or the House might take on this bill, that would give the right to individual retailers for their historic mark-ups. In reading the letter I find that Mr. Arnall is trying to give retailers some relief from the red tape that is required by his office by saying that the individual mark-up would burden the retailer with a lot of bookkeeping and a lot of detail that he would not have to go through if the individual mark-up was not guaranteed.

Now, that is very considerate of Mr. Arnall, but it does not give the retailer the right to add to his cost of his products a fair addition that he should in order to establish the price. Regardless of that, let me say that if the Cole amendment were adopted and if the Herlong amendment were adopted, and even if this bill is made more stringent than it is now, regardless of all this action, the public is going to determine the price of food by supply and demand, whether price control is in effect or not.

It is that way now; you can buy almost any commodity if you search the market enough at below the ceiling set by OPS. So you have the over-all imposition of responsibility on the retailer and wholesaler to keep a lot of books and go through a lot of red tape to keep a Federal bureau operating with some 16,000 employees at a cost to the taxpayers of something like $100,000,000.

In relation to the individual mark-up, I received from my district in southern California a complaint of the last increase in ceilings that was approved by OPS on certain food products. They said it was strictly propaganda for the reason that every item on which ceilings were increased were selling from 2 to 5 cents below OPS ceilings at the time; there was no reason to increase the ceiling; they did not want it; they could not raise their prices to the ceilings, for the public would not pay them. The public would not pay them because the goods were in ample supply. So I think the House should realize that this letter is not one that was writen last night because of some action we took in the House yesterday.

The Cole amendment is not going to change the fundamental law of supply and demand, and the public is going to determine how much the retailer can add to the cost of his product. He has got to put a price on it at which it will sell. So we should cease laboring under the impression that OPS is doing a favor to retailers and wholesalers by saying that they do not have to do all this bookkeeping.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a fact, is it not, that basic commodity prices all over the world have broken substantially in the last few weeks?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a fact that people have been trying to unload their inventories all over this country, this stuff that is in these retail stores, and we find that there is a breaking market. Everyone knows what happens when there is this inventory unloading; you cannot keep the price up by regulation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The demand will determine the price insofar as the public is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised there are seven amendments at the Clerk's desk at this time.

Mr. SPENCE. I ask that the amendments be considered; I ask that the Clerk read the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The mere fact that an amendment is at the Clerk's desk does not mean that it is pending; somebody has to offer an amendment before it can be considered.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title of the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, are there amendments pending to the section upon which debate has just been closed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are three amendments pending that have not been offered by Members.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this title and I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to speak on it.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the action the Committee just took closed debate on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, but the gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the next section and I desire recognition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to debate these amendments. I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment agreed to by the committee. May it be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York offer an amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 11, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"Subsection (B) of section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs and of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration thereof.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I propound a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to discuss this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes only to add to the duties of the Joint Committee on Defense Production under section 712 of the existing law, also known as the watchdog committee, the additional duty of study "of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act." This duty being in addition to the duty of the committee as presently authorized to study and review the program under the act. The bill is essentially one to protect consumers against inflation.

Everyone is a consumer but in addition there are millions of pure consumers in our country among the adult population. For example, there are 4,500,000 social-security annuitants, 6,000,000 Government workers and approximately 2,500,000 receiving veterans compensations and pensions in the shape of disability and death benefits. In addition, there are millions of widows, orphans and retired persons living on fixed incomes. To this number may be added the almost 25,000,000 who are known as white collar workers and whose salaries traditionally lag behind living costs. Under my amendment the watchdog committee would study the impact upon them of the prices allowed under the Defense Production Act.

I believe that this amendment is especially necessary in view of the evident temper of the House and Senate for

widespread decontrol of prices while leaving the machinery for price and wage stabilization. This has not been accomplished in the bill now before the House but probably will be before it becomes law in view of the general temper of both Houses. My amendment takes on an added significance and importance under these circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 61, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY: On page 9, line 24, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 112. Section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'No rule, regulation, order, or policy issued under this act shall direct that preference be given to the placement of procurement in geographic areas designated as areas of current or imminent labor surplus, unless such rule, regulation, order, or policy specifies that in each individual procurement to be so placed a study shall be made of the skilled labor supply and the production facilities available in the industry involved and in the geographic area which would be deprived of the procurement contract through such preference, and that if such study shows that skilled labor and adequate production facilities are available in that geographic area for the production of the item or items to be acquired by the Federal Government through the subject procurement preference shall not be given any other area. Any such rule, regulation, order, or policy heretofore issued is hereby rescinded'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. It is not germane. The amendment seeks to amend the general statute. It does not amend a particular item of the bill. It is not germane to the sections either preceding or succeeding or that portion of the bill against which it is aimed. It does not come within the four squares of the purpose of this legislation. It is a matter that is peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. It is a new section to the bill. Even if it bore a direct relation to the bill—and made the question somewhat difficult of determination—certainly there is no question but that the amendment is offered in a wrong place. It should have been offered earlier. It comes too late. It cannot now be considered.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the amendment is germane to the bill because section 704 of the Defense Production Act allows the President to make such rules and regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the act. The amendment refers to that section of the bill referring to orders and regulations. It simply straightens out a situation that has existed which needs correction and which is causing great hardship in some areas of the country. A result has been obtained by the issuance of an Executive order, and it is my sense and my belief that the Congress has the right, and the proper right, when it is legislating, to legislate to make corrections of improprieties or of injustices which have occurred through the issuance of Executive orders which are issued in implementing the legislation originally enacted by the Congress. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the point of order does not apply and that the amendment should be considered on its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] offers an amendment on page 9, line 24 of the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment is not germane.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] and the Chair has also had an opportunity to reread section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to which the gentleman proposes his amendment.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is not germane at this point in the bill. Section 704 authorizes the President to make such rules and regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act. As the Chair understands the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, the gentleman is proposing a substantive change in the law, and the proposal would not be germane at this point in the bill.

Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my amendment modifying defense manpower policy No. 4 will not be brought before the House for a vote because of the Chair's ruling. When this issue was before us last Friday in voting on the amendments offered by the distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Georgia [Mr. POTTER and Mr. LANHAM] many of the Members of the House, including myself and others from the California delegation, were under a misapprehension as to the possible future effects of the policy on our own districts and on our States. If my amendment had come to a vote those Members would, I am sure, have appreciated the opportunity to pass on the matter again in the light of later evidence which has reached us.

Just before the House went into session last Friday, and knowing that manpower policy No. 4 would be an issue before the Committee that day, a group of California Members met with representatives of Government agencies administering the policy, in my office. In the discussion that morning strenuous attempts were made to convince those Members present that manpower policy No. 4 would, both in the long run and in the immediate future, have a beneficial effect on industry in California and in our own districts. We were told that within a very short time the major industrial areas in California would move into group 4 classifications as areas of labor surplus, and that when that happened we would be eligible for preference under policy No. 4 in placing Government contracts. We were also told that the New York area, the major surplus labor area now competitive with California industries which have suffered from the policy, particularly the shipbuilding and electronics industries, would soon be out of the group 4 classification and would no longer be able to take contracts from us.

On the basis of that supposedly authentic information we went to the floor and voted on whether policy No. 4 should be retained or eliminated. A check since made with the Bureau of Employment Security field offices in California discloses that there is small possibility that California industrial areas will move into a group 4 classification at any time in the near future. This report is completely at variance with the information we were given here by Bureau representatives. While I do not wish to make charges on the floor naming names, I do want to go on record as personally deeply resentful of what I consider to be a deliberate attempt on the part of certain of the agency representatives at last Friday's meeting to mislead the California representatives as to the true situation. No matter whether the attempt was made from misguided zeal to preserve the policy, or from ignorance, there can be no defense for that type of misrepresentation. I want here and now to condemn the action in the strongest terms.

Defense manpower policy No. 4 as it is now administered is a bungling effort. Its aim is to preserve labor skills and industrial facilities in areas suffering from lack of work due to dislocations produced by the defense emergency. What it now does is to shift contracts away from skilled labor and essential facilities into areas where there is an excess labor supply which may be composed of bartenders, beauticians, elevator operators and doormen. It creates distressed labor conditions within essential industries in new areas, while for the most part the only relief it brings is to areas where the unemployed labor is largely unskilled. Unless the formula I have proposed in the amendment just ruled out of order is put into effect, the policy will never help the defense effort. It is certainly hurting it now. It causes confusion, uncertainty, and resentment among essential producers in areas not certified under the policy to have an excess of labor. It causes disaster in one-industry towns when a big con-

tract is taken from them and shifted elsewhere. It takes sorely needed contracts from distressed industries struggling to keep their skilled labor working, as is the case with the shipbuilding industry on the west coast. The policy is, in short, a blundering attempt to cure a slight headache, which, in the process of cure brings acute and disabling attacks to the other vital parts of our industrial body.

Although the House has been deprived of the chance to direct a change in the policy, I call upon the Office of Defense Mobilization and the administration to bring about its elimination or drastic revision. The harmful effects of policy No. 4 are rapidly snowballing—in spite of our 98° weather. The number and value of contracts shifted as a result of preference under the policy is mounting daily. California has already lost millions of dollars in vital contracts and stands to lose millions more. The evidence that the policy has misfired cannot now be overlooked. It is high time for an overhaul—and the officials charged with the responsibility should see to it without delay.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 9, after line 16, add the following:

"SEC. 111 (b) Subsection (c) of section 109 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951 which amends section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'and provides for extending natural gas for house heating to amputee veterans, other hardship cases, and totally disabled individuals'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the committee, but personally I have no objection to the amendment, and I do not think the committee has.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, some people refuse to learn from experience. We all know what happened to prices when OPA came to an end.

Advocates of the suspension of price controls persist in the erroneous claim that you need no price controls when items are selling under ceiling and that the suspension of such price controls on such items will not affect the prices thereof.

The proof is directly to the contrary. On June 5, 1952, because of the terrific pressures and demands on OPS the price of potatoes was decontrolled. The prices immediately went up to well over the ceiling price. We were told that was only temporary and as soon as the black marketeers got rid of their potatoes the prices would drop. They were right.

The prices did drop for a day or two and then they climbed right on up again. Today, exactly 3 weeks after potato prices were decontrolled, potatoes are selling at $2 to $4 per cwt., more than they were selling for on June 5, 1952, the difference in prices varying in accordance with the kind of potatoes and the market in which they are being sold.

What happened to potatoes will happen to every commodity when you remove price control before the end of the emergency.

The attacks we heard today on Governor Arnall were entirely unwarranted. They remind me of the young lawyer who was warned by the experienced trial practitioner, that if he tried a case that was weak on the facts, to argue the law and if it was weak on the law, to argue the facts, and if it was weak on both the facts and the law, to attack his adversary. Having no better argument to offer in support of their position, the advocates of price decontrol now attack the administrator.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the question we are deciding here today is of the greatest importance to the people of the United States. It involves our economic well-being and our security.

If all danger of inflation had disappeared—if there were no possibility that the prices all of us must pay for our daily necessities would shoot up, I would be for removing all unnecessary burdens from our business community. But is the danger over? We have heard a great deal about commodities which are selling below their legal ceiling prices. But it is a fact that this past spring 50 percent of all the things that make up the Consumer Price Index—our best measurement of the cost of living—were still at their peak or very near it. Twenty-one percent of these commodities were only 2 percent below their all-time high levels. Less than 10 percent of these items were as much as 10 percent below their peaks. These are the results of a study made early this spring by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Since then, the cost-of-living index has advanced another 0.6 percent. It stands today only a fraction of a percent below its all-time high. Are these facts indications that there are no pressures pushing prices up?

Freight rates recently went up again. These rates have increased 16 percent since January 1951. This has forced OPS, in many cases, to grant price increases to compensate for greater transportation costs.

Since enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1951, thousands of industries have applied to OPS for higher ceilings based on the Capehart amendment formula. Do these industries want higher ceilings when they foresee the clear possibility of producing and selling at lower prices?

There is another aspect of this question which worries me even more than the possibility of increases in the cost of living.

It seems hardly necessary to recall that what we are considering today is part of the Defense Production Act. Price and wage controls have a very definite bearing on our ability to carry out our present defense production program. And we must be able to carry out this program. On that point there is no argument. No one would disagree to the proposition that we must be strong enough to resist aggression—that we must be able to negotiate only from a position of overwhelming strength.

The inflationary period we endured during the months immediately following the outbreak in Korea took two billion out of every ten billion the Congress appropriated for defense. Should another inflationary spiral of the same intensity develop this fall it would add more than nine billions to the cost of our security, at the present rate of spending. By October, the additional cost might be $12,000,000,000.

Another bout with inflation would seriously hinder our ability to finish up the job of building up our defenses.

To tinker with the machinery set up to prevent the reoccurrence of other inflationary periods seem to be foolhardy under present world conditions. The situation in Korea has not improved despite our fnfinite patience at the conference table. While we have been trying to bring about an armistice there, Communist forces have built up tremendously. Only yesterday our Secretary of Defense warned that Communist China's air fleet has more than 2,000 planes. Our top military and diplomatic leaders have warned us of the "evil pattern visible today both in the Far East and in the West."

Is it good statesmanship, is it wise to do anything that might weaken our economic health under these circumstances?

One of the main arguments advanced for removal of all price and wage control machinery at this time is that these temporary controls impose heavy burdens on our industrial and business communities. So they do. But this is a period of national emergency. In such periods, all of us must accept extra burdens.

Our present price stabilization machinery is geared to suspend ceilings on commodities that are selling below legal ceilings and which do not threaten to climb to those ceilings in the foreseeable future.

Such a system of selective relaxation of controls would remove all unnecessary burdens from our business and industrial communities whenever and wherever it is safe to do so. Is not this wiser than to destroy the entire machinery, built at the cost of many millions of dollars? Let us keep in mind that if we destroy this machinery, we may not have the opportunity to rebuild it in time, should inflation again threaten our defense program and our standards of living.

I do not doubt for a minute the sincerity and good intentions of those who sincerely believe controls are no longer needed. Neither do I doubt the patriotism and sincerity of those who think inflation is still the main threat to our economic strength. Being as impartial as one can be, it must be recognized that there is at least a serious difference of opinion on this point. While such difference lasts, is it wise to knock down the fences we have been building against this danger? Does a prudent businessman cancel his fire insurance just when some well-qualified people tell him that there is a fire smoldering in his plant?

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, June 25, 1952.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for calling to my attention today that some Member of the Congress has expressed the view that I have said that the emergency is no longer with us, and that price and wage controls are no longer needed. I am sure that any Member of the Congress who said this was honest in his impression of my views, but he was erroneously informed as to my views. I have never made any such statement, at any time, in any place. On the contrary, I believe that the emergency is still with us, and that price and wage controls are still needed.

This is a high matter of legislative policy, now being considered by the Congress, and each Member must exercise his own honest judgment. I am not writing you this letter to attempt to influence anybody. But since you inform me that my views have been referred to in the course of debate, I want to set the record straight on what they are.

In the January 1952 Annual Economic Review published by the Council of Economic Advisers and transmitted to the Congress, of which I was one of the signatories as chairman of the council, a strong argument for the continuation of price and wage controls is contained on pages 144–148. The argument for their continuance now is at least as strong as in January, because business conditions now are stronger than in January and the cost of living is now higher than in January.

In my printed testimony on January 23, 1952, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I strongly urged the continuation of price and wage controls.

Testifying in March 1952 before the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I stated on page 285 of the published hearings that we should "hold on to and keep in good working order the variety of anti-inflationary tools which are now in active use" and that "I think it would be most imprudent now to get rid of these tools."

In the course of the same hearings (p. 204) I placed price and wage stabilization importantly on the list of necessary anti-inflationary measures in these times.

The economic situation now is stronger than it was in March, defense outlays are higher and rising, unemployment is lower, and the Government deficit is rising. For all of these reasons, anyone who favored price and wage controls in March should certainly favor them now, and I do.

A couple of weeks ago, I submitted an article for publication in the New York Times, which has not yet been published, in which I indicate the necessity for maintaining the kind of economic controls that we now have.

In the current draft of the Midyear Review by the Council of Economic Advisers, which is being prepared for issuance in mid-July, the retention of price and wage controls is urged.

I have consistently advised the President, and the stabilization officials, as well as any Member of the Congress who may have asked for my advice, that it is much too early to get rid of price and wage controls.

In an oral presentation, which I made to the President's National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy on June 16, I expressed my view to the assembled group of leaders of industry, agriculture, and labor that it is much too early to get rid of price and wage controls.

Consequently, it is clear that this is the position which I have constantly taken; and nobody can produce any statement that I have made anywhere taking a contrary position.

More generally, and in response to what you said to me on the telephone today, I certainly do not believe that the emergency is over. On the contrary, I have been saying all over the country that the emergency is still with us, and that no danger could be so great as the danger of our relaxing prematurely. In fact, that is the main theme of the New York Times article which I submitted a couple of weeks ago and which will appear shortly.

Let me repeat that I do not want to engage in dispute with any Member of the Congress or to intrude upon the legislative function. But in response to your specific inquiry of me today, I have felt bound to transmit to you my actual views with respect to price and wage controls at this time.

Very sincerely yours,
LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, June 26, 1952.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Since writing to you yesterday, I have had opportunity to read page 8067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25. On this page, there is quoted an excerpt from a news report in the New York Journal of Commerce of June 20, 1952, reporting upon an extemporaneous talk which I made on June 19 to a national group of business editors.

The excerpt quoted from the New York Journal of Commerce news account does not say that I am against the continuation of price and wage controls. It merely says that the expansion of production has been even more important than the controls in maintaining the economy on an even keel; this is true and I have always said it. My statement that there is no serious danger of inflationary pressures of a serious and over-all character over the next year, and that we can maintain price stability, is predicated upon maintaining the controls which have been in effect since early 1951 and which have helped to maintain price stability since that time.

As a matter of fact, the news story in the Journal of Commerce on June 20 contained two paragraphs immediately following the limited portion of the news story quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 8067. In other words, the quotation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD did not go far enough to show my views correctly. These two additional paragraphs in the Journal of Commerce news story read as follows:

"In declaring that there is no danger of booming inflation during the next months, the council chairman injected the customary warning that his prediction could be upset by a marked worsening in international conditions or a sudden shift in consumer psychology.

"At the same time, he said that because of these dangers he would not torpedo the tattered remnants of the controls program."

The foregoing quotation makes it absolutely clear that even the Journal of Commerce news story left no doubt that I am in favor of the retention of the remnants of the controls program which was still in effect on June 19, despite previous weakening, and that I am not in favor of the torpedoing of price and wage controls.

Let me emphasize again, as I did in my letter to you yesterday, that I am simply responding to your request for information about my views, and do not desire to engage in any debate with any Member of Congress or to intrude in any way upon legislative functions. If any Member of Congress has conveyed an erroneous impression of my views, I am sure that this was done unintentionally.

Very sincerely yours,
LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.

When naked Communist aggression forced America into the Korean conflict, this Congress took prompt and effective action to ward off a disastrous inflation and preserve a sound economy by sponsoring a price stabilization program which was enacted and has been maintained throughout the period of the Korean struggle. As a result, the soundness of our American dollar has been maintained, the disruption of our civilian economy minimized, and America's internal stability and strength preserved. And all this was achieved while our defense production program was notably advanced.

America's internal stability is a vital front in its defense against Communist aggression; and only selfish, irresponsible leadership would jeopardize America's future by premature relaxation of measures designed to prevent the undermining and crippling of that stability. American defenses for peace can only be as effective as its economy is strong. The military front is only an extension of the home front.

We must make ourselves militarily secure, safeguard our economy from the dangers of runaway inflation with all its consequent social chaos and human ruin.

Only a strong America can be a free America, and provide the world leadership needed to combat the growing menace of international communism.

Do not scrap controls—if you do you will present Stalin with a priceless boon in the Kremlin's drive for world conquest.

[From the Washington Star of June 25, 1952]

UNITED STATES LEADERS DOUBT LESSENING OF RISK OF WAR WITH RUSSIA

The possibility of war with Russia has not lessened in the past year, the Nation's top military and diplomatic leaders believe.

Their views on the subject were given to the House Appropriations Committee during hearings on a bill financing the foreign-aid program. The committee, which took the testimony in closed session, made parts of it public yesterday.

While none of the witnesses was overly pessimistic, most of them cautioned against a slowing down of the aid program at a time when the defenses of the free world are being built up with American help.

Here is what they said when asked about "the possibility of war:"

LOVETT SEES EVIL PATTERN

Defense Secretary Lovett: "It seems to me that there is an evil pattern visible today both in the Far East and in the west * * * and that pattern is the violence and the reckless character of the propaganda war which is conducted by the Soviets and their satellites. I believe it is recognized that an essential part of the military strategy of the Communists is the initial build-up of a strategic propaganda barrage the degree of tension developed is greater than it was 1 year ago."

Averell Harriman, Mutual Security Director: "I think if the Congress appropriates adequate sums of money for carrying forward the program, it (the possibility of war) is substantially less."

HAVE CHANCE TO ACT

Secretary of State Acheson: "We now have a very good chance to make certain that no such tragedy (as control of most of the world by an aggressive tyranny) will ever occur * * * throughout most of the world, our hands are not tied. We have a chance to act, while action still counts. We have an opportunity to create an edifice of strength which will shelter our own security and foster the continued growth of the ideals and institutions which we cherish."

W. J. Kenny, Deputy Mutual Security Director: "I would say the stresses are as great today as they have ever been."

COMMENT ON THE TALLE AMENDMENT

This amendment would terminate all price control on June 30, 1952, except for materials that are allocated or rationed.

In effect, this amendment would end all the protection against inflation which the Government now provides for the consumer. It would terminate most price control.

The exception provided for materials under allocation or rationing would not preserve price control where it is most needed. Allocation and rationing means that the businessman is told to whom he may sell his goods, how much of them and, perhaps, for what purpose. So ruthless an interference with the free market is justifiable only where a material is needed for the defense program and its supply is so short that defense needs could not be met without allocation.

But the general inflationary trend resulting from the defense program causes price pressure for many commodities whose allocation would not be justified.

Bread and meat prices may rise 5 or 10 or 20 percent, causing hardship to many consumers, but, under this amendment, their prices could not be controlled unless they were also rationed.

Fencing wire or cotton-ginning machinery may be raised in price unreasonably—and nothing could be done about it under this amendment unless farmers and ginners were also made to submit to the needless red tape of allocation.

In fact, this amendment would remove all protection of price control from consumers, farmers, and most businessmen.

Every Member who wants to be on record against price control should vote for this amendment. Every Member who wants to protect the country against inflation should vote against it. This amendment should be defeated.

The Talle amendment is shortsighted.

It is based on the theory that prices will go up only when there is a shortage of supply.

I hope that the memory of this House is not short enough to fall for a theory which has so recently been proven completely wrong before our own eyes.

There was no shortage of anything after Korea. You could buy all you wanted. But prices went up, and fast.

There was no shortage of rubber; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 187 percent.

There was no shortage of wool; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 118 percent.

There was no shortage of cotton print cloth; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 58 percent.

There was no shortage of beef cattle; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 30 percent.

There was no shortage of lard; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 84 percent.

It is true that there was acute international tension and fear of war at that time. But, is there no tension today? Can we be sure that there will be no fear of war next week or next month, or next September or October?

Prices could skyrocket again in September or October. The American people would not want that to happen. But the Government could not do anything about it if the Talle amendment were enacted.

The Talle amendment must be voted down.

PRICES WILL GO HIGHER WITHOUT CONTROLS

First. Businessmen are asking OPS for higher ceiling prices.

Food retailers want higher prices.

Milkmen want higher prices.

Packers want higher prices.

Machine manufacturers want higher prices.

Gasoline refiners want higher prices.

Cement manufacturers want higher prices.

Second. National security expenditures will increase $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 during the next year.

Before Korea they were $17,000,000,000 per year—6 percent of our national output.

In the first quarter of 1952 they were $47,000,000,000—14 percent of our national output.

Next year they will be $65,000,000,000—18 percent of our national output.

Add to this a vast expansion of private facilities.

You cannot dump that much added spending on an economy which is already operating practically at capacity and expect prices to control themselves.

Third. Lifting price control will raise prices by causing scare buying.

Right after Korea:

There were no shortages.

The budget was balanced.

Defense spending had not really started.

Yet, people were scared of higher prices.

They rushed out and bought goods they didn't need.

They bid up prices.

Prices rose 8 percent in 7 months.

Today people are confident and savings are at record levels.

If price controls are lifted, they will be scared again.

They will spend instead of saving. They will bid up prices.

WITHOUT CONTROLS PRICES WILL GO UP EVEN IF THERE ARE NO SHORTAGES

First. Right after Korea, prices went up when there were no shortages.

After Korea the budget was balanced; defense spending had not really started; there were no shortages.

Yet prices went up 8 percent in 7 months.

Second. Prices are pressing ceilings and businessmen are asking OPS for higher prices in areas where supplies are plentiful.

There is no milk shortage, yet milkmen want higher prices.

There is no oil shortage, yet oilmen want higher prices.

There is no cigarette shortage, yet cigarette men want higher prices.

Third. Prices will go higher because demand will be high even if materials are plentiful.

(a) Defense spending will increase fifteen to twenty billion dollars to a total of $65,000,000,000 within a year. This will mean more dollars to bid up prices.

(b) If controls are removed people will start scare buying just like they did after Korea. This will increase demand and push up prices.

The issue is prices—not supplies, and prices will go up if controls are removed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard certain criticisms, and what has been said regarding Hon. Ellis G. Arnall, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. I feel it is my duty, and it certainly is a privilege to rise at this point to his defense and to refute what has been said regarding his work here. Mr. Arnall is a distinguished Georgian, a former Governor of our great State, I have known him all of his life; he was born and reared and still resides in my home town. He is a man of honor, integrity, and courage, and possesses the highest educational qualifications, and can hold his place anywhere with any man in this country.

I happen to know what time he is devoting to the duties of his office. I have made many appointments with him for people who sought his advice and his instruction regarding price matters. I know of many conferences he has had with them after supper, at late hours in the evening, when he could not get to them in the daytime. If anyone says he is running around the country only acting as a public-relations officer, that person simply does not know what he is talking about. No man in this country is better versed in price-control matters. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BROWN, vice chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee has told me that no witness who testified before that committee had a better knowledge or keener appreciation of his work nor was more sincere in his efforts.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield for an observation?

Mr. CAMP. Gladly.

Mr. COX. I simply want to say that I never voted for Governor Arnall in my life. Politically speaking, we have been as far apart, almost, as the poles. I expect that I have criticized him as much as any person living. But I do feel it is fair to say that as Office of Price Stabilization Administrator he has been the most courteous man I have known in the carrying along of his work in Washington. I have confidence in his integrity. I have the faith to believe that he is doing his utmost to do a good job, and therefore I regret the criticism, indirect though it may be, but criticism nevertheless which has been aimed at him.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say that any job which Ellis Arnall undertakes to do, he will try to do it to the best of his ability, and his ability is great.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I have known Ellis Arnall for a great many years. I know of no man who has been more painstaking and more efficient in carrying out his duties, not only as Governor of his State, because he was a great credit to his State when he was Governor, but in carrying out his duties as head of the OPS. It is a very difficult and arduous task, but he has carried on forthrightly and honestly and with the greatest integrity.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I have not been acquainted with Governor Arnall for a long period, but it has impressed me that everything you say about him is true. He is a high-class gentleman who has a public spirit, and he is trying to carry out the duties of his office to the very best of his ability. He is subjected to that criticism which falls on every man who offers himself for public service, and it falls upon the best just as it falls upon the worst.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I have known ex-Governor Arnall, the present price administrator, for a number of years. As a matter of fact, since he was a young man. I want to join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] in what he has said in praise of Ellis Arnall as well as with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and other Members who have spoken. I have the utmost confidence in his integrity. I know he is an able and capable man trying to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately prior to the closing of debate on title I.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 11, line 20, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 202. Section 204 (j) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(4) No action taken under this section 204 (j) shall be valid unless the President certifies that the vacancy ratio in low and middle income housing accommodations in the area to be affected by such action is 10 percent or more of the available habitable housing accommodations in that area.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 18, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11 strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'"

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, it will not require 5 minutes to explain this amendment. The amendment simply provides that on the 30th of September next rent control will cease to be in existence in all areas except in critical defense areas or in those areas where the local governing authorities ask that Federal rent control be extended.

In order to get rid of rent control under the present law, where Federal rent control is in effect, the local governing authorities are required to formally ask that it be discontinued. This amendment simply reverses that procedure and allows control to expire on September 30, 1952, unless the local governing authorities take positive action requesting the President to impose control. It does not affect, until after the 31st of March, 1953, the rent control status of the critical defense areas that have been so designated. It is simply a question of whether you want rent control to continue to be imposed on those communities unless they take positive action and ask for it. It does not in any way affect rent control in the critical defense areas.

The question is that simple.

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

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

Mr. McKINNON. Do I understand your amendment would provide that in areas now under rent control, that are considered critical impact areas, this status would not be changed until possibly March, 1953?

Mr. WHEELER. March 31, 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. But in case of another area that becomes impacted by a military operation, if the Federal Government wanted to put Federal rent control into effect in that impacted area, it could not do so without the consent of the local governing body? Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

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

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Your amendment says in critical areas now existing. Your amendment has no effect on them.

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If under the terms of the Rent Control Act an area surveyed to be made critical, do you provide that the local governing body must determine whether the Federal authorities are ready to make it a critical area?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry. I gave the gentleman from California the wrong information. Where it has been declared a critical defense area, rent control automatically goes on until March 31, 1953, without any determination by the local authorities. Where it has been declared to be a critical defense area the Federal rent-control law applies automatically until March 31, 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. But any new area would not be able to be controlled unless the local government took positive action.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; it would come under control immediately upon the determination that it was a critical defense area.

Mr. McKINNON. What happens after March 1953 on a present impact area that now has rent control?

Mr. WHEELER. That remains for the next Congress to determine.

Mr. McKINNON. There is no provision in the gentleman's amendment for such contingency?

Mr. WHEELER. Not beyond March 1953. It merely says that in these noncritical areas the rent control law shall cease as of September 30 this year unless the local governing authorities request the President to extend it. It does not go off in critical areas until March 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman knows that many places throughout the country will become critical defense areas soon because of our new defense effort.

Mr. WHEELER. They will be controlled.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, in a newly created impact area because of national defense there can be no rent control until the local governing authorities take affirmative action.

Mr. WHEELER. Once it has been determined to be a critical defense area they need take no action whatsoever.

Mr. McKINNON. Between now and March.

Mr. WHEELER. March 1953.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that not one of the principal cities of this country has been defined to be a critical defense area? If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, rent control in cities like Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and other places that do not have State rent control laws would automatically be decontrolled.

Mr. WHEELER. If the local governing authorities wanted it, they could simply ask for it.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that if they do not want it they can bring themselves out from under rent control right now; they have done it in many places throughout the country. The present law permits decontrol by action of the local authorities.

Mr. WHEELER. My amendment merely requires affirmative action instead of negative action.

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

Mr. Chairman, the original act was passed on the theory that the people wanted local self-government; that particularly appealed to the people of the South. We gave them local self-government with reference to rent control; they can impose it or they can take it off as they please.

This amendment, as I understand, would take away that right, and on September 30 of this year all of the areas that are not critical defense areas would be decontrolled without local action. We have reversed the attitude we took, and we have taken away from the people the authority they asked us for.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11, strike out lines 17 to 20 inclusive and insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect on March 31, 1953, in any area which prior to or subsequent to June 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area.

"'(2) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph'."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with what the gentleman from Georgia seeks to do by his amendment. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the time has come for us to meet the issue of Federal rent control head-on.

In 1949 Congress provided for "local option" rent control, giving the right to the local communities and the States to decontrol their areas if they saw fit. That was the first step toward placing rent control in the hands of the local and State governments.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] retains Federal rent control, but regardless of what might be said, it does not give the local communities full and complete responsibility in the matter of these controls.

In my opinion, the time has come for the Federal Government to relinquish this responsibility. We should turn it over completely to the States.

Because of the local option provision in the rent-control bill, there are only scattered sections throughout the country that still retain Federal rent control outside critical defense areas. In those areas designated as critical defense areas, it should be provided by the Federal Government In other words, it is the Federal Government's responsibility to control rents where the critical situation is caused by action of the Federal Government. Therefore, in the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], we would leave rent control in the critical areas to be administered by the Federal Government but return to the States the responsibilities that are rightfully theirs by decontrolling once and for all the rest of the country that does not need Federal rent contral.

It will be agreed that my proposal would leave certain parts of the country without rent control, particularly the large cities. Well, several of the States have already decontrolled themselves; several States, so I understand, have stand-by legislation that goes into effect the minute the Federal Government abandons rent control.

There is no reason why the State, county, and local governing bodies cannot meet and provide controls for themselves if such necessity presents itself.

If rent control is to be a permanent function of the Federal Government, then vote my amendment down; if you believe that it is a Federal responsibility to continue to control rents, regardless of the fact that the need is not national, then vote my amendment down.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. In the gentleman's substitute does he have a provision when the present law is to expire or does it expire on June 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On June 30.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman does not have a provision in there that it expires on September 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. JONAS. That raises the point in metropolitan areas, like the city of Chicago, and I use the city of Chicago simply as an example. If we follow the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], we are apt to walk into the same trap we did in 1948. The 60-day notices will be served on the tenants just about 2 days before election day, and I do not want to get into that situation. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment, this expires on June 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I presume that in the city of Chicago you have a city governing body?

Mr. JONAS. Yes; but under existing law the city council has no jurisdiction over passing on any question dealing with rent control. Under the prevailing law, as we have it now, they do not have that jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has a very distinguished Governor who is trying to slip into the back door of the White House. I have heard a lot down South about his belief in States' rights. I am sure that the gentleman's "States' rights" Governor will be pleased to see to it that the Illinois Legislature takes care of your situation in the next few weeks. If my amendment is accepted, it will remove some, if not all, of the present Federal interference into private business and local affairs.

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

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi about his amendment. As I understand his amendment, the difference between that and the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, as far as impacted areas are concerned, is that the Federal Government may only step in and control rents in areas that had not been declared critical prior to June 30 of this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will read the amendment, the amendment reads as follows: With reference to critical areas it says that—

The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect on March 31, 1953, in any area which prior to or subsequent to June 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, the gentleman's amendment permits rent control set up to be initiated by the Federal Government on impacted areas throughout the United States now or at a later time up to March 1953?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, the Federal Government can control rents in impacted areas without the consent of the local governing bodies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is correct, but it has to be certified as a critical defense area.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wheeler amendment and to the Williams amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago I had the privilege of addressing the legislative section of the National Association of Rural Electrification Cooperatives. To that legislative panel came representatives from rural sections all over the United States, many of them unaware of the peculiar and critical problems facing those of us who live in metropolitan areas. I asked them to turn north as they walked out of the hotel so that they would see the district within the city of Chicago which I represent, a district which contains approximately 335,000 people within an area of three square miles. That is a lot of people. They live in huge multistoried apartment buildings, small and medium apartment buildings, and in private homes. They are crowded together. They are congested. They have made use of almost every housing accommodation in the city, including those which a few years ago, relatively, were classified as uninhabitable. They depend upon rent control to tide them over this temporary period of housing shortage, for if rent controls are removed, there are no apartments or houses into which they can move at rentals they can afford to pay. I feel sure that the people to whom I spoke that day gained a fine appreciation of our housing problems, an appreciation they did not have before.

Much has been said during this debate on items in abundant supply. The gentleman from South Carolina spoke of warehouses filled with refrigerators and other consumer items. Other gentlemen have spoken of potatoes and fresh fruits and vegetables. In this bill we must make the determination as to whether the items that are sought to be brought under control are in sufficient supply. If they are, controls will be no longer needed. Yet I would like to point out one significant difference, between shortages in housing and food. If controls are removed and food and food- commodities, and prices go up, consumers can still shop around for cheaper foods. They can find substitutes for foods which become too expensive or for clothing which becomes too expensive, if need be. But housing is in a different category. If there are no housing accommodations on the market, you cannot shop for them or buy them or even try to find a substitute, because no substitutes exist.

Let me read to you from the report of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of the city of Chicago, a very recent report issued on February 29, 1952. The Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council is a private agency, not a Government agency, and is established for the purpose of promoting better housing throughout the city of Chicago. It numbers among its members some of the largest real estate dealers in the city of Chicago. The report which is entitled "Chicago and Its Housing Supply" makes clear exactly what the housing shortage is. Let me read to you the following:

In 1940, 3.8 percent of the total dwelling units in the city of Chicago were vacant, for sale or for rent, while in the metropolitan area outside of the city of Chicago, there were 2.2 percent of the total dwelling units which were vacant and for sale or rent. In 1950, this vacancy rate of inhabited or inhabitable units had fallen to 0.8 percent in the city of Chicago, and to 0.7 percent in the metropolitan area outside the city.

With this vacancy factor, do you believe that people who have their rents raised beyond their means can find other quarters at prices they can afford to pay? Of course they cannot. I read further:

The vacancy rate which will insure that persons seeking housing will have a minimum amount of freedom of choice in the housing market ranges from a minimum of 2½ percent to a maximum of 6 percent. This percent of the dwelling units in a city the size of Chicago must at all times be vacant and on the market for sale or rent, to provide the frictional buffer to care for the constant movement of persons into and out of housing, and into and out of the city itself.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments offered by both the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi limiting rent controls to critical areas completely overlook the needs of the people in the tremendous crowded urban communities today because not one of such communities has been classified as a critical defense area. If either of these amendments prevails, if rent control is removed, there will be chaos in large communities such as the city of Chicago. There will of necessity have to be demands for wage increases, giving another push to the inflationary spiral, for the tenants will have to have some means of obtaining increased rents to pay for shelter they must have. The number of our families is growing; the population is growing out of all proportion to the number of housing accommodations presently in existence and being built. This is a problem that can be licked only by building more and more housing—to unfreeze and liberalize the limited housing market.

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

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

Mr. SITTLER. The gentleman has just made some statements about the city of Chicago that are quite revealing to me. I wonder if it is not true that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia the people of Chicago, who know about that very well, and the governing officials could thereupon invoke rent control in the city just as well. I wonder if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia does not meet very completely the situation the gentleman is speaking about.

Mr. YATES. A few years ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment which he said would provide for local control. It would give the right to local communities to take themselves out from rent control in the event they thought it was necessary. That part of the law is still in effect. If a local community does not want rent control, they can take themselves out from under rent control under the local-option provision, as many have done already in the past few years.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, my city and State have local rent controls, so these amendments cannot affect my city or State. I think you can then consider what I have to say on the subject as being entirely objective.

Both these amendments will not only decontrol large cities but will also decontrol many small cities. I have in my hand a list of cities which either one of these two amendments, if adopted, would immediately decontrol.

In the State of Georgia, which is represented in part by the gentleman who offered the first amendment, we find that there will be immediate decontrol under either amendment of the following cities: Atlanta, Macon, Albany, Rome, Athens, and Americus.

There are 36 States and Puerto Rico in which hundreds of cities would be immediately decontrolled.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. The State of Mississippi passed a law that you cannot have rent control. If the Office of Rent Control here does not know it, it had better find out about it.

Mr. MULTER. In the State of Mississippi only those cities are under rent control which are in critical defense areas.

Mr. MORTON. These are defense impact cities.

Mr. MULTER. Right.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman's amendment permits them to continue controls.

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

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

Mr. SITTLER. I, too, am objective about the situation in the State of Mississippi and in these small communities because I do not live in them.

But I wonder if the gentleman does not accord to the governing bodies of these small communities the native in-

telligence to handle their own problems and invoke rent control if it is necessary. Whom does the gentleman fear?

Mr. MULTER. I do not fear anybody, but we know the pressures upon the local city councils and the local governing bodies are such that they will not take the action that is required.

Mr. SITTLER. By whom is the pressure exerted?

Mr. MULTER. The same persons who pressure us year after year to discontinue rent control throughout the country.

Mr. SITTLER. Who exerts these terrible pressures, if the gentleman will tell us?

Mr. MULTER. You know these local councils have not been taking any such action with the exception of Los Angeles, I think, which is the only local council in the country that has taken such action. The State of Mississippi, as a State, has done so. What other local governing body in the country has taken such action?

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, let me say that the city council of the city of Chicago in 1947, at the time when it appeared that rent control was going off the books, passed an ordinance providing for the continuation of rent control. That ordinance was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois on the theory that the legislature had not given the city council that legislative authority to pass the ordinance. In the State of Illinois, we have a fight, or rather we have a misunderstanding with some of the down-State communities as to what our problems in the city of Chicago are. We would have a terrible time trying to get rent control legislation through the legislature of the State of Illinois, because there is no appreciation of our peculiar problems within the city of Chicago. Therefore, the only protection we have to obtain rent control, and to keep rent control, is to have the act continued.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SITTLER. Then what the gentleman from Chicago would do would be to remove by one further step from the city of Chicago the responsibility for the management of that city. He cannot handle it in his own State legislature, therefore, he wants to push it all the way to the National Capitol in Washington.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, if Chicago wants local control, we cannot have local control because of the legislative situation. We want rent control, but cannot get it as a result of the lack of legislative power, which the State legislature will not give the city.

Mr. MULTER. The advocates of local option overlook the fact that these amendments would automatically decontrol these small cities, as well as many large ones. The right given by the amendments to recontrol could never be invoked by them because their States have never given them that legislative authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few brief observations. Under the present law, outside of defense critical areas, as I understand it, and if I am mistaken I would like to be corrected, a community or city can only be taken out of rent control by action on the part of the city or community through negative action. Of course, the legislature has power to do it so far as the application of rent control to the entire State is concerned. So when I use the word "community" I am referring to it in its broad as well as limited sense.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], as I understand it, does not disturb the basic situation in relation to rent control outside of critical defense areas except that instead of negative action on the part of the State, county, city, or town, or any other political subdivision of a State, it requires that they take affirmative action in order to have rent control continued, and by rent control I mean outside of a critical defense area. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi completely terminates rent control, as I understand it, outside of critical defense areas. It seems to me, in the light of the present emergency, there is a necessity for the continuance of rent control. I hope the Williams amendment will be defeated.

Now coming to the Wheeler amendment, and expressing my own views, there is a question involved there as between the present law and whether it should be negative or affirmative action to have rent control. I recognize that men may honestly differ on that. I had not intended to speak on the Wheeler amendment, if it was confined to the Wheeler amendment, so my main purpose in taking the floor in this discussion is, with all due respect to the gentleman from Mississippi, to express the hope that his substitute amendment will be defeated. While personally I might feel that the present law would bring about the greatest results, and I shall vote against the Wheeler amendment, the principle or the policy or the idea involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] in relation to the affirmative action on the part of the community in order to have rent control is one on which persons may, as I say, honestly differ. My main purpose is to express the hope that the Williams substitute will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is a point that I think is a very fine point, as to whether the governing body should have any say so or not. For the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the rest of the Members, I asked Mr. Tighe Woods during the hearing that very question. I asked him:

What do you think of an amendment providing that after the survey is made in an area to determine whether it is a critical area or not, is presented to the local governing body for review?

Mr. Woods said:

Actually we have been doing that informally, and such an amendment would not bother me at all.

Now, there is the Administrator saying that cooperation with the local governing body is a good thing, and I think for that reason this amendment should be approved.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I said, with all due respect to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], my main purpose is to call attention to the complete termination of rent control, if a situation existed where it was reasonably necessary. The difference in the Wheeler amendment—and it is an important difference—is whether a community should be permitted to say they did not want it, or they should be compelled to say, "We want it."

May I ask a question of the gentleman? In the event your amendment is adopted and it should become incorporated into law, in a case like Chicago or Boston—I do not mean to confine my inquiry to large metropolitan cities alone, but there are hundreds of thousands of population in other cities, the local, duly elected city authorities, the city council or selectmen, or whatever they may be called, duly elected in accordance with its municipal charter, would they be the agency or authority to affirmatively request rent control?

Mr. WHEELER. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it would not have to be submitted to the people for a vote?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It could be done through their duly elected officials?

Mr. WHEELER. Through their duly elected officials.

Mr. YATES. They have that right at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The one thing that I have taken the floor particularly for is to call attention to the fact that the Williams amendment means the death of anything being done in relation to rent control outside of critical defense areas. While I do not favor the Wheeler amendment, I hope that the Williams amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] a question about his amendment, as I agree with him it is time for the local communities to take the responsibility and say affirmatively whether there is a local emergency condition that requires rent control. In large cities there are various parts of a city that do not currently need rent control. Under the gentleman's amendment, I wonder if there is a possibility for the particular municipality, by its own vote, by a designation of wards or sections, having rent control in one portion and releasing it in another portion where rent control is not needed.

Mr. WHEELER. The amendment anticipates the local governing authorities knowing more about their needs, insofar as rent control is concerned, than does any agency of the Federal Government. I could very well envision under this amendment the local governing authority of any city doing pretty much as they please about the imposition of rent control.

Mr. FULTON. That means that within a town or city, under this amendment, they could have a part or all of the city under rent control if they so wanted it. For instance, sections or wards that do not need rent control, under certain standards of living, and having adequate supply of a particular level of housing, might be decontrolled, and other parts of the municipality that do need it will have rent control according to the local agency's authorization. The local community can and should decide its own problems on rent control.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe this amendment is broad enough to take care of that situation.

Mr. FULTON. That is what I wanted to make sure. Blanket action on a national level is causing inequities and injustices in the administration of rent control at present. I believe the local real-estate dealers and owners at present have legitimate complaint on the administration of rent control from Washington.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is familiar with the Housing and Rent Act which states that if an area is decontrolled, the director is then directed to decontrol the surrounding area to a certain extent; it is a matter of reasonableness in order to prevent discrimination, because if you decontrolled a certain area of the city but left the remainder of the city controlled you might have discrimination that would not be equitable.

Mr. FULTON. I think the position of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] and mine is that there should be the right within the particular municipality or local subdivision to decide what portion of that subdivision shall be under rent control or shall be released, not that the local municipality must act as an open or shut matter so that the whole municipality is under rent control or the whole municipality released from rent control.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think this amendment would place in the hands of the local authorities that determination.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

I come from a large industrial, residential and farm area, parts of which want rent control and need it, and the other parts and subdivisions and municipalities do not want it and do not need it. Some of the communities in my district have been released from rent control.

I shall be glad to support the Wheeler amendment because it will give to the local communities this right to determine whether they locally have an emergency, and the decision should be in local hands. If the communities do not have an emergency, then through their elected officials they can say there is no such emergency and they do not want rent control. As a matter of fact we in Congress on all these emergency regulation and control acts should be looking toward the time when the controls come off, and work toward that end. A free economy works best. Because we have been operating and governed on emergency after emergency and control after control, some New Deal people in the Government use this as a method to stay in power and keep controls on indefinitely. We in Congress must work toward a free economy and the relaxing of controls as soon as the emergency conditions lessen. Otherwise the American people face a permanent controlled economy. Rather than have rent control entirely under the Federal Government, I think it is one step toward decentralization in requiring affirmative action by the local community to decide whether under the Federal act they have such an emergency that their individual community requires rent control. In that part of the community where rent control is needed, it will be continued and where it is not needed it will be released by the local community officials.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. My question is: Have these local bodies the authority in all cases to act affirmatively?

Mr. FULTON. I believe that the action will be by resolution or by ordinance of the local authority. That then will be the method by which it is determined whether the conditions of this national act have been complied with in each case.

It is not a case, I believe, as the gentleman from Illinois has been trying to argue, that the local authorities take an action under the State law or constitution. That does not have any bearing whatever, as the local community by its action is simply meeting the conditions or requirements of the Federal statute.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that the local authorities should take any unconstitutional action. I stated that the Supreme Court of Illinois had declared unconstitutional the effort of the city of Chicago to provide rent control, because the city had not been delegated such authority by the State Legislature. Under this amendment, there might be the question again whether the city can vote controls without specific legislative grant of authority.

Mr. FULTON. Under the Federal statute the local municipal authority is given the right to say whether or not they want rent control. Once the municipality complies with that statute or the regulations under it, the action becomes effective regardless of State law. That is the deciding factor.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does this have any effect on section 202?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not; the request applies only to the pending amendment and amendments thereto.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, there has been some effort to confuse what the basic issues are here, particularly as between the Wheeler amendment and the Williams amendment. The fundamental issue raised by the Williams amendment is the question, Who is going to assume the responsibility for control in an area where control may be found to be needed? The Williams amendment simply says that if controls are needed in areas other than defense-impacted areas, then it is the local responsibility, they should set up their own rent-control offices and their own rent-control plan, that the Federal Government should not be forced into the responsibility of furnishing that service. If they need it, fine. We do not say they cannot have it. All we say is, you do it yourself in your own way and in your own manner. It seems to me that is the American way of doing it. In my judgment, the Williams amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the two pending amendments or at least one of them practically leaves the question of rent control in the hands of the local people. I cannot see any objection to that.

It is my purpose in taking this time to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who pointed out the critical rent situation in the city of Chicago that the city of Chicago has had rent control for 10 years. Does he propose to continue that same policy in the hope that he will obtain a solution of that problem in that city by continuing rent control as it is now?

Mr. YATES. In answer to the gentleman's question, I would say I do not like controls any more than the gentleman does, but where you have a monopolistic housing market as you do in many large cities today, where there is a housing shortage which does not permit freedom or opportunity to find a place to live at a reasonable rental, if rents are increased beyond the ability of consumers to pay, then I certainly believe rent controls should be retained.

Mr. DONDERO. There will be no houses built for rent by private owners or private investment as long as rent control hangs over the heads of the investors. That has caused the shortage

of houses in this country. It is also true in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expressed my own thoughts very clearly on this matter. In addition, as I understand it, the estimate is that the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] would save about $10,000,000 of administrative cost in the Division of Rent Control of OPA.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that should be subject to local option it is the matter of rent. On the basis of personal experience, as a former municipal official, I can testify that I was much better qualified to pass upon the need of my community of Uniontown for rent control, housing, or most anything else than was the then Member of this House who had the responsibility of representing our whole district, which contains several cities comparable to Uniontown and which are far removed from Washington.

To the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may I say that the Legislature of the State of Illinois should provide relief for the city of Chicago by passing legislation to meet its needs. If relief for the city of Chicago is not to be found in the State capital of Illinois then State lines should not, in effect, be abolished by having every city go to the Federal Government for relief.

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

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that he has argued favorably, and I agree with him, in favor of local option. You have that option under the present law because a municipality can take itself out from under rent control if it so desires.

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman for his agreement. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] because I would put the force of inertia on the side of decontrol rather than on the side of controls. I have faith in the good judgment of the average city council and in its responsiveness to the local electorate. If the people of any city outside a critical defense area want rent controls they can get them through the action of their local officials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in opposition to both amendments, because I represent, perhaps, the biggest bloc of low-income working people in the State of Minnesota. I have five wards that come in the category of low-income groups. Now I have watched this rent-control situation very carefully for a number of years, both as a member of our State legislature and serving on one of our municipal boards. Somebody asked a question a minute ago as to who puts the pressure on to kill rent controls. I do not think that question need be asked. We know it here in Washington. One of the strongest lobbies in Washington and one of the strongest in my State is the real-estate board. I witnessed a mass meeting in the city of Minneapolis that was called for the purpose of determining rent-control policy. Our State has a stand-by rent-control act. The result was that the city council of the city of Minneapolis listened and took the recommendation of about 40 members of the real-estate board, but when the opponents were heard there were over a thousand of them there protesting against the proposed decontrol legislation. This is a typical example of the power of organized power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good idea to let local people handle things as much as it is possible for them to do so. However, if Members on the left side of the aisle want fairly to get rid of rent control, I suggest they can do it in one very effective way; do not be so pinchpenny in the amount of money you allow every year for public housing for low-income families. Like housing our defense contracts are awarded on a Federal, not on a regional basis; when you make everything equal, either local or regional, and not just rent, you can handle rent lifting more equitably than the amendments allow. We could use many times more housing units in our area, before rents can be fairly decontrolled. We are not declared a war-impact area; we do not get war contracts; we are between New York and Pennsylvania; we are out in the cold. If you want to get rid of rent control fairly on a Federal basis, one way is to step up your allocation of low-income dwelling units. Both amendments should be defeated. The supply of low-income dwelling units does not equal by any means our needs.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wheeler amendment. It carries out the principle of States' rights for which I have always fought and worked. It gives the decision to local authorities in reference to the continuation of rent controls. In the final analysis I believe local government in a general sense is the best government and this amendment certainly does decentralize the operations of rent control.

I think this amendment is a good amendment and should receive an overwhelming vote from the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency considered at length and heard from various witnesses on the necessity for the extension of rent control. We reported a bill that extends it for 1 year. It would certainly be inadvisable to extend it for just a few days when the people who are renters would have no opportunity to get sufficient notice of the conclusion of rent control. The great argument that was made for the present Rent Control Act was that it gave the local people the authority to manage their own affairs, based on the principle of local self-government. They can now do away with rent control at any time they desire. It seems to me that that system is far more preferable than for the United States Government to tell each section of the country whether they want control or not, that on September 30 of this year it will be ended.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment and the amendment thereto be defeated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment to the Defense Production Act which would decontrol all localities except those which have been designated as critical defense housing areas should be defeated.

On the face of it—but only on the surface—this amendment sounds reasonable and logical. Any closer examination of the facts will reveal it for the trick and the sham that it is. This amendment purports to remove rent controls except from those areas which have been designated as critical. Any one of us might logically ask why rent controls should exist in any area unless the housing shortage is critical. To this there is only one answer. Rent controls should not exist unless there is a critical housing shortage in the area under control. However, the proponents of this amendment are fully aware that the critical is the technical and limited sense that is defined in Public Law 96.

Let us examine the facts as to what constitutes a critical area under Public Law 96.

The law specifically restricts certification as critical defense housing areas to those localities which meet all three of the following criteria: first, a new defense plant or installation has been or is to be provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been or is to be reactivated or its operation substantially expanded; second, substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel is required to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and third, a substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists or impends which has resulted or threatens to result in excessive rent increases and which impedes or threatens to impede the activities of such defense plant or installation.

The proponents of this amendment know that under these complex restrictions that only 109 areas, containing some 550,000 rental housing units and a total population of around 8,000,000 persons, have been designated as critical.

They also realize that the majority of our industrial cities such as Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco would be decontrolled because of this amendment—simply because they could not meet one of the technical definitions of the word "critical" as it appears in Public Law 96. These cities are all highly important defense production centers, they simply cannot meet one condition proposed for critical designations, they have not had a substantial in-migration of labor. They have a critical housing

shortage—they have new and expanded defense plants—but they also have a nearly adequate local labor market.

The fact that these cities do not need any great in-migration of labor has nothing to do with whether the rents will skyrocket if controls are lifted in these great industrial cities. The plain fact is that these cities are of vital importance to the defense effort and the suspension of rent controls on these cities could only result in hampering defense production and adding another push to inflation and defense costs.

Nearly half of cities in the United States having more than 100,000 population now have rent stabilization of the "noncritical" type. More than 53,000,000 people live in communities which could be decontrolled by this proposal. For renters in these communities we would be tampering with the second most important component in their cost of living—their rent.

Even more important to me and to all believers in local self-determination, for the past several years the local people in all of these cities under noncritical rent stabilization have had the legal right to end rent stabilization for themselves through their local governing bodies. Are we to sit here in this Chamber and say that we in our wisdom know better than the local governing bodies of each of these communities that rent control is no longer needed in their city?

If the Federal rent control is onerous or unnecessary in these cities, the local governing body can abolish it through the simple process of passing a resolution to that effect after holding a hearing.

When a person examines the facts on the proposed amendment—he can only conclude that not only is it unwise but, also, it is an aid to inflation and a detriment to defense production. To an even greater extent it is an unnecessary amendment which attempts to make the judgment of the Congress superior to the judgment of local people who know the local situation.

I am attaching a list of cities in the United States now under rent control which would automatically be decontrolled if this amendment were adopted:

Cities with 1950 population in excess of 10,000, which are subject to rent control but are not located in critical defense housing areas as of May 29, 1952

(City and 1950 population)

ARKANSAS	
El Dorado	23,047
CALIFORNIA	
San Francisco	775,357
Richmond	99,545
Vallejo	26,038
Merced	15,278
San Pablo	14,476
San Lorenzo	14,000
Chico	12,312
COLORADO	
Denver	415,786
Pueblo	63,685
Boulder	19,916
Lakewood	15,000
Wheat Ridge	10,000
CONNECTICUT	
New Haven	164,443
Bridgeport	158,709
Waterbury	104,477
Stamford	74,293
New Britain	73,726
Norwalk	49,458
Bristol	35,873
West Haven	31,876
New London	30,367
Norwich	23,382
Greenwich	23,000
Danbury	22,424
Hamden	21,623
Ansonia	18,711
Naugatuck	17,463
Willimantic	13,565
Shelton	12,384
Thompsonville	11,000
Derby	10,264
DELAWARE	
Wilmington	110,356
FLORIDA	
Panama City	26,248
GEORGIA	
Atlanta	331,314
Macon	70,252
Albany	30,907
Rome	29,617
Athens	28,102
Americus	11,367
ILLINOIS	
Chicago	3,620,962
Peoria	111,856
Springfield	81,628
Evanston	73,641
Cicero	67,544
Oak Park Village	63,529
Aurora	50,576
Quincy	41,402
Waukegan	39,099
Danville	37,892
Bloomington	34,048
Belleville	32,701
Alton	32,176
Galesburg	31,357
Granite City	29,139
Maywood	27,409
Freeport	22,425
Pekin	21,912
Elmwood Park	18,771
Ottawa	16,951
Highland Park	16,767
Streator	16,442
Brookfield	15,484
Forest Park	14,946
Skokie	14,821
Lincoln	14,344
Melrose Park	13,109
LaSalle	12,023
Collinsville	11,907
Downers Grove	11,868
De Kalb	11,567
Dixon	11,532
Carbondale	10,911
Macomb	10,586
Evergreen Park	10,515
Wood River	10,217
Marion	10,130
INDIANA	
Gary	133,911
Evansville	128,636
South Bend	115,911
Terre Haute	64,214
Elkhart	35,556
Mishawaka	32,878
Michigan City	28,379
Logansport	20,933
La Porte	17,280
Goshen	12,977
Valparaiso	11,966
IOWA	
Des Moines	177,865
Sioux City	83,991
Cedar Rapids	72,296
Dubuque	49,528
Burlington	30,639
Iowa City	27,018
Fort Dodge	25,025
Keokuk	16,076
KANSAS	
Garden City	10,893
KENTUCKY	
Louisville	369,129
Lexington	55,534
Owensboro	33,983
Hopkinsville	12,531
Frankfort	11,949
St. Matthews	10,000
LOUISIANA	
New Orleans	570,445
Shreveport	127,206
Lake Charles	41,202
Bossier City	15,368
Gretna	13,848
MAINE	
Portland	77,634
Lewiston	41,142
Bangor	31,473
South Portland	21,732
Auburn	23,078
Westbrook	12,280
MARYLAND	
Baltimore	949,708
Silver Spring	44,294
Cumberland	37,632
Hagerstown	36,292
Bethesda	29,756
Frederick	18,092
Middle River	17,442
Catonsville	16,018
Dundalk (district 12)	15,436
Annapolis	15,016
Towson	14,778
District 13	13,366
Takoma Park	13,301
Hyattsville	12,288
College Park	11,137
Mount Rainier	10,978
Cambridge	10,366
MASSACHUSETTS	
Boston	801,444
Worcester	203,486
Springfield	162,399
Cambridge	120,740
Fall River	111,963
New Bedford	109,189
Somerville	102,351
Lynn	99,738
Lowell	97,249
Quincy	83,835
Newton	81,994
Lawrence	80,536
Medford	66,113
Brockton	62,860
Malden	59,804
Holyoke	54,661
Pittsfield	53,348
Chicopee	48,939
Haverhill	47,213
Waltham	47,198
Everett	45,789
Arlington	43,984
Fitchburg	42,671
Salem	41,842
Taunton	40,056
Chelsea	39,038
Watertown	37,339
Revere	36,663
Weymouth	32,695
Northampton	28,998
Beverly	28,855
Framingham	27,845
Belmont	27,379
Melrose	26,919
Gloucester	25,048
Methuen	24,411
Leominster	24,084
Attleboro	23,665
Braintree	23,130
Peabody	22,647
Milton	22,395
North Adams	21,475
Westfield	20,961
Wellesley	20,847
West Springfield	20,398
Woburn	20,269

Natick	19,663
Wakefield	19,600
Gardner	19,617
Winthrop	19,494
Dedham	18,499
Southbridge	17,511
Greenfield	17,237
Saugus	17,146
Lexington	17,098
Norwood	16,693
Needham	16,262
Marlboro	15,741
Danvers	15,702
Winchester	15,567
Milford	15,405
Newburyport	14,073
Reading	13,879
Marblehead	13,711
Plymouth	13,652
Webster	13,215
Stoneham	13,208
Fairhaven	12,811
Clinton	12,295
Andover	12,261
North Attleboro	12,119
Adams	12,027
Athol	11,540
Swampscott	11,535
Stoughton	11,139
Dartmouth	11,120
Amherst	10,850
Amesbury	10,810
Easthampton	10,694
Hingham	10,674
Barnstable	10,397
Northbridge	10,328
Middleboro	10,139
South Hadley	10,122
Randolph	10,007
MICHIGAN	
Detroit	1,849,568
Dearborn	94,994
Kalamazoo	57,704
Bay City	52,523
Highland Park	46,155
Hamtramck	43,245
Wyandotte	36,666
Monroe	21,275
River Rouge	20,366
St. Clair Shores	19,785
Benton Harbor	18,612
Ecorse	17,457
Livonia	17,413
Van Dyke	17,000
Midland	14,202
Niles	13,117
Albion	10,395
St. Joseph	10,123
MINNESOTA	
Minneapolis	521,718
St. Paul	311,349
Duluth	104,511
Rochester	29,634
St. Cloud	28,375
Austin	23,035
St. Louis Park	22,495
Mankato	18,785
Richfield	17,415
Hibbing	16,212
Faribault	16,012
South St. Paul	15,996
Moorhead	14,798
Albert Lea	13,488
Brainerd	12,558
Virginia	12,332
Robbinsdale	11,239
Owatonna	10,149
MISSOURI	
St. Louis	856,796
Kansas City	456,622
St. Joseph	78,588
Springfield	66,731
University City	39,595
Independence	36,832
Jefferson City	24,990
Cape Girardeau	21,539
Webster Groves	23,289
Kirkwood	18,587
Clayton	15,925
Jennings	15,236
Fairmount	15,000
Richmond Heights	14,827
St. Charles	14,307
Maplewood	13,238
Gravois	12,000
Ferguson	11,527
Overland	11,463
Luxemburg	10,686
MONTANA	
Missoula	22,320
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Manchester	82,732
Nashua	34,666
Berlin	16,545
NEW JERSEY	
Newark	438,776
Jersey City	299,017
Paterson	139,336
Trenton	128,009
Camden	124,555
Elizabeth	112,817
East Orange	79,340
Bayonne	77,203
Clifton	64,511
Atlantic City	61,657
Irvington	59,201
Passaic	57,702
Union City	55,537
Hoboken	50,676
Bloomfield	49,313
Montclair	43,775
Plainfield	42,212
Perth Amboy	41,291
Kearny	39,828
New Brunswick	38,768
Orange	38,413
West New York	37,754
Belleville	32,059
Linden	30,434
Hackensack	29,207
West Orange	28,624
Garfield	27,605
Nutley	26,746
Fair Lawn	23,865
Englewood	23,092
Long Branch	23,049
Westfield	21,335
Rahway	21,287
Phillipsburg	18,909
Summit	17,890
Roselle	17,646
Bergenfield	17,611
Rutherford	17,394
Cliffside Park	17,123
Morristown	17,078
Asbury Park	17,035
Millville	16,116
N. Arlington	15,977
East Paterson	15,391
Lodi	15,384
Collingswood	15,255
South Orange	15,175
Hawthorne	14,828
Gloucester	13,692
Harrison	13,535
Dumont	13,030
Carteret	13,003
North Plainfield	12,760
Red Bank	12,710
Princeton	12,160
Pleasantville	12,032
Ridgefield Park	12,001
Fort Lee	11,611
Somerville	11,566
Roselle Park	11,521
South River	11,323
NEW MEXICO	
Albuquerque	96,815
Roswell	25,572
Santa Fe	25,547
Clovis	17,168
NORTH CAROLINA	
Durham	71,311
Raleigh	65,679
Rocky Mount	27,644
Wilson	22,964
Salisbury	19,999
Lexington	13,562
Elizabeth City	12,332
Thomasville	11,126
NORTH DAKOTA	
Fargo	37,931
Grand Forks	26,617
Minot	21,924
Bismarck	18,544
Jamestown	10,601
OHIO	
Cleveland	914,808
Cincinnati	503,998
Columbus	375,901
Toledo	303,616
Akron	274,605
Dayton	243,872
Youngstown	168,330
Canton	116,912
Springfield	78,508
Cleveland Heights	59,141
Hamilton	57,951
Lorain	51,202
Lima	50,246
Warren	49,674
Mansfield	43,363
Euclid	41,447
Zanesville	40,424
East Cleveland	39,875
Portsmouth	36,663
Norwood	34,626
Newark	34,178
Marion	33,786
Middletown	33,634
Elyria	30,197
Sandusky	29,060
Parma	28,852
Barberton	27,893
Alliance	26,112
Garfield Heights	21,606
Chillicothe	20,121
Niles	16,733
Maple Heights	15,556
South Euclid	15,415
New Philadelphia	12,966
Xenia	12,871
Campbell	12,830
Bexley	12,235
Bowling Green	11,972
Struthers	11,905
Delaware	11,783
Sidney	11,413
Rocky River	11,036
Washington Court House	10,457
Conneaut	10,073
Girard	10,068
OKLAHOMA	
Ardmore	17,831
PENNSYLVANIA	
Philadelphia	2,071,605
Pittsburgh	676,806
Erie	130,803
Scranton	125,536
Reading	109,320
Allentown	106,756
Harrisburg	89,544
Altoona	77,177
Wilkes-Barre	76,826
Bethlehem	66,340
Chester	66,039
Lancaster	63,774
Johnstown	63,232
York	59,953
McKeesport	51,502
New Castle	48,563
Williamsport	44,964
Norristown	38,193
Hazelton	35,486
Easton	34,410
Sharon	26,305
Aliquippa	26,067
Washington	25,898
New Kensington	25,226
Pottsville	23,642
Butler	23,511
Pottstown	22,616
Kingston	21,061
Uniontown	20,432
Dunmore	20,302
Nanticoke	20,140

Clairton	19,418
Meadville	18,906
Monessen	17,929
West Mifflin	17,929
Duquesne	17,612
Greensburg	17,237
Chambersburg	17,205
State College	17,142
Shamokin	16,884
Braddock	16,518
Swissvale	16,467
Munhall	16,422
Ambridge	16,415
McKees Rock	16,278
Carbondale	16,235
Carlisle	16,232
Jeannette	16,179
Shenandoah	15,792
Sunbury	15,600
West Chester	15,109
Pittston	14,992
Warren	14,747
North Braddock	14,724
Hanover	16,439
Coatesville	13,839
Farrell	13,677
Connelsville	13,302
Darby	13,188
Plymouth	13,026
Phoenixville	12,913
Ellwood City	12,898
Dermont	12,731
Steelton	12,564
Turtle Creek	12,347
Brentwood	12,312
Carnegie	12,154
Lansdowne	12,140
Columbia	11,962
Latrobe	11,952
Donora	11,831
South Hills	11,750
Bellevue	11,573
Tamaqua	11,491
Lock Haven	11,325
Yeadon	11,322
Mahanoy City	10,930
Conshohocken	10,909
Springfield	10,500
Coraopolis	10,491
Waynesboro	10,321
Arnold	10,271
Homestead	10,031
RHODE ISLAND	
Providence	248,674
Pawtucket	81,436
Cranston	55,060
Woonsocket	50,211
Warwick	43,027
East Providence	35,791
Central Falls	23,610
North Providence	13,798
Cumberland	12,825
Johnston	12,735
Westerly	12,354
Bristol	12,311
Lincoln	11,020
SOUTH CAROLINA	
North Charleston	20,000
St. Andrews	15,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Sioux Falls	52,696
Aberdeen	20,976
Huron	12,713
TENNESSEE	
Memphis	396,000
Nashville	174,307
Oak Ridge	30,236
Columbia	10,921
VERMONT	
Burlington	33,039
Rutland	17,647
Barre	10,866
WASHINGTON	
Seattle	467,591
Everett	33,807
Walla Walla	24,071
Lake City	23,000
Riverton Heights	20,000
Renton	16,039
WEST VIRGINIA	
Huntington	86,353
Charleston	73,501
Wheeling	58,891
Clarksburg	31,817
Parkersburg	29,510
Fairmont	29,273
Morgantown	25,446
Weirton	24,143
Bluefield	21,341
South Charleston	16,627
Moundsville	14,759
WYOMING	
Cheyenne	31,807
Casper	23,557
Laramie	15,497
PUERTO RICO	
San Juan	169,247
Ponce	65,182
Mayaguez	50,376
Caguas	24,377
Arecibo	22,134
Rio Piedras	19,935
Guayania	16,913
Bayamon	14,596
Aguadilla	13,468

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EBERHARTER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill (H. R. 8210) back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I present this motion in all seriousness.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency, after extensive hearings and extensive consideration reported out a bill which purported and did to some extent control prices, wages, and rents. This House in Committee of the Whole saw fit to tear that bill, as reported out, to pieces, so that now we have before us and will have before us nothing but a skeleton without any meat on whatsoever; just a naked title to the bill.

When this committee adopted the so-called Talle amendment, it wiped out absolutely all controls as far as the housewife is concerned and also absolutely so far as all consumers are concerned. This was fortified by the amendment presented by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Harrison, which decontrols vegetables and fruits, including fresh vegetables and all canned fruits and vegetables, such as tomatoes and corn, and peas, and peaches, pears, in fact, practically all food it is possible to put in a can. Where does that leave the housewife, the consumer? There will be no controls whatsoever on food.

Then we have the Sadlak amendment, which will deny to the United States of America, in favor of the financially well heeled industrial corporations, the critical and strategic materials the Government of the United States and its Allies need for the defense of the free world.

Then the Lucas amendment hobbles a new Wage Stabilization Board so that it cannot pass upon fringe benefits, which are in many instances more important than the mere matter of wages and hours.

We have nothing left but a fiction here, Mr. Chairman. Why should we go through the agony of voting now after going through the agony of several days of passing upon amendments to this bill? The agony we have gone through is nothing whatsoever in comparison with the agony the Administrator of this act will go through.

I call your attention also, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that every businessman will suffer agonies in trying to interpret this measure and to obey the law as it will be. And what will the consumer go through, agonizing from day to day and week to week and month to month? We will also be passing upon something that will cause chaos in the labor market, in the business market, and in the financial market and cripple our efforts for defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee in its wisdom will see fit to refer this bill back to the committee with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. Then if we want to pass upon a true price and wage control bill let the Committee on Banking and Currency report out a bill, which will meet the present conditions, and let us not go through the motions of passing nothing but a title, and attempt to fool the American people by saying that we passed price controls or wage controls. Vote one way or another, but do not try to sell this skeleton to the American public and the defense officials; do not say to the whole world that we here are in favor of inflation, and that we are not going to accept our responsibilities and take the lead in defending the free world. Are we playing the game just as Mr. Stalin predicted years ago when he said the United States would collapse economically and then the Soviet Union could take over not only all of these small nations in Europe and Asia, but later on gobble up the South American countries and finally the United States of America.

I hope my motion to strike out the enacting clause is adopted.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The amendments proposed by the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi will kill rent control.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The bill will, with the Wheeler amendment will kill rent control, so that we will have nothing whatsoever except the naked bones of a control act. That is all. So I think we ought to send it back to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. YATES. On June 8, 1952, the Washington Post contained an article in which there was a statement by the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards that higher production costs will drive the prices of new houses up during the coming months; yet we propose to take rent control off by this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope my motion will be adopted. If it is not adopted, well, I can truly say that I have tried to present the facts so that the people of the country are not fooled. They will see what the House has been doing here and can be guided accordingly when it comes to expressing their will in the future.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of my colleagues will believe that I am satisfied with this bill. I think it has been emasculated. I think it has been weakened, but I think it would be a great error to agree to the motion of the gentleman who has just preceded me. We have not yet ceased to consider this bill. We are going back into the House. We may have votes on some questions, the result of which may correct the errors we have made. It would certainly be a great mistake, because the bill has been weakened, to recommit it to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As much as I would like to see a better bill enacted, I do not know that we will succeed in doing any better if you recommit it than we have done. I would hate to see it come back to that committee. We will have no time to consider it. The sands are fast running out. It would be a tragedy if you do not maintain some semblance of price control and wage control. I am hopeful that the Members, after they have slept on the matter and after they have had time to consider it, will rectify some of the errors they have made. You are soon going to have an opportunity to do that. This would mean that the bill, after all the consideration that has been given to it, is now going to be cast aside without consideration. Certainly that is not admissible. If you want to offer a motion to recommit, do so after we have had every opportunity to correct the bill, and then let the House pass upon it. But to do it now would put the Committee on Banking and Currency in a position in which they could not render any service, and it would cause the death not only of price control and wage control but of allocations and priorities which are so essential to the conduct of our defense effort. Certainly you do not want to do that. I ask that you vote this motion down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 42, noes 132.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks prior to the Eberharter amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 69, noes 119.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 125, noes 103.

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

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHEELER and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 144, noes, 113.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

(The balance of the bill reads as follows:)

SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) Consistent with the other provisions of this Act, all affected agencies, departments, and establishments of the Federal Government shall, by July 15, 1952, establish and administer rents and service charges for quarters supplied to Federal employees and members of the Uniformed Services furnished quarters on a rental basis in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto conclude at 2:30.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are now 5 amendments at the desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the gentleman make it 2:45?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto conclude not later than 2:45.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H. R. 8210 offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: Page 12, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'If any locality which has been decontrolled as a result of action by its local governing body under paragraph (3) of subsection (j) of this section is included in an area certified under this subsection as a critical defense housing area, the President shall promptly notify the local governing body of that fact, and shall not establish any maximum rent for any housing accommodation in the locality until 60 days have elapsed after the date on which such notice is given. If, within such 60-day period, the local governing body adopts a resolution in accordance with applicable local law and based upon a finding by it reached as the result of a public hearing held after 10 days' notice, that any of the conditions listed in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection does not exist in the locality, the certification involved shall have no effect with respect to the locality for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (m) of this section. The preceding two sentences shall not apply with respect to any housing accommodation occupied by, or by the family of a member of the Armed Forces who is stationed at an Armed Forces installation in or adjacent to the locality, or with respect to any certification made before the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952'."

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the reading of the amendment the gentleman has offered that it is the same amendment I have at the desk. I shall support the gentleman's amendment and hope it will be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members are not confused insofar as these rent-control amendments are concerned. I will attempt to describe the difference between my amendment and the Wheeler amendment which the Committee has just adopted.

The Wheeler amendment provides that if an area is now a critical defense area his amendment will have no effect so far as changing that situation is concerned; that in any area in the United States that is now under rent control, and it is not a critical defense area, rent control will cease at a certain date, unless the local governing body invokes rent control under existing law by appropriate legislative action.

Insofar as my amendment is concerned, I say that if a local governing body has deconrolled the area by legislative action, it shall not be recontrolled unless the findings of the Defense Mobilizer and the Secretary of Defense, who must make a survey to determine whether it is a critical defense area, are turned over to the local governing body for review. If the local governing body finds that the conditions exist as the result of a survey made by these two Federal agencies, that they in fact exist, then the local governing body will by affirmative vote agree with the Federal Government that rent control should apply. If, on the other hand, the local governing body finds that the conditions the Federal agency investigating that area determine are not true, and take negative action, the certification of that area as a critical defense area shall have no force and effect.

There are three things that are necessary to determine whether an area is critical or not: If a new plant or installation has been built in the area, and there is a substantial in-migration of defense workers, or military personnel is required to carry out the activities of such plant or installation, and that there is a substantial shortage of housing to house the defense workers or military personnel. All three of these things must be found in any area that is not now a critical defense area before it can be determined to be a critical defense area and rent control imposed. The essential difference is that if the local governing body has decontrolled rents, my amendment only applies to those areas that have taken such legislative action.

I think that this gives to the local governing body a right to review the findings, and it gives recognition on the part of the Congress that the local governing body has some responsibility to this area.

In order to inform you what the attitude of the Rent Control Administrator is, during the hearings I asked Mr. Tighe Woods this question. You will find it on page 322 of the hearings:

Mr. McDONOUGH. What do you think of an amendment providing that after the survey is made, it is presented to the local governing body for review?

Mr. WOODS. Actually we have been doing it informally. Such an amendment would not bother me at all.

I do not think it is necessary to go into any more detail on this amendment. I trust that the Members of the Committee fully understand it. It is a further amplification of the question of local governing bodies in relation to rent control, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, the national defense of our country is not a local matter; it is a Federal matter. Defense areas are defined by the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the Defense Mobilizer. To turn over to the local authorities the right to say whether or not rents in a critical defense area shall be controlled, it seems to me, would be very ill-advised. I understand that is just what the gentleman's amendment does. That amendment, my recollection is, was submitted to the committee and was rejected. It certainly would weaken our defense and weaken the measures we take for our own protection if we turn over to each local community the discretion in regard to these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. POULSON. Could the gentleman tell me how it would work, for instance, in Los Angeles? If in one particular section of the city there was an acute shortage, because of the defense program, would it apply to the entire city?

Mr. SPENCE. The local authorities can decontrol now if they want to.

Mr. POULSON. I mean, in a defense area. The city of Los Angeles has decontrolled rents. But, let us assume there was one particular area where there was an acute need because of the defense program, and they would certify that in that particular area there should be rent control. Would that affect the entire city or not?

Mr. SPENCE. No. The critical area is defined by the authorities that are charged with its definition. The critical area would be confined to that part which was designated as a critical area by Government authority. The local authorities have the right to decontrol as they please the entire city or any part of it.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that the local-option principles of the present rent-control law are desirable and in keeping with our American democratic tradition. However, with equal sincerity and conviction I believe that it would be a great mistake to give the local governing body a veto over the initial introduction of rent control into a critical defense-housing area.

In these critical areas, the Federal Government—not the local government—is responsible for the acute housing situation and the pressure on rents. The Federal Government has established the military installations, and has directed the men who are stationed at these installations. The construction and expansion of defense production plants are the direct effect of defense orders which the Federal Government has placed. For these reasons the Federal Government has a responsibility which it cannot evade, to provide—at least initially—protection to servicemen and defense workers against exorbitant rents.

Actually, in most of these areas, only the Federal Government is able to clearly evaluate the need for rent control at the beginning. This is not because Federal officials are any wiser than local officials, but because only the Federal Government has the full information upon which the decision to certify the locality as a critical area was based. Much of this information must remain classified for security purposes, and cannot be divulged to the general public or to the mayors and members of our elected city councils. In the course of time, the plans which are reflected in this classified information come into actuality, and their actual effect upon the local housing situation becomes clear to the people in the community. If, at this point, it appears that the Federal Government has miscalculated on the effect which the activation of its military installations or the construction of defense plants would have on the housing situation in the community, the governing body of the community will realize the mistake. If it finds that rent control actually is not necessary, it then has ample authority under the present legislation to remove it.

It may be argued that members of the Armed Forces and their families would be protected. Quite the contrary is true because landlords generally would not rent to a member of the Armed Forces and thereby subject their property to rent control when other properties are not under control. If a landlord rents to a soldier he might later be subject to rent control, but if he did not rent to a soldier there is always the possibility that the city council would override any determination by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization.

For these reasons, I urge that there be no local veto of the introduction of rent control in a critical area. I believe the local option decontrol provision in the present law is not only sufficient, but provides a much sounder basis for a local determination. The amendment proposed by the Congressman from California should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in line with the question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in which he stated that the military authorities or those who have the power to designate a critical area could take in the whole city of Los Angeles, just because a little section was designated a defense area, it seems to me we certainly should have some method by which the governing body within the city would have the right to decontrol certain portions of the city if they did take the whole city. Assume that because they take one area they say the whole city of Los Angeles is a defense area. Anybody who has been out there knows that would be about as silly and ridiculous a thing as you could do, but we know they do those things.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. I understood the chairman of our committee to tell the gentleman in answer to his question that that supposition could not happen.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, but the question is how they can define it. It is still within the city. That is his opinion, but I should like to have some protection for the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. MULTER. You have the protection in the law which now gives you the right to decontrol. Los Angeles is decontrolled and has the right to decontrol. You do not need this amendment to continue that right.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, but suppose they declare the whole city a critical area?

The reason I was in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] was that I am, naturally, going to vote against the whole bill, but I thought this was just as good a time to finish it up as it would be later on. What I predict right now is that we who are opposed to this type of control, which is not getting any results but merely creates this large bureaucracy, will find this is what will happen. We think we are making headway, but the committee will go into conference and they will be in disagreement up until about the last day or two before the recess or adjournment. Then they will come back in the usual method and say ,"We cannot agree, so let us have a continuing resolution." That will leave this Price Control Act, this monstrosity with all its evils, in effect. So I say, let us settle it right now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many amendments there are on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed there are three amendments at the desk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], now have amendments at the desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I suggest that in order that the Members offering the amendments may have at least 5 minutes each on their amendments they be recognized for the purpose of offering their amendments. It might complicate the situation, but it will be in lieu of cutting off debate on this amendment or on the amendments as they come up. Would that be agreeable?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman knows time has been fixed for debate to close at 2:45. The gentleman might ask unanimous consent that out of the time remaining these three gentleman who have amendments to offer be allotted 5 minutes apiece to explain their amendments.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YORTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would that mean they would be recognized now?

The CHAIRMAN. They would not be recognized until the pending amendment is disposed of, but the Chair would retain for them 5 minutes apiece.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Wheeler amendment.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD CAUSE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOLDIERS

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

Mr. Chairman, there probably is not any place in the United States where the battle over rent control has been fought out as it has been in the city of Los Angeles. I certainly do not blame the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] for interesting himself in this problem. But I want to call to your attention what you are doing if you vote for this amendment. The last two sentences of this amendment provide that it will not apply to housing occupied by soldiers or their families where the soldier is stationed nearby. Therefore, this amendment should be called the amendment to rent no more houses to soldiers in areas that are not now controlled, but which may be in the future if they become critical defense areas.

Under this amendment if a defense area is declared impacted because of defense activity, and the local body reviews the Federal decision and decides against controls, then control will be applied only to houses occupied by soldiers or their families. What person offering a house for rent in an uncontrolled area would rent that house to a soldier from this date forward if we adopt this amendment? I remember when I came home I had a lot of trouble getting into my own house. It is very difficult for soldiers sometimes. This amendment does not even purport to take care of the families of veterans if the veterans are overseas. It only makes provision that control may be placed on housing where a veteran is stationed nearby. I cannot understand the kind of reasoning that puts that sort of wording into an amendment and asks the House of Representatives to vote against the soldiers of this country and against their families by practically barring them from the opportunity to rent houses.

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

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would the gentleman say that the amendment should apply to the armed services, and if the local governing body says that there shall be no rent control there, that the soldiers in that area shall be under rent control? Mr. YORTY, I can see where you are attempting to say that this is discrimination against members of the armed services, which is not my intention. My intention is to protect members of the Armed Forces. The House legislative counsel may have made a mistake in drafting the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to the gentleman only for a question. Let me say to the gentleman, I am not making a theoretical argument. I am making a factual, legal argument. I believe the gentleman should again study the last two sentences of his amendment. In my opinion, the legislative counsel has not properly considered the effect of the last part of the amendment as it would apply to members of the armed services. What it does is to say that this amendment does not apply to housing occupied by soldiers if they are stationed nearby, or housing occupied by their families if the soldiers are stationed nearby. If a soldier is in Korea it does not even purport to protect his family. Only if a soldier is stationed at home on duty nearby is he supposed to be protected by this amendment construed in the most favorable way. I say again, and I repeat, and it cannot be refuted, that this is an antisoldier amendment because no person will rent to a soldier in the future if there is a chance that the area might be controlled and applied only to people who rent to soldiers. It would definitely cause discrimination against members of the armed services who desire to rent houses in areas not now under control.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the author of this amendment some questions.

Do I understand that this amendment applies in those areas that have heretofore been decontrolled, and thereafter the National Government determines that this is a critical area, and that after the National Government determines it is a critical area you must have the concurrence of the local council in order to make rent controls effective?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right. In other words, the local governing body has to make an affirmative finding that the findings of the Federal Government as they have found them are correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You could and would visualize that in some instances in those areas that have been decontrolled and the National Government finds it is a critical area, before rent control can become effective, the local authorities must also enter into the same findings in order to have rent control?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I also understand that your amendment goes further and says that it shall not apply to a man in the Armed Forces stationed nearby. Is that correct?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The last two sentences of the amendment read that it shall not apply to housing accommodations occupied by the family of a member of the armed services who is stationed at an armed services installation adjacent to the locality. That has reference to camps in the immediate area.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I understand that in order for it to be effective the National Government and the local government must approve it; and if they do approve it, then it shall apply to the Armed Forces.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct. It shall not apply to the Armed Forces and their families.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Shall not apply to the Armed Forces?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right. If they say that rent controls shall go into effect, it shall apply to the Armed Forces. If they say it shall not go into effect, it shall not apply to the Armed Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then if they do not both concur, you have no rent control as it deals with the Armed Forces stationed in that area?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Except whatever control may be under the Government itself on those Army installations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of course, in the installation owned by the Government itself they have control of that, but I am talking of areas outside of Government ownership.

Now, if you have a decontrol situation, it has already been decontrolled, in order for your amendment to become effective in critical areas, then who, under your amendment, would administer the terms and conditions of the rent control, and what would it be?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Of course, if the local government determines that the Federal findings are not according to their findings, there is no rent control applied. If they find that they are, then rent control is applied; but if it is applied, it does not apply to any Army personnel stationed in Army installations in that adjacent locality.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the Federal Government Rent Control Office would be in force and effect and would be reestablished, if you had a

combination of the National Government in a critical area and the local government concurred in their findings?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a substitute to my own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw his amendment and modify it, if he desires to do so.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I withdraw the amendment and will offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: On page 12, following line 5, add another section as follows:

"SEC. — Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any locality which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such locality, and the governing body of said locality has by resolution, adopted in accordance with applicable local law, found that the conditions set forth in subsection (1) exist in said locality'."

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment. I recognized the possibility of misconstruing the last section of the amendment I originally offered insofar as the armed services are concerned.

I have five sons who are veterans of World War II. My oldest son is at present in the Armed Forces and a Korean veteran.

I would never discriminate against or provide any means whereby the members of the armed services and their families would be discriminated against.

The language referring to the Armed Forces and their families was inserted by the House legislative counsel and since it might be misconstrued to be discriminatory I have removed it in my substitute amendment.

This amendment as proposed will merely provide for a review of the findings of the Federal Government and to determine whether those findings are in accordance with the facts and then take affirmative or negative action.

If there is any doubt in the minds of those who had the idea that the last section of my first amendment would discriminate against the armed services, I have by this amendment removed that section and I want the RECORD to show that it was never my intention regardless of any remarks to the contrary by my colleague from California [Mr. YORTY]—that there was any desire on my part to discriminate against the members of the armed services and their families, but rather to protect them against decontrol in the immediate area where they may be living in an armed services installation in an area that is not declared critical by the local governing body and consequently would not be under rent control.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDONOUGH) there were—ayes 39, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: At page 12 of H. R. 8210, add the following after line 5:

"SEC. 302. The Director of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized to appoint a Defense Areas Advisory Committee to advise him in connection with the exercise of any function or authority vested in him by section 204 (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, or by delegation thereunder, with respect to determining any area to be a critical defense housing area. Any committee so appointed shall consist, in addition to a chairman, of representatives of the Department of Defense, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Office of Rent Stabilization. Any Federal agency shall, to the fullest practicable extent, furnish such information in its possession to the Defense Areas Advisory Committee as such committee may request from time to time relevant to its operations."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this merely sets up an advisory committee to help the Director of Defense Mobilization to reach a proper determination in connection with the defense areas. I understand the agencies involved have no objection to it, and at least some of the members of the committee on the other side have indicated that they have no objection to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. Chairman, I might say that my opposition to the amendment is quite qualified. There probably is not very much reason why it should not be agreed to. However, I want to take this time to talk on other matters.

Mr. Chairman, before we close debate on this bill we should bear in mind that there is a school of thought here in the Committee of the Whole that through the exercise of some very smart tactics, which are political in nature, if this bill is made too ineffective according to the standards of certain administrators of the act, then those who have done this will find themselves in very serious political straits come next October and November. Because those statements have been made I think the counterstatement should also be made that it is obviously within the province of the administration, if it sees fit to do so, to increase prices. This may be done in several ways. It may be done, as Mr. Arnall and Mr. Putnam have tried to do in weeks gone by, by throwing out scarce propaganda which impels the people against the possibility of rising prices to turn their money into commodities. That has been done and prices can be increased in that manner. Also the Commodity Credit Corporation can go on a buying spree and force the price of any commodity up almost as high as it wants to by accumulating in its warehouses huge and unnecessarily large stocks of goods. This is also true of the Defense Department and the other procurement agencies of the Government.

May I say to you that under the present circumstances and in the foreseeable future if prices do rise in the United States it will be because of the deliberate actions taken by the administration to put this House and the Congress in the embarrasing position of not having gone along with it on price control. Do not be frightened. If we cannot take care of ourselves in that situation, then we do not deserve to be here in this Congress. Inflation cannot be stopped by direct price controls alone, but prices can be maintained at a high level by the manipulation of the commodity markets by the agencies of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 58, noes 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 12, line 5, after "budget", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to housing units under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission where Federal rent control is now in effect."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 12, after line 5, insert a new section as follows:

"Section — subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 as amended, is amended by striking out paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"'1. A new defense plant or installation has been provided or an existing defense plant or installation has been reactivated or its operations substantially expanded;

"'2. Substantial immigration of defense workers of military personnel has occurred to carry out activities at such plant or installation;

"'3. Substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers of military personnel exists which has resulted in excessive rent increases and which impedes activities of such defense plant or installation'."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, last year Lorain, Ohio, was declared a critical defense-housing area. At the same time they imposed rent control on the area they took in a number of smaller communities, including some rural areas, that had no need for rent control at all.

All my amendment does is to differentiate properly between the conditions for certification as a critical area under the

Defense Housing Act, and conditions for certification as critical under the Housing and Rent Act.

At present these conditions are substantially the same, yet the objectives are far apart.

The conditions for certification of a critical defense-housing area under the Defense Housing Act must necessarily look to the future; that a military installation is to be reactivated, a substantial inmigration of personnel will be required, and a substantial shortage of housing impends. This is necessary because the object of the Defense Housing Act is to construct housing that would be ready for occupancy at some future date when the area would sustain the impact of increased defense activity.

However, rent control deals with a situation in the present, and therefore the conditions for certification of a critical defense area under the Rent Act should deal in the present.

For example, under the present law the President may impose full Federal rent control in an area which may sustain substantial immigration of defense workers at some future date and which would result in a threat of excessive rent increases. There is no basis whatsoever for providing such broad authority to impose rent control because of a future need. Particularly, is this so when we realize that when an area is certified for rent control, the rents may be rolled back 6 months, a year or all the way back to June 24, 1950.

In effect, the amendment would prevent a premature designation of an area as critical for full Federal rent control, yet would not affect the maximum rent or the roll-back date once the area is certified to meet an actual existing situation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will adopt the amendment.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. As I understand the amendment it would prevent a critical defense area from being designated until the workers or the soldiers were in that area; is that true?

Mr. AYRES. No, that is not true at all. For instance, in the Lorain situation which was declared a critical defense area, if they do not get the steel strike settled pretty soon there will not be any need for calling it a critical defense area.

Mr. SPENCE. As I understand the amendment, at the time the area would be declared a critical defense area, controls would be placed on housing.

Mr. AYRES. All my amendment does is to separate the two, and say two decisions have to be made and not one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 87, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the Talle amendment had been limited to its first half, decontrolling any material that has been selling below ceiling price for 3 months, I would have voted for it. There ought to be specific rules laid down requiring orderly decontrol by OPS when the criteria are met—and that is a fair and reasonable one.

But the second yardstick in the Talle amendment, namely, mandatory suspension of ceiling price for any material in adequate or surplus supply, and judged to be in adequate or surplus supply if not rationed—is unwise, in my opinion. It would either compel rationing, which I do not favor, or permit prices to rise above ceilings without limit. This is a price control bill, and while I support amendments to make sure that the ceilings OPS establishes are fair and will not discourage production because production is the main answer to rising prices, I believe it is unwise to remove ceilings entirely except when the ceiling was proved unnecessary by the material selling below the ceiling.

So I am compelled to vote against the Talle amendment in its present form because of the second criterion established. If the amendment is adopted, I hope it will be revised in conference.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep apprehension that I have watched the action of this House in deliberately and systematically decimating our economic controls. Although I fully realize that certain changes in the present structure and scope of these controls are warranted by the change in economic conditions, I am gravely perturbed by the adoption of the numerous amendments which have crippled this legislation to the point where it is now a mere skeleton of its former self—a skeleton with which the Government is supposed to maintain the economic stability of our Nation.

The argument has been repeatedly advanced while the bill has been under consideration, that the need for economic controls has disappeared. Now, there are two ways, it would appear to me, of looking at this question. On one hand, there are people who feel that controls, with their requirements, are burdensome, and that it would be politically expedient to remove them. It is that kind of thinking that prevailed in Congress in 1946, when all price controls were suddenly removed with the assurance that prices would soon level off and decline. The opposite, however, proved to be the case, and there are very few consumers who will ever forget the hardships of inflationary pressures which were released on the public as a result of hasty congressional action.

The other way of looking at this question consists of judging hard, practical facts, and having some concern for the average wage earner and taxpayer, to whom every increase in prices brings additional hardships. It is from this viewpoint that the advisability of maintaining economic controls should be determined.

Let us look at some plain facts. The Members who voted to cripple economic controls pointed out, for instance, that the general level of prices has leveled off and is relatively stable. This condition prevailed, however, only for a brief period during the early part of the year. The past few months, in contrast, have witnessed a steady and continued increase in the cost of living. The indexes compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that, since a drop last February, prices have been steadily going up, and are today only one-tenth of 1 percent below the all-time peak reached in January.

The argument was also raised that many goods are presently in plentiful supply, some of them selling below price ceilings. With this assertion I have no quarrel to pick. But if one looks a bit deeper than just the surface, we must come to the realization that our defense program, which largely affects the available supply of goods and their prices, is still increasing in volume. It is estimated that defense expenditures will amount this coming fiscal year to $60,000,000,000. This tremendous influx of money into our economy cannot pass by without an inflationary effect on the average, day-to-day cost of living.

All these factors, and many others which were brought out during the debate, point to the fact that the economic state of the Nation is not as yet stable, and can be very easily thrown out of balance to the detriment of the consumers and the Nation as a whole.

It should also be remembered that the abolition of a large part of the structure of our present economic-stabilization program, envisaged in the present form of the legislation before this House, will preclude the possibility of maintaining a close and accurate check on the economic changes occurring in our Nation, which may require prompt remedial action. In addition, the proposed abolition of the Wage Stabilization Board, which in my opinion should remain tripartite in nature, constitutes but another attempt to cripple or invalidate the presently set up stabilization process.

In view of the above-mentioned factors—namely, the continuing increase in the cost of living; the anticipated $60,000,000,000 outlay for defense during fiscal 1953; and the lack of adequate evidence of economic stability—it would appear to me that the crippling of economic controls, so as to make them completely ineffectual, is unwise at the present time; further a failure to provide preventive checks that could be invoked promptly, is foolhardy.

THE NEED FOR CONTINUING PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, we, the representatives of the people of the United States, must recognize that it is imperative during this time of emergency to continue price controls as they have been established under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The threat of inflation and the resultant

danger to our national economy and defense effort is as prevalent today as it has been at any time during the past 2 years.

We often hear it said that the Federal Government should cut down expenditures in the interest of economy. But there would be no gain realized by cutting down expenditures if, at the same time, the Members of Congress in one short-sighted moment allowed the evils of inflation to befall our Nation as a result of lifting price controls and if the necessary quantity of goods and services so desperately needed for the defense effort were further reduced by increasing prices.

The facts seem to indicate clearly that price controls have been very effective in diminishing the fires of inflation, for in the 15 months prior to establishment of price controls in January 1951 the consumers' price index increased by 7.7 percent, and in the short span of 6 months following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea this index increased by 6.6 percent. In the 15 months following establishment of price controls the consumers' price index has increased by only 3.9 percent.

In little more realistic terms, these figures simply mean that the increases in prices in the 15 months prior to the establishment of price controls decreased the value of the dollar in terms of the 1939 purchasing power by 4 cents, and in the 15 months since price controls were instituted the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased by only 2 cents.

Shakespeare once said, "What is past is prologue." Yes, the past is merely an introduction—a beginning—and we should grow as a result of what has happened in the past and should be in a position to face the future more intelligently. The situation that resulted from our unwisely lifting of price controls after the Second World War in the face of similar inflationary pressures should be lesson enough to show us the way for the future.

Mr. Bernard Baruch got to the heart of this whole question of continuing price controls in a single sentence in his letter to Senator BLAIR MOODY, Democrat, of Michigan. "It is a question," wrote Mr. Baruch, "of which is to be put first, the national interest or the special interest." It is our obligation as representatives of the people of the United States to act in their best interest for we and they are the roots from which democracy must draw its life. If we do our share, as Mr. Baruch has said, considering only the national interest and not the special interest, it becomes obvious that price controls should be continued.

In conclusion it must be noted that the removal of price controls at this time would have the following possible effects:

First. Uncontrolled inflation with a resultant decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar because the total demand for goods and services for consumer consumption is greater than their supply.

Second. Inflated dollars would mean that the Government would have to expend more money to get the same quantity of goods and services needed for defense.

Third. The Government's increased spending would have to be financed by larger taxes or increased deficit spending.

Fourth. The lower and middle income groups would be forced to live on a relatively lower level because of higher prices.

Fifth. Fixed income pensions and institutions would be squeezed by the pressure of depreciated purchasing power of their income.

Mr. Chairman, the voices raised most earnestly in behalf of retention of controls and holding the line against each and every special interest comes from no one political party and no one economic level. It is the voice of the American people demanding a workable and effective Defense Production Act that can successfully do the job for which it has been designed.

It is true that nobody likes to take unpalatable medicines. Yet when the family doctor orders the patient to do so, in order to combat illness or disorder, the patient usually does so. If not, he suffers the consequences.

I think we should view controls in the same light. Nobody likes them. However, as undesirable as controls are, they pose less of a peril to a free economy than does the near confiscation of uncontrolled inflation which can be disastrous or ruinous to our economy. Controls are the necessary medicines with which to combat inflation. All of us are aware of what inflation can do when it is allowed to run rampant through a nation. We have too many examples in history of this terrifying and destructive power. We caught a glimpse of this power after the United States went into war in Korea and prices soared from day to day and from hour to hour.

In this time of emergency the question which is squarely put to us is this: What is to come first, the national interest or the special interest?

If we are to maintain a stabilized economy, one that will not explode in our faces and wreck the whole country at a time of crisis, we must adopt an effective measure of control. That challenge is ours now. In the interest of our people, in the interest of our economy, in the interest of our national security, I shall vote against any and all amendments that will cripple and make ineffective the Defense Production Act which we are now considering.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted to extend my remarks at this point, I desire to include the following article from the New York Times of yesterday:

STEEL AGREEMENT REACHED, DROPPED—BETHLEHEM AND UNION EFFECT ACCORD WITH MODIFIED UNION SHOP—INDUSTRY REJECTS IT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The Bethlehem Steel Co. and the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, reached an understanding last week that would have ended the steel strike, but the deal was subject to the approval of other major steel companies and they, or a majority of them, refused to go along.

Well-placed industry sources said the understanding covered the two remaining major issues blocking a settlement of the 23-day-old steel strike—the union shop and back pay. They described the union-shop compromise as a modification of the principle that requires all employees to become members of the union within 30 days after their employment begins. Steel union officials declined to comment.

Other aspects of the steel story today were:

A project to reopen certain mills for the production of top priority military material apparently has failed.

The Senate Labor Committee approved two plant-seizure bills but the Democratic policy committee decided not to put them on the calendar for consideration in view of recent Senate rejections of similar proposals.

The understanding between Bethlehem and the union was reached at an informal meeting last Thursday in New York. The Bethlehem officials reported this to a meeting of steel industry leaders on Friday. The industry turned it down. Bethlehem, in accordance with a kind of compact, or gentlemen's agreement, that binds the steel companies, bowed to this decision, and talks with the union were broken off.

The understanding, it was reported, would have given the employees more back pay than the offer made by the companies in Washington 2 weeks ago. The objections of the industry, however, were grounded on the union-shop compromise and not on the back-pay proposal.

The veto strength was exercised largely by United States Steel, Inland, National, and Armco. The last two companies are only partly affected by the strike. Some of their units, which have independent unions or are unorganized, are producing steel.

Republic Steel and Jones & Laughlin stood with the group but they are believed to be more amenable to compromising the union-shop issue than the others are at this time.

Two weeks ago, just before the collapse of bargaining in Washington, Republic was reported to be out in front in the union-shop negotiations, but backed away under pressure from United States Steel, it was said.

Bethlehem was the first to settle with the union 2 years ago. There was some kind of understanding among the steel companies at that time, too, although it was not believed to be as tight as the current compact. Anyhow, the Bethlehem settlement became the industry pattern.

VARIOUS FACTORS IN DEADLOCK

The impasse in the steel negotiations probably cannot be ascribed to any single factor. It is the belief of many informed persons that the large supplies of some types of steel is the major influence in the companies' decision and that when these inventories are reduced a price increase will be more meaningful and bargaining will be conducted on a more realistic basis.

Likewise, as the steelworkers feel the pinch of payless paydays more and more the union becomes more amenable to compromise.

The possibility that President Truman may have to use the Taft-Hartley law against the union to restore production and possibly will invoke it Thursday, also may figure in the industry's calculations to some extent.

Resistance to compulsory unionism on grounds of principle varies in strength among employers generally and this is true within the steel industry. Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland, is probably the most articulate of the steel employers who oppose the union shop on moral grounds. The fact that Inland once made a union-shop agreement in its coal mines is not regarded by Mr. Randall as a refutation or contradiction of his position. He feels that the coal-mine contract was something the

company had to take and did not agree to voluntarily.

Other steel employers, while believing that union membership should be held to a voluntary basis, say privately that they probably would conform to the prevailing practice.

When the Washington talks were called off about 2 weeks ago, both sides announced they were willing to produce steel for essential armaments. They appointed committees, which met with defense production officials several times, but so far the Government has not designated a single plant for reopening on an emergency basis.

The project apparently involved so many technical problems, as well as labor-management bargaining problems, that it is not going to yield much if anything. The union concedes that it is reluctant to send some of its members back to work in an area where other members would continue striking.

The industry and the Government, for their part, seem unwilling even to ventilate the problems involved.

The seizure bills, which were pigeonholed almost as fast as they were reported out of committee today, were sponsored by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Republican, of Oregon.

The Humphrey bill was tailored specially for the current steel dispute to provide for just compensation for both sides. It would not permit the Government to impose the union shop. The committee also proposed another bill offered by Senator HUMPHREY providing for the establishment for a labor-management study.

The Morse bill would give the President a flexible set of tools, including seizure and an injunction to use whenever the national security was threatened by a labor-management dispute.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I find it necessary to cast my vote against final passage of the Defense Production Act now before us. Previous to this vote, I have voted against the crippling amendments offered by various Congressmen which have been included in the bill.

In my opinion, the Defense Production Act as it now comes before us, is a spineless, useless measure which betrays the American people and which would undermine our defense program as well as the Nation's economy. I cannot conscientiously vote for it. It is a control bill in name only; it utterly destroys controls and paves the way for skyrocketing prices, profiteering, increased living costs, and terrible hardships for the American people to bear. It protects special interests and those who stand to make huge profits when controls are removed; it is a boon to those who seek unconscionable gains even though it means jeopardizing our freedom.

This so-called control bill makes our people defenseless against those who have now been given the go sign to charge outrageous prices for food and other necessities of life; it throws them to the wolves of greed and selfishness. At the same time the wage freeze is extended so that most people will find it impossible to meet the further increased living costs. Their wages remain the same while costs boom upward. This is a shocking and conscienceless act, and I want no part of it.

The American people looked to Congress for protection and help in these days of spiraling living costs. Furthermore, they expected us to prevent further inflation in order that our Nation's economy would remain safely stabilized. The terrific inflation which is now bound to come will prove disastrous; we will destroy ourselves as surely as any enemy could, for when our economy is dangerously undermined, our Nation stands defeated.

The crippling amendments which have been adopted and which so seriously destroy the effectiveness of this control measure have made this a no-control measure. For these reasons, I am voting against it.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, my vote against this miscalled price-control bill is a protest against what I regard as a fraud on the people of the United States. This bill as amended by the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats is no longer a price-control bill. The people should not be misled into thinking that it is a control bill. It is, as it now stands, a decontrol bill. It will remove controls from items which already are so high that people are rightfully complaining. Another price spiral would do untold damage to our economy and perhaps completely wreck our defense effort. Prices which skyrocketed before controls were instituted cost us thousands of planes, tanks, and ships, for which the sums appropriated turned out to be insufficient. We cannot permit this to happen again by passing a watered-down fraudulent price-control bill in our haste to adjourn. We have time to do the job right, and it is our duty to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I detest controls, their bureaucracy, red tape, and all the annoyance that goes with them. But what is the alternative at a time like this? Defense expenditures will be larger during the ensuing months than heretofore. Huge defense payrolls will give consumers more funds, but not more consumer goods. The inflationary pressure on prices which will result must be held down by price control. I wish there were some other way, but there is not. Under these circumstances, this decontrol bill is a threat to our economy. The original bill reported by the committee remains in name only. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has described the coalition which riddled this bill by amendments as being "drunk with power." I believe that power has been used against the best interests of the Nation. Perhaps a House-Senate conference committee can repair the damage enough to make the bill workable, but as the bill now stands it is an unjustified attempt to lift the lid and let inflation rob our people of their savings and earnings.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, of course we must all vote for passage of this bill for one reason: that is the only way it can go to conference where there may be a possibility of getting a better bill. In its present form, the bill is a betrayal of the consumer and the American public.

It is with the greatest reluctance that I shall vote for passage. I must do so only in the hope that the conference committee may change it so we have controls.

In other words, a vote for passage is not a vote for this bill. It is only a vote to send it to conference where a better bill may be worked out. That will give us the opportunity in a couple of days to vote either for or against the conference report.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that the only answer to inflation is controls. That opinion has been justified by the rising costs of food, clothing, and the necessaries of life. These rises have been occasioned because of the limited legislation that we have adopted in our struggle against inflationary prices. The original bill, as reported by the committee, would have been a great factor in stabilizing our economy. However, the many amendments that have been adopted to this measure in the last few days, have merely placed wages in a strait-jacket and given carte blanche to those who have been making profit out of consumers' goods.

Having consistently voted against the crippling amendments to the bill, I now find myself, along with many of my distinguished colleagues, in the position that it is necessary to cast my vote against final passage of the Defense Production Act. It is not a control bill, except in name. It, in effect, destroys controls and opens the way to increased living costs.

The provision providing for a wage freeze puts the employee into the position of having his wages remain the same while prices go steadily upward.

Reference to invoking the Taft-Hartley law is further evidence that this bill is, in truth, an antilabor measure. Hence I cannot, and will not, vote for passage of the bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to the attempts being made here to completely remove every reasonable economic regulation from the existing Defense Production Act. The paramount domestic problem facing the Nation now is to prevent the collapse of our economic stability from the ruinous ravages of threatening, runaway inflationary pressures. The eyes of all the American taxpayers are focused on us today to observe our determination to legislate wisely for the general welfare or surrender to the persuasive lobbying tactics of special groups. I earnestly hope this House will act for the common interest of all the people, without political partisanship or misplaced confidence in the extravagant cries of selfish-seeking organizations.

Under ordinary living conditions I would be the first to protest against the imposition of any controlled economy but will any person dare say we are living under normal circumstances today? In the complex economic turmoil surrounding American life now I am deeply and gravely apprehensive of the disastrous effects which would most surely seem to follow any full elimination of the sensible control safeguards presently protecting our economic structure. I earnestly believe the removal of all price controls

at this time would inevitably lead to these chief crippling results:

First. Uncontrolled inflation with a resultant decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar because the total demand for goods and services for consumer consumption is greater than their supply.

Second. Inflated dollars would mean that the Government would have to expend more money to get the same quantity of goods and services needed for defense.

Third. The Government's increased spending would have to be financed by larger taxes or increased deficit spending.

Fourth. The lower- and middle-income groups would be forced to live on a relatively lower level because of higher prices.

Fifth. Fixed-income pensions and institutions would be squeezed by the pressure of depreciated purchasing power of their income.

The average American taxpayer and wage earner well remembers what happened back in 1946 when all price controls were suddenly removed, with the naive assurance that prices would soon level off and decline. Just the opposite proved to be the case, and few consumers will ever forget the hardships thrust on the buying public by that hasty congressional action. Our experience right after World War II should be lesson enough to convince us of our duty to protect the American housewife and wage earner from another morale-demoralizing price-gouging era.

The plain facts existing today point to the truth that the economic state of this country is not yet soundly stable and can be very easily thrown out of balance to the detriment of the consumers and the national welfare as a whole. The indexes compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that, since a drop last February, prices have been steadily going up and are right now only one-tenth of 1 percent below the all-time peak reached in January of 1951. The continuing increase in the cost of living necessities; the anticipated $60,000,000,000 outlay for defense spending in fiscal 1953 with the accompanying effect on the supply of goods for civilian use; the lack of any real evidence proving our basic economy will remain stable convinces me the failure to provide preventive inflationary checks now is practically unwise and an invitation to economic disaster.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of great emergency when the Communist leaders are deliberately and admittedly trying to promote disunion and demoralization among the people of the United States we have only one challenge squarely facing the Members of this House. Are we going to legislate wisely for the general welfare of the country or are we going to further the selfish objectives of a few organized groups? The question is simple and our answer should be clear, in voting to maintain a reasonable system of price controls for the protection of the great majority of our citizens, the wage earners and their families. I earnestly hope the Senate and the conference committee will demand and insist that the retention of sensible price controlling machinery is vitally essential to our continuing economic stability while we are engaged in this desperate struggle for survival against the Godless Communist leaders seeking to destroy us from within and without.

Mr. Chairman, I also feel in duty bound to speak against the attempts to legislate on gravely important national problems by hasty amendment actions when the Congress is rushing toward a deadline of adjournment, either temporary or permanent. This is not the temperate, unprejudiced atmosphere in which to calmly deliberate on such nationally important problems as the application of the Taft-Hartley law provisions to the steel production difficulty, the abolition of the Wage Stabilization Board and the decimation of the Housing and Rent Control Act. These are matters that deeply affect the welfare and morale of the whole country. They demand long, careful, unpassioned legislative exploration for decisions of wisdom in solution. Until the overpublicized steel dispute the Wage Stabilization Board possessed an excellent record of helping to equitably settle many vexing labor and management differences to the acceptance of both sides. A summary dissolution of this Board, which in my conviction should remain tripartite in nature, would prove to be ill-advised at this time. The hurried and exciting efforts here to pressure the President into forceful use of the injunctive penalties of the Taft-Hartley Act against the steelworkers is a regrettable punitive gesture in this hour of serious threat to our national security.

That suggestion is obviously against the full sense of American justice when we reflect the steelworkers themselves voluntarily refrained from walking off their jobs, as they were legally entitled to do the moment the contract expired, and stayed at their work of producing steel for 150 days. To say the least it is indeed questionable common sense to destroy and discourage the spirit and will of management and labor to continue to resolve their honest differences by the orderly processes of real, genuine collective bargaining without unwarranted Government interference, of imperialistic directive. In the last analysis the responsibility of insuring the public safety is adequately protected by sufficient defense material production belongs to the Congress. We cannot and should not try to evade that obligation to the people we represent by any subterfuge imposition saddled, without any careful or thoughtful examination, on the Chief Executive. Let us remain at work here in the Congress and meet our duty by making a full and complete study to determine the necessity of enacting a fair and balanced seizure law safeguarding the interests of management, labor, and the public, if it becomes imperative to do. This is a problem that should be given separate and concentrated attention. It ought not to be cursorily passed on amidst a jumble of amendments surrounding other legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal to limit rent stabilization to critical defense housing areas has been accorded too little scrutiny to judge its real effect. Unfortunately the significance of the terms "critical" and "noncritical" are not their usual ones when applied to rent-controlled areas. Critical areas are those brought under control because they have experienced sudden population increases of defense workers or military personnel since June of 1950; noncritical areas are those which have not had that unexpected population development. However the so-called noncritical areas are of great importance to our over-all defense program because they include most of our great industrial cities.

In fact, this proposal would be a damaging blow to the general stabilization effort. A majority of our major industrial cities would suddenly find themselves without rent control. Of 106 cities in the United States with 100,000 or more population a total of 52 have ordinary types of noncritical rent control that would be affected by the decontrol action. This amendment would disturb the lives of the one-third of our people who live in cities for which decontrol is proposed.

There are completely adequate guarantees in the present law to assure that the rent-stabilization program will not be unduly prolonged in any area, whether critical or noncritical. The governing body of every municipality, and of every county, has full authority to terminate the rent-stabilization program whenever it finds control is no longer required. The fact that local governing bodies with over 53,000,000 persons in their jurisdiction have refused to exercise their authority under this provision is emphatic proof that most local officials, who know their particular areas best, are firmly convinced the rent-stabilization program is still urgently needed in their own communities.

Mr. Chairman, some great and experienced authorities have declared this period to be the most dangerous in the history of our great Nation. Even without such authoritative warning I believe the average citizen and wage earner realizes full well our very existence and civilization is being threatened by the most devilish and resourceful enemy the world has ever known; certainly the Members of this body understand the Communist military threat as well as their insidious design to incite our people toward class-hatred and group-quarreling. I, therefore, wish to urge and implore my colleagues to calmly and judiciously dwell on the fundamental importance of the action we take here as it affects the national welfare. Sound and wise laws cannot be enacted in a legislative atmosphere of confusion, excitement, and prejudice. I earnestly ask you all to consider long and thoughtfully on the doubtful wisdom of approving any legislation that may well increase antagonisms and divide our people when unity, understanding, cooperation, and good will are so essential to our national-defense effort and the success of the free world in this decisive fight against totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendments to the Defense Production Act offered here today

since they would, in effect, remove controls or weaken them to such extent that they would no longer be effective. I find it necessary to vote against final passage of the bill since I cannot conscientiously give my support to a program designed to undermine the Nation's economy. I am deeply shocked at the action of the House in permitting the price control law to be amended and revised in such manner that it cannot possibly be anything but a control law in name only. In reality, the amendments adopted here today offer a green light signal to the profiteers to impose financial burdens upon the American people who are looking to us to protect them from further increases in the cost of living.

The issue being fought here today is an old one. Carrying the ball for the removal of price controls are those special interests who stand to profit most from high prices. Alined against the special interests are the farmers, wage and salary earners, and housewives, the consumers of the Nation.

The votes cast here today will reveal which side we are on. And I warn the Members of the House that the action taken on this bill will not soon be forgotten by the American public.

The Defense Production Act has had my support consistently. With controls in force we have barely been able to hold the line of the cost of living. I believe, most emphatically, that if we remove all of the reduction of $31,920,000 achieved price controls the flame of inflation will burn higher and higher. That portion of our population who live on annuities and pensions will be faced with disaster. Lower and middle income groups will be forced to a lower standard of living. This bill now before us is but a feeble gesture to extend the present law. It is so badly mangled that if it becomes law it will carry little meaning.

The people of this country look to Congress for protection against spiraling living costs. We cannot let them down. I vote against this bill in protest against its inequities.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the House has proven today that, in spite of air conditioning, the heat of 102° here in Washington affected a great many. The "coalition" has amended price control out of the law and has tried to use the bill to wreak vengeance on the American wage earner. They have succeeded in so riddling the stabilization program that there is no program left. With each amendment wedged through today they have struck another blow for the price profiteers and another blow at the consumer and the American worker. They have also added billions of dollars to the price we are going to have to pay for defense weapons and to the eventual reckoning when we have to raise the taxes to pay for the defense effort. It may also be that an individual day of reckoning will come sooner than they think for some of our Republican colleagues who have so happily swung the ax. The consumer will have an ax of his own to swing in November and 4 months of higher and higher prices to work up to the point of swinging it in the right direction. Outraged labor will also have its innings then, and so will the tenant whose rent has hit the ceiling between now and November.

It is only by a complete run-down of the amendments tacked on to the Defense Production Act by the House that we get a full picture of the almost incredible disregard for the national stability and safety shown by the Dixie-GOP's. Apparently they set out to do two things: to straitjacket labor and the consumer and to give a clear field to business and agricultural interests for making hay in the sunshine of the Republican smile. What this may do to the defense effort God knows, but seemingly the other side of the aisle is willing to leave it up to the Almighty to take care of that—they have certainly forced the House to abdicate its responsibility in the matter.

Let us note for the record just what we have done to any hope of controlling inflation and keeping production going in these deadly serious times. On the question of labor, wages, and industrial peace we have first the Lucas amendment. Under its terms the Wage Stabilization Board is thrown out the window. With the present set-up of the Board both labor and management were provided with a sensible, workable arrangement under which collective bargaining could be allowed to operate with a minimum of interference—where their representatives had an effective voice in decisions of vital importance to both sides—where the fundamental national policies on labor policies could be hammered out in free discussion among equals—and where irreconciliable disputes could be brought for settlement of all issues without paralyzing the defense effort. The tripartite composition of the Board—with equal representation for industry, labor, and the public—assured at least some of the elements of justice to both sides. Under the Lucas amendment we have a kangaroo court dictating terms, with no effective voice given to either labor or management. The labor and industry members can do no more than plead their special cases. The decisions will not be the result of negotiations between equals, but the unilateral edict of the majority of public members. Wage policies set by this method cannot be realistic. In the limited conditions where the Board may advise on disputes brought before it the collective-bargaining principle has been destroyed. With no authority to offer advice on other than wage issues the procedure becomes a farce. When labor is told, "This will be your maximum wage" and is denied the chance to trade wage concessions for fringe and security benefits it becomes slave labor in a subtle form. Labor will not and cannot willingly submit to such a system. Labor has given up more than its share already in voluntarily submitting to the restrictions placed on its bargaining freedom under the present law. The obvious intent of the supporters of the Lucas amendment is to set up a packed Board sympathetic to industry and unfriendly to labor. I have heard reports that when the Lucas amendment proposals were suggested to former Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson he was all for them. He was asked what sort of people he thought should be made "public" members of the proposed Board—the majority and dictating group. His reply is supposed to have been, "Why, businessmen, of course." That is a perfect illustration of the kind of "fair" thinking behind the Lucas amendment and an indication of the fairness of the policies it would put out.

The House has ripped out of the act the only means we now have for getting a quick settlement of labor disputes threatening stoppage of defense production. We have put nothing in its place. I suppose that the House's action in adopting the Smith amendment, "requesting" the President to use the Taft-Hartley law procedures in the steel strike, means that we are content to let all disputes ride and leave them up to the "tender mercies" of Taft-Hartley. The House is fooling only itself if it thinks that the steel strike or any other strike will be settled by that means. If we adjourn sine die on July 5 and the President does see fit to request an injunction under the Taft-Hartley law, what happens after the 80-day so-called cooling-off period is over? The steel unions voluntarily cooled off for better than 5 months before they were forced to strike. It would be ridiculous to expect them to give up their just demands under the force of a Taft-Hartley injunction. The steel industry certainly has not demonstrated any likelihood that they will accept the reasonable settlement presented to it. So that would leave us around the end of September with a steel strike on again. We will then either come back to Washington and do what we should be doing now—give the President the powers he needs to handle the situation and keep steel production going, or set up a wage board able to do more than sit back and look piously on—or we will have a 3 months' shutdown in steel until we make up our minds to do something about it in January. If a strike situation should arise in any other industry vital to the defense effort, we will be confronted with the same problem there. Such a strike is threatening right now in the jet engine industry. But what have we done to face up to these cold facts? Nothing. The House is playing ostrich and hiding its head in the sands. With our heads buried we may think we can safely ignore what is going on around us. But let my Republican colleagues not forget that they are exposing themselves to attack just as the ostrich does when he lets his tail feathers fly in the breeze.

The Lucas amendment and the Smith amendment combined will work to put a ceiling on the workingman's wages—the wages out of which he has to feed and clothe and house himself and his family. What have we done to keep a ceiling on the prices of his food, clothing, and shelter? And what have we done to hold down the cost of rearming ourselves so that we will not have to pass a tax bill with skyrocketing tax rates in the next few years? The Dixie-GOP coalition has put through the Talle amendment,

which for all practical purposes decontrols everything the workingman has to buy. Watch the cost of living shoot up after that one goes into effect—if it does. They have adopted the Cole amendment guaranteeing pre-Korea percentage mark-ups to wholesalers and retailers—the price push-up amendment. And not content with that, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with help from their Dixiecrat friends, have effectively terminated Federal rent controls as of 3 months from now by adopting the Wheeler amendment.

Looking over the roster of those who voted for these monstrous amendments we find the same old story. The Republican friends of big business have again joined forces with the reactionary elements from the South to put a halter on the wage earner and the people on low fixed incomes—the elderly people retired on social security and pensions, the pensioned veteran, and the small-salaried white-collar worker. I, personally, want no part of the responsibility for such action.

I cannot conscientiously vote for H. R. 8210 in its present form. I voted against each of the amendments I have named. In the face of the amendment-ridden controls laws that will come out of this bill it would almost have been better had the Barden amendment taking off all wage and price controls been allowed to stand. At least, the laboring man would have had a sporting chance to try for wage increases to match soaring prices. As it is we are left with a choice of voting for a bill to clamp down on wages while letting business put the clamps on the consumer, or no bill at all. I cannot go for that kind of a squeeze play. The RECORD will show that I voted against this controls bill. Let it also show that I believe a firm and fair system of controls to be an urgent necessity now, but that I cannot and will not be a party to passage of a bill controlling nothing but the price of labor, and, at the same time, handcuffing labor against any effort to keep its standards up to what is referred to as the "American way of life."

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Time was fixed to conclude debate at 2:45 p. m. There are still 3 minutes remaining. Does the gentleman desire to be recognized for that time?

Mr. McKINNON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as this debate closes, may I point out that if the House adopts the Talle and Cole amendments, this bill cannot be truthfully called an anti-inflationary bill but a superinflationary act. Time will prove that statement.

I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say a few moments ago that if prices go up in the next few months as the result of this bill—and he must presume they will—it will not be the fault of the House but the fault of the executive agency.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Take the Tolle amendment, as an example. If this amendment is finally adopted, no item can be price controlled if it is deemed in surplus for the preceding 90 days. Surplus is defined in the amendment as an item not being allocated, or rationed at the retail level.

Now many things today are in surplus, according to that definition but they most assuredly are selling at ceiling prices, and will sell at even higher prices if the Talle amendment is adopted.

Consider the shoes you are now wearing. You bought them at ceiling prices, but they are not in short supply. If we are to maintain ceiling prices, we must ration them—at a burden to the consumer and a cost to the taxpayer. If we do not ration them, the price increases.

On page 12 of the committee hearings is a table which shows that, on March 15, 1952, 50 percent of the items included in the cost-of-living index were at their all-time peak. Eighty-five percent of these items were within 5 percent of their all-time peak. On March 15, this cost-of-living index was at 188 percent of the prewar average but, on May 15, the index had risen further to 189 percent of the prewar average—it was within one-twentieth of 1 percent of its all-time high and I understand that since May 15 it probably has gone to a new high.

On page 14 of the record of the hearings I find that 96 percent of the wholesale prices that are of primary interest to business and to procurement agencies were at the very peak or only very slightly below it during the early part of this year. And, I understand that since then very little change has occurred.

Indeed, price pressure is continuing all the time. On page 1508, I find a list of items two pages long—items on which ceiling price increases have been requested from the Office of Price Stabilization as late as last month. There are 79 items, and they are not small items but many of them are broad categories. They include such a variety of things as steel mill products, glass containers, cotton ginning machinery, dinnerware, automotive repair services, fertilizer, cosmetics, newsprint, beef, pork, canned peas, soft drinks, coal at retail, and heating oil.

I looked through this long list of items for those whose prices might be controlled under the Talle amendment. I can assure you there are less than a dozen of them. There are more than five dozen of those items which, under the Talle amendment, would not be decontrolled—right after ceiling price increases have been requested for them. Does anyone believe that this five dozen items might not be immediately raised in price the day after the Talle amendment went into effect?

Does anyone believe that when the price spiral had started with these five dozen items it would stop right there? The cost of living, already at an all-time high and on the uptrend, would keep rising and rising fast. I need not tell you that the wages of millions of workers now are automatically tied to the cost of living index. They would have to be raised under the Talle amendment—industry's costs would go up—prices would be raised, wages would climb—and we would be right back on the inflationary merry-go-round.

The supporters of the Talle amendment might find it merry—but the American people would not. The American people have suffered enough from inflation. They do not want any more of it. They do not want prices raised by the Talle amendment. They want to see this amendment defeated and this time we should think of the best interest of the American consumer and not the special interest of a few who seek to make more profit.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, 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. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 696, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Talle, Lucas, Smith, Barden, Cole, and Wheeler amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TALLE: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 104. Section 402 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The ceiling price for any material shall be suspended as long as (1) the material is selling below the ceiling price and has sold below that price for a period of 3 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military consumption and has been in such adequate or surplus supply for a period of 3 months. For the purpose of this paragraph, a material shall be considered in adequate or surplus supply whenever such material is not being allocated for civilian use, or in the case of an agricultural commodity or product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom, is not being rationed at the retail level of consumer goods for household and personal use, under the authority of title I of this act'."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is not the parliamentary situation such that if this amendment prevails, no commodity can be controlled unless it is rationed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. It is

not in the province of the Chair to interpret the laws.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 210, nays 182, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—210

Abbitt	George	Nicholson
Adair	Golden	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Hara
Allen, Ill.	Graham	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant	Osmers
	Gregory	Ostertag
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Passman
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn	Patman
	Hagen	Patten
Andrews	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Arends		Poage
Armstrong	Hall, Leonard W.	Potter
Auchincloss		Poulson
Baker	Halleck	Prouty
Barden	Harden	Radwan
Beamer	Harris	Rankin
Belcher	Harrison, Nebr.	Redden
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Harvey	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Hill	Regan
Boggs, Del.	Hillings	Riley
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rivers
Bow	Hoeven	Robeson
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Brehm	Holmes	Sadlak
Brooks	Hope	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Saylor
Brownson	Hunter	Schenck
Bryson	Ikard	Scrivner
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Scudder
Buffett	James	Shafer
Burleson	Jarman	Sheehan
Busbey	Jenison	Short
Bush	Jenkins	Sikes
Byrnes	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Carrigg	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sittler
Chatham		Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth		Springer
Chiperfield	Kearney	Stanley
Church	Kearns	Stockman
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Taber
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Talle
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Taylor
Cooley	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Larcade	
Crawford	Latham	Tollefson
Cunningham	LeCompte	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Velde
Dague	McConnell	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Weichel
Denny	McGregor	Werdel
Devereux	McIntire	Wharton
D'Ewart	McMillan	Wheeler
Dolliver	McVey	Whitten
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Dorn	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Eaton	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Meader	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Merrow	Winstead
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	Morton	Woodruff
Gathings	Mumma	
Gavin	Murray	

NAYS—182

Anfuso	Bennett, Fla.	Buckley
Angell	Bennett, Mich.	Burnside
Ayres	Bentsen	Burton
Bailey	Blatnik	Butler
Bakewell	Boggs, La.	Camp
Baring	Bolling	Canfield
Barrett	Bolton	Case
Bates, Mass.	Bosone	Celler
Battle	Bray	Chudoff
Beall	Brown, Ga.	Clemente
Bender	Buchanan	Colmer
Cooper	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Corbett	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cotton	Irving	O'Neill
Coudert	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
Crosser	Javits	Patterson
Crumpacker	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Deane	Judd	Polk
DeGraffenried	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Delaney	Kean	Price
Denton	Keating	Priest
Dingell	Kee	Rabaut
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Rains
Donohue	Kelly, N. Y.	Ramsay
Donovan	Kennedy	Reams
Doyle	Keogh	Rhodes
Eberharter	Kerr	Ribicoff
Elliott	King, Calif.	Riehlman
Engle	Kirwan	Roberts
Fallon	Klein	Rodino
Feighan	Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.
Fine	Lane	Rogers, Mass.
Flood	Lanham	Rooney
Fogarty	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Forand	Lesinski	Ross
Fugate	Lind	Scott, Hardie
Fulton	McCarthy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Furcolo	McCormack	
Garmatz	McGrath	Secrest
Gary	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Gordon	McKinnon	Shelley
Granahan	McMullen	Sheppard
Granger	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Green	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Greenwood	Madden	Smith, Va.
Hale	Magee	Spence
Hand	Mansfield	Staggers
Hardy	Marshall	Thomas
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Havenner	Mills	Trimble
Hays, Ark.	Mitchell	Van Zandt
Hays, Ohio	Morano	Walter
Hébert	Morgan	Watts
Hedrick	Morrison	Wier
Heffernan	Moulder	Wigglesworth
Heller	Multer	Withrow
Herter	Murdock	Wolverton
Heselton	Murphy	Yates
Hess	Norblad	Yorty
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—38

Aandahl	Evins	Richards
Abernethy	Fenton	Sabath
Addonizio	Fisher	Sasscer
Albert	Frazier	Steed
Allen, La.	Gore	Stigler
Aspinall	Herlong	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Jensen	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Teague
Burdick	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	Nelson	Vinson
Carnahan	Pickett	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Powell	Wickersham
Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BEALL and Mr. SECREST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 6, line 15, strike out section 106 and insert as follows:

"The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title or remain in effect under the title for more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, which shall deny a seller of materials or services at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or services or his customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by his records during such period, except as to any one specific item of a line of material sold by such seller which is in short supply as evidenced by specific Government action to encourage production of the item in question'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 164, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—231

Adair	Cooper	Hess
Allen, Calif.	Corbett	Hill
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Hillings
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Hinshaw
	Crawford	Hoeven
Anderson, Calif.	Crumpacker	Hoffman, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Holmes
	Curtis, Mo.	Hope
Andrews	Curtis, Nebr.	Horan
Arends	Dague	Hunter
Armstrong	Davis, Ga.	Ikard
Auchincloss	Davis, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.
Barden	Denny	James
Bates, Mass.	Devereux	Jarman
Battle	D'Ewart	Jenison
Beall	Dolliver	Jenkins
Beamer	Dondero	Jensen
Belcher	Dorn	Johnson
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Jones, Hamilton C.
Bentsen	Durham	
Berry	Eaton	Jones, Woodrow W.
Betts	Ellsworth	
Bishop	Elston	Judd
Blackney	Engle	Kearney
Boggs, Del.	Fernandez	Kearns
Boggs, La.	Forrester	Keating
Bolton	Fulton	Kerr
Bow	Gamble	Kilburn
Boykin	Gathings	Kilday
Bramblett	Gavin	Larcade
Brehm	George	Latham
Brooks	Golden	LeCompte
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	Lovre
Brown, Ohio	Graham	Lucas
Bryson	Grant	McConnell
Budge	Gross	McCulloch
Buffett	Gwinn	McDonough
Burleson	Hagen	McGregor
Busbey	Hale	McIntire
Bush	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillan
Butler		McVey
Byrnes	Hall, Leonard W.	Mahon
Cannon		Martin, Iowa
Carrigg	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Chatham	Hand	Mason
Chenoweth	Harden	Meader
Chiperfield	Harris	Merrow
Church	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.
Clevenger	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Kans.	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Harvey	Morton
Colmer	Hébert	Mumma

Murray	Rogers, Fla.	Teague
Nelson	Rogers, Tex.	Thomas
Nicholson	Sadlak	Thompson, Mich.
Norblad	St. George	Thornberry
Norrell	Saylor	Tollefson
O'Hara	Schenck	Vail
Osmers	Scott, Hardie	Van Pelt
Ostertag	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Velde
Passman	Scrivner	Vorys
Patten	Scudder	Vursell
Phillips	Shafer	Weichel
Poage	Sheehan	Werdel
Potter	Sheppard	Wharton
Poulson	Short	Wheeler
Preston	Simpson, Ill.	Whitten
Prouty	Simpson, Pa.	Widnall
Radwan	Sittler	Williams, Miss.
Rankin	Smith, Kans.	Williams, N. Y.
Redden	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Winstead
Regan	Stanley	Wolcott
Riehlman	Stockman	Wood, Ga.
Riley	Taber	Wood, Idaho
Rivers	Talle	Woodruff
Robeson	Taylor	
Rogers, Colo.		

NAYS—164

Abbitt	Gordon	Mansfield
Anfuso	Granahan	Marshall
Angell	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Ayres	Green	Mills
Bailey	Greenwood	Mitchell
Baker	Gregory	Morano
Bakewell	Hardy	Morgan
Baring	Hart	Morrison
Barrett	Havenner	Moulder
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Multer
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ohio	Murdock
Blatnik	Hedrick	Murphy
Bolling	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bonner	Heller	O'Brien, Mich.
Bosone	Herter	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bray	Heselton	O'Konski
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill
Buchanan	Holifield	O'Toole
Buckley	Howell	Patman
Burnside	Hull	Patterson
Burton	Irving	Perkins
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Canfield	Javits	Polk
Case	Jonas	Price
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Chudoff	Karsten, Mo.	Rains
Clemente	Kean	Ramsay
Combs	Kee	Rhodes
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Crosser	Kennedy	Rodino
Dawson	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Rooney
DeGraffenried	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Delaney	King, Pa.	Ross
Denton	Kirwan	Secrest
Dingell	Klein	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Shelley
Donohue	Lane	Sieminski
Donovan	Lanham	Sikes
Doyle	Lantaff	Spence
Eberharter	Lesinski	Staggers
Elliott	Lind	Trimble
Fallon	McCarthy	Van Zandt
Feighan	McCormack	Walter
Fine	McGrath	Watts
Flood	McGuire	Wier
Fogarty	McKinnon	Wigglesworth
Forand	McMullen	Withrow
Ford	Machrowicz	Wolverton
Fugate	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Furcolo	Mack, Wash.	Yorty
Garmatz	Madden	Zablocki
Gary	Magee	

NOT VOTING—36

Aandahl	Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.
Abernethy	Evins	Richards
Addonizio	Fenton	Sabath
Albert	Fisher	Sasscer
Allen, La.	Frazier	Steed
Aspinall	Gore	Stigler
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Sutton
Beckworth	Lyle	Tackett
Burdick	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	Pickett	Vinson
Carnahan	Powell	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Reams	Wickersham

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Reams.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCAS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS: On page 7, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 109. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order, but the number of members representative of the general public shall at all times exceed the aggregate of the number of members representative of labor and the number of members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board for representatives of labor shall equal the number of offices on the Board for representatives of business and industry. Among the members representative of labor, at least one shall be a person who is not a representative of any organization which is affiliated with either of the two major labor organizations.

"'(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall be 1 year, unless sooner terminated in accordance with section 717. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'((A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

"'For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of law heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted'."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that a separate vote was demanded on the Lucas amendment. My understanding is that there is no Lucas amendment, but that there is a Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. It is the Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute, but it is still the Kearns amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that a request was made for a separate vote on the Lucas amendment, and all the other amendments have already been acted upon as a whole, is it in order now to have a separate vote on the Kearns amendment?

The SPEAKER. Whatever there is left is the Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute. The Chair is going to hold that it is subject to being voted on now.

The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 138, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—256

Abbitt	Gary	Morton
Adair	Gathings	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Murray
Allen, Ill.	George	Nelson
Andersen, H. Carl	Golden	Nicholson
	Goodwin	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Grant	O'Hara
	Greenwood	Osmers
Andrews	Gregory	Ostertag
Arends	Gross	Passman
Armstrong	Gwinn	Patman
Auchincloss	Hagen	Patten
Baker	Hale	Patterson
Bakewell	Hall,	Phillips
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Potter
Battle	Leonard W.	Poulson
Beamer	Halleck	Preston
Belcher	Hand	Priest
Bender	Harden	Prouty
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Radwan
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rains
Bentsen	Harrison, Nebr.	Rankin
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Reams
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Rees, Kans.
Boggs, La.	Hess	Regan
Bolton	Hill	Riehlman
Bonner	Hillings	Riley
Bow	Hinshaw	Rivers
Boykin	Hoeven	Robeson
Bramblett	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Holmes	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Ross
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Sadlak
Brownson	Hunter	St. George
Bryson	Ikard	Schenck
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Buffett	James	Scrivner
Burleson	Jarman	Scudder
Burton	Jenison	Seely-Brown
Busbey	Jenkins	Shafer
Bush	Jensen	Sheehan
Butler	Johnson	Short
Byrnes	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Jones,	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hamilton C.	Smith, Miss.
Chiperfield	Jones,	Smith, Va.
Church	Woodrow W.	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Judd	Springer
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Stockman
Colmer	Kearns	Taber
Cooley	Keating	Talle
Cooper	Kerr	Taylor
Cotton	Kersten, Wis.	Teague
Coudert	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Kilday	
Crawford	King, Pa.	Thornberry
Cunningham	Larcade	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Dague	Lovre	Velde
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Vursell
Denny	McCulloch	Weichel
Devereux	McDonough	Werdel
D'Ewart	McGregor	Wharton
Dolliver	McIntire	Wheeler
Dondero	McMillan	Whitten
Dorn	McMullen	Widnall
Doughton	McVey	Wigglesworth
Durham	Mack, Wash.	Williams, Miss.
Eaton	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	Willis
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Engle	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Meader	Winstead
Fernandez	Merrow	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Md.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Idaho
Fugate	Miller, N. Y.	Woodruff
Gamble	Morano	

NAYS—138

Anfuso	Beall	Burnside
Angell	Bolling	Canfield
Ayres	Bosone	Cannon
Bailey	Bray	Carrigg
Baring	Buchanan	Case
Barrett	Buckley	Celler
Chelf	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chudoff	Irving	O'Konski
Clemente	Jackson, Wash.	O'Neill
Combs	Javits	O'Toole
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Crumpacker	Kee	Polk
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Price
Deane	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
DeGraffenried	Keogh	Ramsay
Delaney	King, Calif.	Rhodes
Denton	Kirwan	Ribicoff
Dingell	Klein	Roberts
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Rodino
Donohue	Lane	Rogers, Colo.
Donovan	Lanham	Rooney
Doyle	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lesinski	Saylor
Elliott	Lind	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Feighan	McCarthy	
Fine	McCormack	Secrest
Flood	McGrath	Shelley
Fogarty	McGuire	Sheppard
Forand	McKinnon	Sieminski
Fulton	Machrowicz	Sikes
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Sittler
Garmatz	Madden	Spence
Gordon	Magee	Staggers
Granahan	Mansfield	Thomas
Granger	Marshall	Tollefson
Green	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Hart	Mills	Walter
Havenner	Mitchell	Watts
Hays, Ark.	Morgan	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Morrison	Withrow
Hedrick	Moulder	Wolverton
Heffernan	Multer	Yates
Heller	Murdock	Yorty
Heselton	Murphy	Zablocki
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	
Howell	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—37

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Evins	Sabath
Addonizio	Fenton	Sasscer
Albert	Fisher	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Kennedy	Thompson, Tex.
Blatnik	Lyle	Vinson
Burdick	Morris	Welch
Carlyle	Pickett	Wickersham
Carnahan	Powell	
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Burdick.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 9, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 111. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled and the Congress therefore requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—228

Abbitt	Gavin	Norblad
Adair	Goodwin	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Graham	Ostertag
Allen, Ill.	Grant	Patman
Andersen, H. Carl	Greenwood	Patten
	Gregory	Phillips
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Poage
Andresen, August H.	Hale	Potter
	Hall,	Poulson
Andrews	Edwin Arthur	Preston
Arends	Hall,	Priest
Auchincloss	Leonard W.	Prouty
Ayres	Halleck	Radwan
Barden	Hardy	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Harrison, Nebr.	Reams
Battle	Harrison, Va.	Redden
Beall	Harrison, Wyo.	Reed, Ill.
Belcher	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Fla.	Herter	Regan
Bentsen	Hess	Riehlman
Berry	Hill	Riley
Betts	Hillings	Rivers
Blackney	Hoeven	Robeson
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, La.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Holmes	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Hope	Ross
Bow	Horan	Sadlak
Boykin	Hunter	St. George
Bramblett	Ikard	Schenck
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Brooks	Jarman	Scrivner
Brown, Ga.	Jenison	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Shafer
Bryson	Jensen	Short
Buffett	Johnson	Sikes
Burleson	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Burton	Jones, Hamilton C.	Simpson, Pa.
Busbey		Smith, Kans.
Bush	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Byrnes		Smith, Va.
Camp	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Kean	Springer
Chelf	Kearney	Stanley
Chenoweth	Kearns	Stockman
Chiperfield	Keating	Taber
Church	Kerr	Talle
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Thomas
Colmer	Lanham	Thompson, Mich.
Cooper	Lantaff	
Cotton	Larcade	Thornberry
Coudert	Latham	Trimble
Cox	LeCompte	Vail
Crawford	Lovre	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Lucas	Van Zandt
Curtis, Nebr.	McConnell	Velde
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Vursell
Deane	McGregor	Watts
Denny	McIntire	Weichel
Devereux	McMillan	Werdel
D'Ewart	McMullen	Wharton
Dondero	McVey	Wheeler
Dorn	Mahon	Whitten
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Widnall
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Meader	Willis
Fallon	Merrow	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Mills	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	Mumma	Woodruff
Gary	Murray	
Gathings	Nicholson	

NAYS—164

Anfuso	Bishop	Burnside
Angell	Blatnik	Butler
Armstrong	Bolling	Canfield
Bailey	Bosone	Cannon
Bakewell	Bray	Carrigg
Baring	Brownson	Case
Barrett	Buchanan	Celler
Beamer	Buckley	Chudoff
Bennett, Mich.	Budge	Clemente

Cooley	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Corbett	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Crosser	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Irving	O'Hara
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson, Wash.	O'Konski
Dague	James	O'Neill
Dawson	Javits	Osmers
DeGraffenried	Jones, Ala.	O'Toole
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Passman
Denton	Karsten, Mo.	Patterson
Dingell	Kee	Perkins
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Philbin
Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.	Polk
Donohue	Kennedy	Price
Donovan	Keogh	Rabaut
Doyle	King, Calif.	Rains
Eberharter	King, Pa.	Ramsay
Elliott	Kirwan	Rhodes
Engle	Klein	Ribicoff
Feighan	Kluczynski	Roberts
Fine	Lane	Rodino
Flood	Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.
Fogarty	Lind	Rooney
Forand	McCarthy	Roosevelt
Fugate	McCormack	Saylor
Fulton	McGrath	Scott,
Furcolo	McGuire	Hugh D., Jr.
Garmatz	McKinnon	Secrest
Gordon	Machrowicz	Seely-Brown
Granahan	Mack, Ill.	Sheehan
Granger	Mack, Wash.	Shelley
Green	Madden	Sheppard
Gross	Magee	Sieminski
Hagen	Mansfield	Sittler
Hand	Marshall	Spence
Harden	Miller, Calif.	Staggers
Harris	Mitchell	Tollefson
Hart	Morano	Walter
Havenner	Morgan	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Morrison	Williams, N. Y.
Hébert	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Hedrick	Moulder	Withrow
Heffernan	Multer	Wolverton
Heller	Murdock	Yates
Heselton	Murphy	Yorty
Hinshaw	Nelson	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—39

Aandahl	Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.
Abernethy	Eaton	Richards
Addonizio	Evins	Sabath
Albert	Fenton	Sasscer
Allen, La.	Frazier	Steed
Aspinall	George	Stigler
Baker	Golden	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Tackett
Beckworth	Herlong	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Lyle	Vinson
Carlyle	Morris	Welch
Carnahan	Pickett	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Powell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Welch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. George.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Baker.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a live pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 11, line 10, after "1952", insert "*Provided, however,* That title 4 and all authority thereunder shall terminate at the close of July 31, 1952."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 244, answering "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—151

Allen, Calif.	Fisher	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	George	O'Hara
	Golden	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Phillips
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Poage
	Gross	Potter
Andrews	Gwinn	Poulson
Arends	Hagen	Rankin
Ayres	Halleck	Redden
Barden	Harden	Reed, Ill.
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Harrison, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Berry	Harvey	Regan
Betts	Hébert	Rivers
Bishop	Hill	Robeson
Blackney	Hillings	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, Del.	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Saylor
Brehm	Hope	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Hunter	Scrivner
Buffett	Ikard	Scudder
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Busbey	James	Sheehan
Bush	Jarman	Short
Byrnes	Jenison	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Chiperfield		Smith, Wis.
Church	Kearns	Springer
Clevenger	Kilburn	Stockman
Cole, Kans.	Kilday	Taber
Cole, N. Y.	King, Pa.	Talle
Cooley	LeCompte	Teague
Cox	Loyre	Thompson, Mich.
Crawford	Lucas	
Crumpacker	McConnell	Vail
Cunningham	McCulloch	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	McDonough	Vorys
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Werdel
Davis, Wis.	McVey	Wharton
D'Ewart	Mahon	Wheeler
Dolliver	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Merrow	Wolcott
Durham	Miller, Md.	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Idaho
Elston	Mills	Woodruff
Fernandez	Morton	

NAYS—244

Abbitt	Brownson	Denton
Adair	Bryson	Devereux
Anfuso	Buchanan	Dingell
Angell	Buckley	Dollinger
Armstrong	Budge	Dondero
Auchincloss	Burnside	Donohue
Bailey	Burton	Donovan
Baker	Butler	Doyle
Bakewell	Camp	Eberharter
Baring	Canfield	Elliott
Barrett	Carrigg	Engle
Bates, Mass.	Case	Fallon
Battle	Celler	Feighan
Beall	Chelf	Fine
Bender	Chudoff	Flood
Bennett, Fla.	Clemente	Fogarty
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Forand
Bentsen	Cooper	Ford
Blatnik	Corbett	Forrester
Boggs, La.	Cotton	Fugate
Bolling	Coudert	Fulton
Bolton	Crosser	Furcolo
Bonner	Dague	Gamble
Bosone	Dawson	Garmatz
Boykin	Deane	Gary
Bray	DeGraffenried	Gathings
Brooks	Delaney	Gordon
Brown, Ga.	Denny	Granahan
Granger	Lane	Rabaut
Grant	Lanham	Radwan
Green	Lantaff	Rains
Greenwood	Larcade	Ramsay
Gregory	Latham	Reams
Hale	Lesinski	Rhodes
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lind	Ribicoff
	McCarthy	Riehlman
Hall, Leonard W.	McCormack	Riley
	McGrath	Roberts
Hand	McGuire	Rodino
Hardy	McKinnon	Rogers, Colo.
Harris	McMillan	Rogers, Mass.
Harrison, Wyo.	McMullen	Rooney
Hart	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Havenner	Mack, Ill.	Ross
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Wash.	Sadlak
Hays, Ohio	Madden	Scott, Hardie
Hedrick	Magee	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Heffernan	Mansfield	
Heller	Marshall	Secrest
Herter	Martin, Mass.	Seely-Brown
Heselton	Meader	Shelley
Hess	Miller, Calif.	Sheppard
Hinshaw	Miller, N. Y.	Sieminski
Holifield	Mitchell	Sikes
Holmes	Morano	Sittler
Horan	Morgan	Smith, Va.
Howell	Morrison	Spence
Hull	Moulder	Staggers
Irving	Multer	Stanley
Jackson, Wash.	Murdock	Taylor
Javits	Murphy	Thomas
Johnson	Murray	Thornberry
Jonas	Nelson	Tollefson
Jones, Ala.	Norblad	Trimble
Jones, Mo.	Norrell	Van Pelt
Jones, Hamilton C.	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Zandt
	O'Brien, Mich.	Walter
Judd	O'Brien, N. Y.	Watts
Karsten, Mo.	O'Konski	Weichel
Kean	O'Neill	Whitten
Kearney	Osmers	Widnall
Keating	Ostertag	Wier
Kee	O'Toole	Wigglesworth
Kelley, Pa.	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Kelly, N. Y.	Patman	Williams, N. Y.
Kennedy	Patterson	Willis
Keogh	Perkins	Winstead
Kerr	Philbin	Withrow
Kersten, Wis.	Polk	Wolverton
King, Calif.	Preston	Yates
Kirwan	Price	Yorty
Klein	Priest	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—35

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Eaton	Sabath
Addonizio	Evins	Sasscer
Albert	Fenton	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morris	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr Fenton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. Were he present, he would vote "yea." I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11, strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 170, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—225

Abbitt	Bender	Bryson
Adair	Bennett, Fla.	Budge
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Buffett
Allen, Ill.	Bentsen	Burleson
Andersen, H. Carl	Berry	Busbey
	Betts	Bush
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Byrnes
Andresen, August H.	Blackney	Carrigg
	Boggs, Del.	Chatham
Arends	Bolton	Chenoweth
Armstrong	Bow	Chiperfield
Auchincloss	Boykin	Church
Ayres	Bramblett	Clevenger
Barden	Bray	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Brehm	Cole, N. Y.
Beall	Brooks	Colmer
Beamer	Brown, Ohio	Cooley
Belcher	Brownson	Cooper
Cotton	Ikard	Rankin
Cox	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Crawford	James	Reed, Ill.
Crumpacker	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham	Jenison	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins	Regan
Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen	Riehlman
Dague	Johnson	Riley
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Rivers
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Robeson
Denny	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rogers, Fla.
Devereux		Rogers, Tex.
D'Ewart	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ross
Dolliver		Sadlak
Dondero	Judd	St. George
Dorn	Kearney	Saylor
Doughton	Kearns	Schenck
Durham	Keating	Scott, Hardie
Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.	Scrivner
Elston	Kilburn	Scudder
Engle	Kilday	Shafer
Fernandez	King, Pa.	Sheehan
Fisher	Lantaff	Short
Ford	LeCompte	Sikes
Forrester	Lovre	Simpson, Ill.
Fulton	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Gamble	McConnell	Sittler
Gathings	McCulloch	Smith, Kans.
Gavin	McDonough	Smith, Va.
George	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Golden	McIntire	Springer
Goodwin	McMullen	Stanley
Graham	McVey	Stockman
Grant	Mack, Wash.	Taber
Gross	Mahon	Talle
Gwinn	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Teague
Hale	Mason	Thompson, Mich.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meader	
	Merrow	Vail
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Halleck	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Harden	Morton	Vorys
Harrison, Nebr.	Mumma	Vursell
Harrison, Va.	Murray	Weichel
Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson	Werdel
Harvey	Norblad	Wharton
Hébert	O'Hara	Wheeler
Hedrick	Osmers	Widnall
Hess	Ostertag	Williams, Miss.
Hill	Passman	Williams, N. Y.
Hillings	Patten	Willis
Hinshaw	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Hoeven	Poage	Wilson, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Potter	Wolcott
Hoffman, Mich.	Poulson	Wood, Ga.
Hope	Preston	Wood, Idaho
Horan	Prouty	
Hunter	Radwan	

NAYS—170

Andrews	Eberharter	Kennedy
Anfuso	Elliott	Keogh
Angell	Fallon	Kerr
Bailey	Feighan	King, Calif.
Baker	Fine	Kirwan
Bakewell	Flood	Klein
Baring	Fogarty	Kluczynski
Barrett	Forand	Lane
Battle	Fugate	Lanham
Blatnik	Furcolo	Larcade
Boggs, La.	Garmatz	Latham
Bolling	Gary	Lesinski
Bonner	Gordon	Lind
Bosone	Granahan	McCarthy
Brown, Ga.	Granger	McCormack
Buchanan	Green	McGrath
Buckley	Greenwood	McGuire
Burnside	Gregory	McKinnon
Burton	Hand	McMillan
Butler	Hardy	Machrowicz
Camp	Harris	Mack, Ill.
Canfield	Hart	Madden
Cannon	Havenner	Magee
Case	Hays, Ark.	Mansfield
Celler	Hays, Ohio	Marshall
Chelf	Heffernan	Miller, Calif.
Chudoff	Heller	Mills
Clemente	Herter	Mitchell
Combs	Heselton	Morano
Corbett	Holifield	Morgan
Coudert	Holmes	Morrison
Crosser	Howell	Moulder
Dawson	Hull	Multer
Deane	Irving	Murdock
DeGraffenried	Jackson, Wash.	Murphy
Delaney	Javits	Nelson
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Norrell
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.
Dollinger	Kean	O'Brien, Mich.
Donohue	Kee	O'Brien, N. Y.
Donovan	Kelley, Pa.	O'Konski
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Neill
O'Toole	Rodino	Thomas
Patman	Rogers, Colo.	Thornberry
Patterson	Rogers, Mass.	Tollefson
Perkins	Rooney	Trimble
Philbin	Roosevelt	Walter
Polk	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Watts
Price		Whitten
Priest	Secrest	Wier
Rabaut	Seely-Brown	Wigglesworth
Rains	Shelley	Winstead
Ramsay	Sheppard	Withrow
Reams	Sieminski	Wolverton
Rhodes	Smith, Miss.	Yates
Ribicoff	Spence	Yorty
Roberts	Staggers	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Eaton	Sabath
Addonizio	Evins	Sasscer
Albert	Fenton	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morris	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NICHOLSON moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 8210) to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 12, following line 5, add another section as follows:

"SEC. —. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any locality which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such locality, and the governing body of said locality has by resolution, adopted in accordance with applicable local law, found that the conditions set forth in subsection (1) exist in said locality.'"

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 185, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—211

Abbitt	Gavin	Morrison
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Morton
Anfuso	Graham	Moulder
Angell	Granger	Multer
Armstrong	Gregory	Mumma
Auchincloss	Hale	Murdock
Ayres	Hall,	Murphy
Baker	Leonard W.	Murray
Bakewell	Halleck	Norblad
Baring	Hand	Norrell
Bates, Mass.	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Battle	Harris	O'Brien, Mich.
Beamer	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Osmers
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Ostertag
Bentsen	Hedrick	Passman
Blackney	Heffernan	Patman
Boggs, Del.	Heller	Philbin
Boggs, La.	Herlong	Polk
Bolling	Herter	Preston
Bolton	Heselton	Priest
Bonner	Hess	Prouty
Bosone	Holifield	Rabaut
Boykin	Holmes	Radwan
Brooks	Horan	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Ramsay
Brownson	Hull	Reams
Bryson	Irving	Redden
Burton	Jackson, Wash.	Riehlman
Byrnes	James	Riley
Camp	Jarman	Rivers
Canfield	Javits	Roberts
Cannon	Johnson	Robeson
Carrigg	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Case	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Jones,	Rogers, Fla.
Chatham	Hamilton C.	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Jones,	Rooney
Clemente	Woodrow W.	Ross
Colmer	Judd	Sadlak
Combs	Kean	Schenck
Cooley	Kearney	Scudder
Cooper	Keating	Secrest
Cotton	Kennedy	Sieminski
Coudert	Keogh	Sikes
Cox	Kerr	Smith, Miss.
Crosser	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Crumpacker	Kilburn	Spence
Curtis, Mo.	King, Calif.	Stanley
Dague	Kluczynski	Talle
Deane	Lane	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Lantaff	Thomas
Delaney	Larcade	Thornberry
Denny	Latham	Tollefson
Devereux	Lesinski	Trimble
Dingell	Lind	Van Pelt
Dondero	McCarthy	Van Zandt
Donohue	McConnell	Vorys
Doughton	McCormack	Watts
Durham	McKinnon	Weichel
Eaton	McMillan	Whitten
Elliott	McMullen	Widnall
Engle	Machrowicz	Wier
Fallon	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Magee	Williams, Miss.
Forrester	Martin, Mass.	Williams, N. Y.
Fugate	Meader	Willis
Furcolo	Merrow	Winstead
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.	Zablocki
Gary	Mitchell	
Gathings	Morano	

NAYS—185

Adair	Berry	Busbey
Allen, Ill.	Betts	Bush
Andersen,	Bishop	Butler
H. Carl	Blatnik	Chenoweth
Anderson, Calif.	Bow	Chiperfield
Andresen,	Bramblett	Chudoff
August H.	Bray	Church
Andrews	Brehm	Clevenger
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cole, Kans.
Bailey	Buchanan	Cole, N. Y.
Barden	Buckley	Corbett
Barrett	Budge	Crawford
Beall	Buffett	Cunningham
Belcher	Burleson	Curtis, Nebr.
Bennett, Mich.	Burnside	Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Dawson	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Denton	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
D'Ewart	Jonas	Regan
Dollinger	Karsten, Mo.	Rhodes
Dolliver	Kearns	Ribicoff
Donovan	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Dorn	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Doyle	Kilday	St. George
Eberharter	King, Pa.	Saylor
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Elston	Klein	Scott,
Feighan	Lanham	Hugh D., Jr.
Fine	LeCompte	Scrivner
Fisher	Lovre	Seely-Brown
Flood	Lucas	Shafer
Fogarty	McCulloch	Sheehan
Forand	McDonough	Shelley
Ford	McGrath	Sheppard
Fulton	McGregor	Short
George	McGuire	Simpson, Ill.
Golden	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Goodwin	McVey	Sittler
Granahan	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Grant	Madden	Smith, Wis.
Green	Mahon	Springer
Greenwood	Mansfield	Staggers
Gross	Marshall	Stockman
Gwinn	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Hagen	Mason	Teague
Hall,	Miller, Md.	Thompson,
Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	Mich.
Harden	Mills	Vail
Harrison, Nebr.	Morgan	Velde
Harrison, Va.	Nelson	Vursell
Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson	Walter
Harvey	O'Hara	Werdel
Havenner	O'Konski	Wharton
Hays, Ohio	O'Neill	Wheeler
Hill	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Hillings	Patten	Wilson, Tex.
Hinshaw	Patterson	Withrow
Hoeven	Perkins	Wolcott
Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips	Wolverton
Hoffman, Mich.	Poage	Wood, Ga.
Hope	Potter	Wood, Idaho
Hunter	Poulson	Yorty
Ikard	Price	
Jackson, Calif.	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—35

Aandahl	Dempsey	Sabath
Abernethy	Evins	Sasscer
Addonizio	Fenton	Steed
Albert	Frazier	Stigler
Allen, La.	Gore	Sutton
Aspinall	Kee	Tackett
Bates, Ky.	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Beckworth	Morris	Vinson
Burdick	Pickett	Welch
Carlyle	Powell	Wickersham
Carnahan	Reece, Tenn.	Woodruff
Davis, Tenn.	Richards	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addonizio for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Pickett against.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.

Mrs. Kee with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JONAS, Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WITHROW, and Mr. BURNSIDE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have voted against final passage of this so-called Price and Rent Control Act.

Actually this bill as passed controls neither prices nor rents, and as a matter of fact the only control feature in it is that it controls wages. This seems to me manifestly unfair. In fact it is a fraud on the American people since it gives the impression that it controls prices and rents. With the Talle amendment it decontrols prices on all of the essential commodities. With the Wheeler amendment, leaving up to the local communities the decision as to whether there should be rent control, it in effect provides for no rent controls whatsoever.

While it is true that in the State of New York we have a State rent-control law, when we legislate here we do so for the entire country and not on a sectional basis; and therefore I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill which will really offer no rent controls to the people of the country.

As I pointed out in my remarks yesterday, we are in an emergency period where we need these controls—both price and rent. The cost of living has been going up consistently; yet we take the position here that we do not need any of these controls. It does not require much of a memory to remember what happened when the Emergency Price Control Act, which was in effect during World War II, was discontinued In spite of the cries of the business interests that if controls were removed prices would come down, they actually had the opposite effect. Prices have never been as high in the history of our country as they are today; yet here we are making the same mistake again.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues have been undecided as to whether to vote for this bill and take a chance on a better bill coming out of conference, or to take the straightforward action of voting against it. I am certain that if this bill were defeated, a simple extension resolution would be brought in extending the law as it now stands, even though it is quite weak, what with the Capehart and Herlong amendments in it.

The manifest fraud in presenting this bill to the country as a price-control bill is evidenced by the fact that a majority of the unholy coalition, that is the Republicans and Southern Democrats who were instrumental in the passage of all of the emasculating amendments just passed, have voted for this bill on final passage. They evidently want to create the impression that they favor price and rent controls when actually they are guilty of destroying them. I know my constituents would have wanted me to vote against such a fraud; and I trust that when prices and rents do go up, as they inevitably must, the people of this country will know where to assess the blame.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the section numbers and the cross references in the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, be taken from the Speaker's table, that all after the enacting clause be stricken

out, that the bill just passed be substituted, and that the bill as so amended do pass.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952."

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

SEC. 102. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title are hereby revived and shall continue in effect until June 30, 1953, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply, or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased. This section shall not be construed to limit the authority contained in sections 101 and 704 of this act."

SEC. 103. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fresh fruits or vegetables."

SEC. 104. Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 105. (a) In carrying out the policy of the United States as set forth in section 2 of this act, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint representatives to confer with other friendly nations through the mechanism of the International Materials Conference in an effort to ascertain the existing and potential supply of materials useful in the economic mobilization of this and such other nations, as well as the most effective distribution of such materials in executing that policy. Upon a finding by the President, reached after a hearing at which interested parties may express their views, that a pattern of international distribution recommended after such consultation is necessary or appropriate to promode the national defense and compatible with the best interests of the United States, he may, any other provision of this title to the contrary notwithstanding, use the authority vested in him by this act to make it possible for this Nation to carry out the recommendations made by any such conference.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials both domestically produced and imported and facilities through the controlled materials plan or other methods of allocation."

PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

SEC. 105. Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of a seller of a material at retail or wholesale within the meaning of subsection (k) of this section."

SEC. 106. (a) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding after the word "profession" in paragraph (ii) thereof the following: "; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession."

(b) Declaratory of existing law, paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(v) (1) Rates and charges by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended, and including compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, and charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others; charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common carrier operations; and (2) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pick-up and delivery and local transfer services: *Provided,* That no common carrier or other public utility shall at any time after the President shall have issued any stabilization regulations and orders under subsection (b) make any increase in its charges for property or services sold by it for resale to the public, for which application is filed after the date of issuance of such stabilization regulations and orders, before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase;".

(c) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(viii) Rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing."

(d) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(ix) Annual or semiannual payments in the nature of compensation made to employees or officers of a business or enterprise which constitutes a distribution of a portion or percentage of its profits according to a profit-sharing plan or practice which was established and in effect on or before January 15, 1950. If the determination of any amount or part of the plan or practice involves the exercise of the discretion of managers of the business or enterprise, such plan or practices may be continued and payments made thereunder so long as the discretion is exercised according to the same policy standards and principles which were applicable and in effect on or before January 15, 1950."

SEC. 107. Subsection (k) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "hereafter" in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 108. Section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof before the period the following proviso: ": *Provided, however,* That if the antitrust laws of any State have been construed to prohibit adherence by sellers of materials for wholesale or retail to uniform suggested retail resale prices, the President shall issue regulations giving full consideration to the customary percentage margins of such sellers during the period hereinbefore set forth."

SEC. 109. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof two new subsections as follows:

"(l) No rule, regulation, order or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by the State law (other than any so-called fair trade law) or regulation now in effect.

"(m) If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, no rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale."

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, whenever price ceilings are declared in effect on any agricultural commodity at the farm level, the Director of Price Stabilization must at the same time put into effect margin controls on processors, wholesalers, and retailers, such margin controls to allow the processors, wholesalers, and retailers the normal mark-ups as provided under this act, except that under no circumstances are the sellers to be allowed greater than their normal margins of profit.

SEC. 111. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "403." and by adding

at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations, relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That the Board may undertake to mediate and/or arbitrate labor disputes involving wages, salaries, and other compensation, if the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies to the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency that all remedies available to the Service have been exhausted, and (i) the parties themselves request the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate, or (ii) the President requests the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate the dispute and the parties consent: *Provided further,* That in any effort to mediate and/or arbitrate a labor dispute referred to the Board pursuant to the terms of the foregoing proviso, a panel of the Board, the membership of which is constituted in the same proportion as is the Board itself, may act on behalf of the Board.

"(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the twenty-ninth day following the date on which this subsection is enacted."

SEC. 112. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages, and to stabilize prices and wages."

SEC. 113. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

"SEC. 411. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension."

SEC. 114. Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. *Resolved,* That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

SEC. 115. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "his."

SEC. 116. (a) Section 717 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of February 28, 1953."

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. Subsection (e) of section 4 and subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1953."

SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any defense-rental area, including any community owned and operated by the Federal Government, which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such area."

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

PUBLIC CONTRACTS

SEC. 301. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended (1) by redesignating sections 10 and 11 as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately following section 9 a new section 10 as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, such act shall be applicable in the administration of sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of this act.

"(b) All wage determinations under section 1 (b) of this act shall be made on the record after opportunity for a hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or of the applicability of any such wage determination may be had within 90 days after such determination, is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles, or equipment purchased or to be purchased by the Government from any source, who is in any industry to which such wage determination is applicable.

"(c) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulations required by any provision of this act in any contract subject to this act, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any legal question which might otherwise be raised, including, but not limited to, wage determinations and the interpretation of the terms 'locality,' 'regular dealer,' 'manufacturer,' and 'open market.'"

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2594 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 8210 as passed, as follows: "That this act may be cited as the 'Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nor shall any restriction or other limitation be established or maintained upon the species, type, or grade of livestocks killed by any slaughterer, nor upon the types of slaughtering opera-

tions, including religious rituals, employed by any slaughterer; nor shall any requirements or regulations be established or maintained relating to the allocation or distribution of meat or meat product unless, and for the period for which, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have determined and certified to the President that the over-all supply of meat and meat products is inadequate to meet the civilian or military needs therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products.'

"SEC. 102. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'When all requirements for the national defense, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities and minimizing inflationary pressures. No authority granted under this act may be used to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference.'

"SEC. 103. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Whenever priorities are established or allocations made under section (a) with respect to any raw material, and such priorities or allocations operate to limit the production of articles or products produced in the United States, the President shall by proclamation limit the importation, during the period such priorities or allocations are in effect, of any article or product in the manufacture or production of which such raw material is used to 100 percent of the average annual imports of such article or product during the calendar years 1947 through 1949: *Provided*, That the Tariff Commission has reported to the President that a substantial portion of the American producers of such article or product, or an article or product competitive therewith, has requested such limitations on imports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to supply the essential defense needs therefor. Upon the application of any substantial American producer, the Tariff Commission shall publish the fact of having received such application, shall hold public hearing thereon and shall report the facts to the President within 60 days of the receipt of such application. Such report to the President shall include the article or product on which the import limitation has been requested, whether it contains any raw material which is under priority or allocation control, whether a substantial portion of the American producers thereof have requested the above-specified import limitation, the maximum quantity of imports which would comply with said import limitation and such other facts as the Tariff Commission deems appropriate. A copy of said report to the President shall be submitted to the Secretaary of Defense. If said report of the Tariff Commission indicates that the above-specified conditions have been met by the applicant and the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is not sufficient to meet the essential defense needs, the President shall proclaim such import limitation within 30 days of his receipt of the report from the Tariff Commission. If the Secretary of Defense has certified that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to meet the essential defense needs therefor, the President shall, by proclamation, limit the imports of such article or product to such quantity as the Secretary of Defense certifies as necessary, in excess of American production, to meet the essential defense needs. All reports of the Tariff Commission and all certifications of the Secretary of Defense made hereunder shall be made public at the time of their issuance.'

"SEC. 104. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.'

"SEC. 105. The first sentence of section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and manufacture of newsprint.'

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No regulation or order shall be issued or remain in effect, under this title, which prohibits the payment or receipt of hourly wages at a rate of $1 per hour or less.'

"SEC. 107. Section 402 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The ceiling price for any material shall be suspended as long as (1) the material is selling below the ceiling price and has sold below that price for a period of 3 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military consumption and has been in such adequate or surplus supply for a period of 3 months. For the purpose of this paragraph, a material shall be considered in adequate or surplus supply whenever such material is not being allocated for civilian use, or, in the case of an agricultural commodity or product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom, is not being rationed at the retail level of consumer goods for household and personal use, under the authority of title I of this act.'

"SEC. 108. (a) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence thereof, after '(1) the Agricultural Act of 1949,' the following: 'except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that act, for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.'"

"(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No ceiling prices for products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, milk, and other dairy products shall be established or maintained in any agricultural marketing area at levels which fail to reflect for the processing of such products the cost adjustments provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection and which fail to reflect for the distributing and selling of such products the customary margin or charge provided in subsection (k) of this section. Where a State regulatory body is authorized to establish minimum and/or maximum prices for sales of fluid milk, ceiling prices established for such sales under this title shall (1) not be less than the minimum prices, or (2) be equal to the maximum prices, established by such regulatory body, as the case may be: *And provided further*, That in the case of prices of milk established by any State regulatory body, with respect to which price, parties may be deemed to contract, no ceiling price may be maintained under this title which is less than the price so established. No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fruits or vegetables in fresh or processed form.'

"SEC. 109. Subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(6) For the purpose of determining the applicable ceiling price under the general ceiling price regulation issued January 26, 1951, as amended, any sale of fertilizer to the ultimate user by a person who acquired it for resale shall be considered a retail sale. This paragraph shall take effect as of January 26, 1951.'

"SEC. 110. (a) Paragraph (111) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(iii) Price of rentals for (a) materials furnished for publication by any press association of feature service, or (b) books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals, or newspapers, other than as waste or scrap; or rates charged by or wages paid to any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting or television station, a motion picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities.'

"SEC. 111. (a) Paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(v) Rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended;'.

"(b) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(viii) Prices charged and wages paid by bowling alleys.'

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(ix) Wages paid for agricultural labor.'

"(d) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(e) Wages, salaries, or other compensation of persons employed in small-business enterprises as defined in this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That the President may from time to time exclude from this exemption such enterprises on the basis of industries, types of business, occupations, or areas, if their exemption would be unstabilizing with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation, prices, or manpower, or would otherwise be contrary to the purposes of this act. A small-business enterprise, for the purpose of this paragraph, is any enterprise in which a total of eight or less persons are employed in all its establishments, branches, units, or affiliates. This paragraph shall become effective 30 days after its enactment.'

"(e) Subsection 2 of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(xi) Sales of surplus materials by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing.'

"SEC. 112. The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title, or remain in effect under this title for more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, which shall deny a seller of materials or services at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or services or his customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by his records during such period, except as to any one specific item of a line of material sold by such seller which is in short supply as evidenced by specific government action to encourage production of the item in question.'

"SEC. 113. Section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof before the period the following proviso: ': *Provided, however,* That if the antitrust laws of any State have been construed to prohibit adherence by sellers of materials for wholesale or retail to uniform suggested retail resale prices, the President shall issue regulations giving full consideration to the customary percentage margins of such sellers during the period hereinbefore set forth.'

"SEC. 114. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(l) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by any State law (other than any so-called fair trade law) enacted prior to July 1, 1952, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law.

"'(m) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued or maintained under this title, which shall deny to any hotel supply house or combination distributor, affiliated with any slaughterer or slaughtering establishment, the same ceiling price or prices for meat accorded to hotel supply houses or combination distributors which are not so affiliated.'

"SEC. 115. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended by Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order, but the number of members representative of the general public shall at all times exceed the aggregate of the number of members representative of labor and the number of members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board for representatives of labor shall equal the number of offices on the Board for representatives of business and industry. Among the members representative of labor, at least one shall be a person who is not a representative of any organization which is affiliated with either of the two major labor organizations.

"'(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall be 1 year, unless sooner terminated in accordance with section 717. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted.'

"SEC. 116. (a) (1) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'relating to price controls under this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'relating to price controls under this title or rent controls under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended'; and by striking out 'relating to price controls' after 'any such regulation or order'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'this title' the following: 'and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended,'; and by inserting after 'section 705 of this act' the following: ', or section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, as the case may be'.

"(b) Section 408 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 408. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the President, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the President has taken official notice. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of all questions determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper; to permanently enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, the regulation or order or the amendment of or supplement to the regulation or order protested; to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the President; to dismiss the petition; or to remand the proceeding to the President for further action in accordance with the court's decree: *Provided,* That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the President at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. The findings of the President with respect to questions of fact, if supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the President or not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the President or included by the President in such

proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the President. The President shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the President, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"'(b) The Emergency Court of Appeals is hereby continued for the purpose of the exercise of the jurisdiction granted by this title, with the powers herein specified, together with the powers heretofore granted by law to such court which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this title. So far as necessary to decision the court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, interpret the meaning or applicability of the terms of any official action under this title or under this act as amended, of which this title is a part and with respect to this title. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this title.

"'(c) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a United States court of appeals as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any such regulation or order under this title. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this title authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"'(d) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the President setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with section 407 of this title. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the President or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"'(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"'(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"'(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under section 407 of this title prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, setting forth objections to the validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"'(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 409 (a) or 706 (a) of this Act the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with section 408 (b) of this title, any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under section 407 of this title, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this Act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code; nor, except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under this title.'

"SEC. 117. At the end of section 403, add the following new paragraph:

"'Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, administration of salary stabilization for executive, administrative, supervisory, and professional personnel shall be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, under stabilization policies promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Administrator. The term "supervisory personnel" as used herein shall have the same meaning as the term "supervisor" as defined by the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947", and the terms "executive", "administrative", and 'professional" shall have the same meaning as the corresponding terms as defined in existing regulations of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division for the purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act.'

"SEC. 118. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 411. No person shall be required under this act to furnish any reports or other information with respect to sales of materials or services at prices which are below ceiling, if such person certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices.'

"SEC. 119. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress therefor requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions (sections 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.'

"SEC. 120. (a) Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed. The table of contents in the first section of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'Title VI. Control of consumer and real estate credit,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Title VI. [Repealed]'.

"(b) Subsection (c) of section 109 of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, which amends section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'and provide for extending natural gas for house heating to amputee veterans, other hardship cases, and totally disabled individuals.'

"(c) Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) After the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section.'

"SEC. 121. Section 701 (c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the colon at the end of the first sentence thereof, and adding the following: 'during such period:'.

"SEC. 122. Section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"'(f) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.'

"SEC. 123. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'his.'

"SEC. 124. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereto the following new subsection:

"'(d) No action for the recovery of any cooperative payment made to a cooperative association by a Market Administrator under an invalid provision of a milk marketing order issued by the Secretary of the Agriculture pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 shall be maintained unless such action is brought by producers specifically named as party plaintiffs to recover their respective share of such payments within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 with respect to any cause of action heretofore accrued and not otherwise barred, or within 90 days after accrual with respect to future payments, and unless each claimant shall allege and prove (1) that he objected at the hearing to the provisions of the order under which such payments were made and (2) that he either refused to accept payments computed with such deduction or accepted them under

protest to either the Secretary or the Administrator. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all such actions regardless of the amount involved. This subsection shall not apply to funds held in escrow pursuant to court order. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no termination date shall be applicable to this subsection.'

"SEC. 125. (a) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of secton 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out '1952' and inserting in lieu thereof '1953.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out '1952' and inserting in lieu thereof '1953.'

"SEC. 126. Subsection (b) of section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs and of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration thereof.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 201. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1952' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1953.'

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense-housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'

"SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) Consistent with the other provisions of this act, all affected agencies, departments, and establishments of the Federal Government shall, by July 15, 1952, establish and administer rents and service charges for quarters supplied to Federal employees and members of the Uniformed Services furnished quarters on a rental basis in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to housing units under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission where Federal rent control is now in effect.'

"SEC. 203. The Director of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized to appoint a Defense Areas Advisory Committee to advise him in connection with the exercise of any function or authority vested in him by section 204 (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, or by delegation thereunder, with respect to determining any area to be a critical defense housing area. Any committee so appointed shall consist, in addition to a chairman, of representatives of the Department of Defense, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Office of Rent Stabilization. Any Federal Agency shall, to the fullest practicable extent, furnish such information in its possession to the Defense Areas Advisory Committee as such Committee may request from time to time relevant to its operations.

"SEC. 204. Subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraphs:

"'(1) a new defense plant or installation has been provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been reactivated or its operation substantially expanded;

"'(2) substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel has occurred to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and

"'(3) a substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists which has resulted in excessive rent increases and which impeded activities of such defense plant or installation.'"

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.

The proceedings by which the bill H. R. 8210 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at the conclusion of the debate in Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States, on the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill the objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to override the veto and pass the bill H. R. 5678, the President's objections notwithstanding. I have gone very carefully over the lengthy veto message, and I have tried very hard to find in this elaborate opus certain points which would lend themselves to discussion, points that would be pertinent to the provisions of H. R. 5678. Unfortunately, it is impossible, because of the fictional and amateurish character of the message. Therefore, in discussing the veto message, I do feel that I am not discussing the Chief Exectuive's specific objections to the legislative measure now before us. I feel that I am discussing certain thoughts propounded by the President's ghost writers who have neglected to do one thing—to read the bill.

More than half of the veto message deals with the question of whether or not the United States needs more immigrants. The answer to the President's ghost writers is in the affirmative. They say that we need more immigrants to enter our country because our population has grown since 1924 when the quota system was established. In other words, the authors of this message believe that the more population a country has the more people it is able to absorb. This is a brand new argument and shall run counter to the internationally accepted theory, according to which underpopulated and not overpopulated countries offer resettlement opportunities for new immigrants.

Without stretching too much the Presidential ghost writer's argument, Italy, India, and Japan, and not Brazil, Canada, and Australia would be best suited to accept more immigrants.

This extravagant theory, coming to us right after the President's Commission found that we were running out of raw materials, provides for a rather strange illustration of the working of the mind of some of the Presidential advisers. As far as I am concerned, I have noticed among the American people very little support for this brand new theory of overpopulating overpopulated countries, and I do not know of any

widespread desire of enlarging our immigration quotas over and above their present size and over and above the considerable number of additional immigrants that we have received and are still receiving, under special emergency enactments of the postwar years. In any event, the President's ghost writers' demographic dissertations have nothing to do with the legislation before us.

As I pointed out earlier this year on several occasions, this bill is not another displaced persons bill. It is designed to be a permanent statute, codifying and revising the hodgepodge of our immigration and nationality laws. Should the American people decide that they want to admit more immigrants, their representatives in Congress would act according to their wishes, but not in connection with this particular legislation. Similarly, should the American people desire to change the time-tested principle of national origins, from which I believe it would be very dangerous to depart, they would so signify to us and we might then act accordingly. I have not heard any such demands except those coming from isolated groups motivated by political and professional considerations.

The message before us points to many good and desirable provisions of the bill. Among them it lists the removal of racial barriers to immigration and naturalization; the removal of discriminations between sexes, and other improvements of the existing law. If the President's veto is sustained, none of these improvements will be written into the law. The old people of Japanese ancestry, 85,000 of them, whose sons covered themselves with glory on the battlefield of the last war, fighting and dying for the United States, these old people will not become citizens of the United States, and they will continue to face difficulties even in holding to their property in the several States. This, despite the fact that every one of them is legally in the United States and cannot be deported.

If the President's veto is sustained, several thousands of Chinese children of American citizens would remain stranded in Hong Kong under the constant threat of being captured by Chinese Communists and brought up to be our enemies.

If the President's veto is sustained, several thousands of Americans of Italian ancestry who voted in Italian elections in order to help us defeat the Communists will not see their citizenship restored.

If the President's veto is sustained, the American girl who marries an Italian or a Greek, or an Indian or a Japanese, will not be able to bring her husband to the United States.

If the President's veto is sustained, the GI in Japan or in Korea will not be permitted to bring his oriental wife into this country.

If the President's veto is sustained, the homeless and abandoned Korean and Japanese children whose plight has appealed to the big-hearted American boys who prompted their families to adopt them, will be barred from entering the country of their adoption.

If the President's veto is sustained, Communist propaganda in the Far East will be given a new shot in the arm by being permitted to spread the word that we intend to keep the orientals out and that the words of friendship we addressed to them remain just empty slogans.

In that connection I would like to read a paragraph from a letter that I received from General MacArthur bearing date May 23, 1949, in which the general stated:

> The gravity of the issue demands that American policy governing international relationships be raised to the highest moral plane and attuned realistically to a course of broad statesmanship and enlightened vision. * * * The action you advocate is based upon just that type of statesmanship. It completes rectification of a past wrong and gives honor where honor has been well earned and is due. It renews in peace bonds of fraternal understanding and mutual confidence welded in the crucible of war and reaffirms our desire to extend these bonds to embrace all of the peoples of the earth. It repudiates the concept which holds to the superiority of some over the inferiority of others.

We should not permit this to happen, and we should not permit the veto to stand, thus jeopardizing both our domestic and international relations.

As I said in the beginning, I do not know who the President's ghost writers are, but I do find in the veto message most of the statements made by certain persons and certain groups whose motives in fighting this legislation are highly questionable, if not suspicious. On the other hand, I do know that every Government agency charged with the administration of our immigration and nationality laws, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, have strongly recommended the enactment of this bill.

I do know that many patriotic American organizations, including the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor—and in that connection I would like to point out that according to an article that appeared in the Star last week the CIO branded this legislation as being antilabor. If this bill is antilabor, then north is south, and east is west.

The American Federation of Labor participated in the drafting of the bill, and they have stated that for the first time in the history of our immigration laws steps have been taken to protect the American worker.

More than that, in this same letter the CIO said that this legislation could be used to punish labor leaders. I found a case reported in the Southeast Reporter in which there is a very short definition of punishment:

> Punishment in a legal sense is any pain, penalty, suffering, or confinement inflicted upon a person by the authority of the law, and the judgment and sentence of a court for some crime or offense committed by him or for his omission of a duty enjoined by law. (*State* v. *Pope* (60 S. E. 234, 236 and 79 S. C. 87,).)

What crimes or offenses have labor leaders committed that makes them falsely brand this legislation as antilabor?

In addition to the organizations I have mentioned, there is the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Please bear that in mind because there is a Catholic clergyman who has been buttonholing Members of Congress all days trying to influence them improperly, if you please. But the National Catholic Welfare Conference endorses this particular bill.

All associations of our shipping and airlines, as well as the Japanese-American Citizens League and the Chinese-American organizations, have recommended its enactment.

The main purpose of the strengthening of our immigration laws was to give the executive branch a better instrument to protect the security of our country and our citizens. The loopholes in our old statutes have gradually become larger and larger, so that while fighting communism abroad we actually became powerless in fighting its infiltration into our own country. I believe that the Congress is under the obligation—under a mandate—to provide for better protection of our country from subversives, gamblers, narcotic peddlers, stowaways, ship jumpers, and foreign agents who know not only too well how to slip into and remain in our country.

There is no question that under the Constitution and under hundreds of court decisions the Congress has the power to provide for such protection.

Instead of following the presidential ghost writers' example and indulge in writing fiction into veto messages, let me quote in that respect a few court decisions.

The power of Congress to control immigration stems from the sovereign authority of the United States as a Nation and from the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations—*Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581 (1889)); *Edye* v. *Robertson, Collector* (112 U. S. 580 (1884)).

Every sovereign nation has power, inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation, to forbid entrance of foreigners within its dominions, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe—*Nishimura Ekiu* v. *United States* (142 U. S. 651, 659 (1892)).

Congress may exclude aliens altogether or prescribe terms and conditions upon which they may come into or remain in this country—*Fok Young Yo* v. *United States* (185 U. S. 296 (1902)).

The power and authority of the United States, as an attribute of sovereignty, either to prohibit or regulate immigration of aliens, are plenary and Congress may choose such agencies as it pleases to carry out whatever policy or rule of exclusion it may adopt, and, so long as such agencies do not transcend limits of authority or abuse discretion reposed in them, their judgment is not open to challenge or review by courts—*Kaorn Yamataya* v. *Fisher* (189 I. S. 86 (1903)).

It has been settled by repeated decision that Congress has power to exclude

any and all aliens from the United States, to prescribe the terms and conditions on which they may come in or on which they remain after having been admitted, to establish the regulations for deporting such aliens as have entered in violation of law or who are here in violation of law, and to commit the enforcing of such laws and regulations to executive officers—*In re Kosopud et al.* (272 F. 330 (1920)).

It has been repeatedly held that the right to exclude or to expel all aliens or any class of aliens, absolutely or upon certain conditions, in war or in peace, is an inherent and inalienable right of every sovereign and independent nation, essential to its safety, its independence, and its welfare; that this power to exclude and to expel aliens, being a power affecting international relations, is vested in the political departments of the Government, and is to be regulated by treaty or by act of Congress and to be executed by the executive authority according to the regulations so established, except so far as the judicial department has been authorized by treaty or by statute, or is required by the paramount law of the Constitution to intervene—*Colyer* v. *Skeffington* (265 F. 17 (1920)).

The United States may exclude any alien for any reason whatsoever, such as the Government's dislike of the alien's political or social ideas, or because he belongs to groups which are likely to become public charges, or for other similar reasons—*United States* v. *Parson* (22 F. Supp. 149 (1938)).

Although an alien who had acquired residence in this country was entitled to the same protection of life, liberty, and property as a citizen, he acquired no vested right to remain and the Government has power to deport him if, in the judgment of Congress, public interests so required, and such power is not dependent upon the existence of statutory conditions as to his right to remain at the time he became a resident—*United States* v. *Sui Joy* (240 F. 392 (1917)).

An alien resident in the United States may be deported for any reason which Congress has determined will make his residence here inimical to the best interests of our Government—*Skeffington* v. *Katzeff* (277 F. 129 (1922)).

In the more recent decisions on March 10, 1952—Harisiades against Shaughnessy, Mascitti against McGrath, and Coleman against McGrath—Justice Jackson cited 11 Supreme Court decisions sustaining the sovereign nation's power to terminate its hospitality to an alien who failed to comply with the laws of the land of his adoption.

Said Justice Jackson:

> It is a weapon of defense and reprisal confirmed by international law as a power inherent in every sovereign State. Such is the traditional power of the Nation over the alien, and we leave the law on the subject as we find it.

Regarding the President's ghost wrters' complaint that certain provisions of this legislation are applicable to the deportation of subversives, this is what Justice Jackson had to say:

> During all the years since 1920 Congress has maintained a standing admonition to aliens, on pain of deportation, not to become members of any organization that advocates overthrow of the United States by force and violence, a category repeatedly held to include the Communist Party. These aliens violated that prohibition and incurred liability to deportation. They were not caught unawares by a change of law.

Regarding the President's ghost writers' complaint about the constitutionality of the other provisions of this bill, Justice Reed, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Carlson against Landon—March 10, 1952—cited five Supreme Court decisions to sustain the following finding:

> The power to expell aliens, being essentially a power of the political branches of Government, the legislative and executive, may be exercised entirely through executive officers, "with such opportunity for judicial review of their action as Congress may see fit to authorize or permit." This power is, of course, subject to judicial intervention under the "paramount law of the Constitution."

This judicial intervention has been fully preserved in the bill presently before us. So have been other rights and privileges of the alien foreign-born and native-born citizens.

Notwithstanding the fiction contained in the veto message, all existing statutes governing the loss of United States citizenship have been liberalized, and I want to stress the words "all of them"—those relative to loss of citizenship by dual nationals as well as those relative to children of American citizens born abroad.

The paragraphs of the veto message which discuss these provisions of the bill prove once more what I said at the outset, that the ghost writers simply neglected to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the proposed law before they advised the President to disregard the recommendations of all his executive agencies and succumb to pressures motivated by political interests.

After having spent close to 4 years in studying and drafting this law, its authors, supported by every one of the administrative agencies working in the field of immigration and naturalization, recommended the passage of this legislation and now they most sincerely recommend that it be passed again, the Presidential "illadvisers" notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to address this group on this veto. However, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, having given voice to his views whereby he took the President to task for, shall I say, having what might be deemed the temerity in vetoing this bill, I feel it incumbent upon myself to say a few words in support of the President.

The President exercised his discretion. I believe he acted with fortitude, with integrity, and with wisdom, as he saw fit. The President's motive in vetoing this bill must be deemed above reproach. His views are above suspicion.

Even those of Catholic faith have the right to present their views for or against this veto. All faiths have the right to do this and they should not be castigated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has somewhat offended against the preservation of the right of protest.

I can understand very well the perturbation of mind of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has labored long and assiduously on this bill. He feels a keen rebuff. I do not think that warrants, however, the severity and the bitterness, shall I say, of his denunciation of the President. I think he should take it in his stride. We cannot win at all times. In this work with which we are confronted here we meet with many rebuffs and frustrations, but there come times when we have victories and it compensates us for all our disappointments. He is disappointed. His disappointment should not warp his judgment.

Ghost writing, which he attacks, is apparently essential in the busy life of any President. Turn the mirror upon yourselves. I do not think there is a Member in this House who has not had at some time or other a ghost writer. I venture that there is not a Member of this House who has not at some time or other been at least aided and given some comfort by others in the writing of his speeches. It may be only a matter of degree, that is all. But when you take the multifarious duties of a President, it is almost impossible for him to write every speech or every observation that comes from his pen. He must have the aid and the counsel of others. Consider his herculean tasks, his varied pursuits, the intensity of his work and you readily see that continual speech writing requires considerable assistance

The test is: "are the remarks embraced to the President." If so, they are his. The veto is the veto of the President, beyond all doubt. It has been the practice of many Presidents to have ghost writers. I just read Judge Rosenman's book about 20 years with the President. He spoke of the ghost writing that was involved in many of the presentations of President Roosevelt. Even General Eisenhower has his ghost writer. President Hoover, President Coolidge, and President Taft all had their ghost writers, and they received such aid and comfort from many of their counselors in that regard.

The strictures laid on the President are rather heavy and I think a bit unfair. All wisdom does not reside either in the President or in the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any Member of the House, for that matter. We are all endowed with human frailties. I say the President is well within his rights to veto this bill. The disappointment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is understandable, but his heavy handed criticism of the President is not.

The gravamen of the veto was the objection to further imbedding in our statutes what is known as the national origins theory. Most of the veto message is in opposition to the national origins theory. I believe that theory is out moded and should have been cast into limbo long since. It stems from a sort of claustrophobia, xenophobia, or chauvinism, popular at the end of the last century but which seems to animate many of the people in this land and a

goodly portion of the membership of this House. Too many people believe aliens have horns and that they are the very embodiment of the devil.

The bill vetoed continues to divide the immigration pie in a very unfair and unrealistic manner. We allow something like a total of 154,000 aliens to come into this country yearly, and how do we divide that pie? We give almost half of it to Great Britain. What does Great Britain do? It thumbs its nose at us and says, "We do not want to come to the United States, we do not want to use your immigration quota numbers."

Then what do we do? We continue the hoax. We continue, shall I say, the lie. We continue the fake, as it were. We say we give to Britain almost half the quota, sixty-eight-thousand-odd. They hardly use any of the numbers, and all those numbers go down the drain. That is to the great disadvantage of the aliens who seek to come here from other lands, particularly those from southern and eastern Europe, from Spain and from Greece and from Italy. The President said: "Do not let the British quota numbers go to waste. Assign unused numbers to aliens anxious to come to us, but who cannot because the quotas of their country of origin are ridiculously if tragically small."

Why do we discriminate with pitifully small quotas for those countries in southern and eastern Europe and give to Germany over 25,000 quota numbers, and give to Great Britain all those numbers that I have mentioned, whereas Great Britain does not want to use them? Why so generous to Germany? And so parsimonious to Italy? Why do we continue that course? The President wisely pointed all that out in his veto message.

Names of worthy people from southern and eastern Europe, who are discriminated against by the bill vetoed are part of the warp and woof of American life. These names are found on baseball rosters, in the lists of Congressmen, and governors.

I suggest that if you look at the casualty lists coming from Korea you will see what? Only British or German names? Indeed no. You will see many names of those who came from southern and eastern Europe, Polish names, Hungarian names, Croatian names, Italian names, Greek names, and Turkish names. These diverse names belong to honored dead and wounded. Why should their people be so discriminated against by virtue of the national origins theory, against which the President very properly inveighed, a theory which also flies in the face of our foreign policy?

In one breath we say we wish to hold out a helping hand to you people in Italy, and you people in Greece, and you people in Spain, and you people in other parts of southern and eastern Europe. And in the other breath we do all in our power to wound their sensibilities, to curb their spirit and injure their feelings when it comes to immigration quotas. The President very properly pointed that out. In effect he said they are just as good as the British or the Germans. These people who come from those parts have America born in them—most of them. I do not ask the question whether a man was born in America. I ask the question, "Is America born in you?" Benedict Arnold was born in this country, but America was not born in him. Earl Browder was born in this country, but America was not born in him. Carl Schurz was not born in this country, but America was born in him. Alexander Hamilton was not born in America. America was born in him. Vincent Impelliteri, our great mayor of the city of New York, was born in Italy, but America was born in him. That should be the test. So many Italians and Greeks despite America being born in them are kept out. But this immigration bill which was passed by this House and vetoed by the President, flies in the face of that theory of Americanism.

Those who sponsored this bill, and many members of the House, are forgetful that we built our great country because we siphoned off the best of the brain and the best of the brawn of all peoples of Europe everywhere—not from just a few countries but from all countries of Europe—as a result of which we have the highest standards of living that civilization has ever seen. But this bill again flies in the face of all that. It turns the clock backward, and the President in his wisdom very properly points all that out in his veto message.

What do we do with reference to the escapees coming out from behind the iron curtain or from behind the bamboo curtain? In one breath we say, "Come in, we want to entice you to come from behind the iron curtain or the bamboo curtain." Then when they ask to come into this country and they go to our consuls in the far-spread cities of the world, and when one of them says, "I have come out of Russia," or another says "I have come out of Poland," or "I have come out of Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia, or Rumania, or Hungary." What does the consul say: "No soap. You will have to wait." "How long must I wait?" "You must wait until your quota number is reached." "How long will that be?" "Maybe 10 years, maybe 20 years." Meanwhile what are they to do?

Well, in the case of some of the small countries of Europe, the wait might be over 100 years. We have mortgaged the quotas of some countries for so many years. These are some of the reasons assigned for the veto. The President, indeed, was well within his rights in vetoing this bill.

The praiseworthy provisions of the bill regarding the naturalization of our Japanese residents and the entry of oriental spouses and children, could be readily and speedily enacted in a separate measure on which, I am certain, we could all quickly agree.

The President himself recommends such action.

The veto does not foreclose these essential remedies.

Furthermore, the President properly recommends the setting up of a commission to make a profound study of our immigration and naturalization laws.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those who vote against the President's veto will do so thinking they serve the best interests of the United States. I hope they are right. But I think they are wrong. I will vote to sustain the President's veto.

The greatest fear of man seems to be man.

I recall James Matthew Barrie's Admirable Crichton. In England, the hero was a butler. On a shipwrecked island, he was a regular guy, cock of the walk, real Joe.

That is America. Afraid of no one. It has made it possible for each of us to be "Admirable Crichtons."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, surely nobody questions the right of the President to veto this bill. The think which a great many of us do question is the wisdom of his vetoing it, especially at a time like the present. Today we have thousands and thousands of American boys in Korea whose very lives depend upon the faith in us and good will toward us of the Koreans among whom they are living and fighting. The President's veto perpetuates a situation whereby in our immigration laws those Koreas are officially insulted and stigmatized as biologically inferior beings. What effort do you suppose news of the President's veto has on our allies in Korea?

We have lost a good part of continental Asia to Communist control. Everybody knows what we have done in the last year to try to keep on our side what can be a bulwark of freedom in that part of the world—Japan. She is the third best workshop in the world. Rusisa now controls plenty of manpower. She has territory. She has raw materials. What does she need? She needs a workshop. And there it is—Japan, the best in Asia. To keep it on our side and out of Russia's hands, we must depend on people whom the President chooses today to declare unfit for even one of them, no matter how gifted or cultured, to come into the United States as an immigrant because he is not of the white, the black, or the red race. That is what existing law provides, and the President's veto keeps it as it is.

We want and need the people of Asia to stand with us at a time when things are not going too well—and then our President slaps them in the face.

Mr. Speaker, racial discrimination in our dealings with other peoples is the weakest spot in America's armor. Make no mistake about the importance of this issue. The colored peoples around the world outnumber the white peoples two to one. They can outwork and undereat any white men that ever lived. They will outwait him and outsuffer him and outendure him; and they will outbreed him. They will win out, if our enemies succeed in uniting them against us, and I fear they will if the white man continues much longer on his statute books immigration laws that publicly discriminate against friendly peoples by denying, with certain exceptions, any quota whatsoever for those whose skins happen to be yellow or brown.

Those are the very people on whose faith in us, whose friendship for us, whose sense of unity with us the lives of our own sons in Korea, Japan, and other parts of the Far East depend, and on whom our future security in the Pacific basin depends, and on whom ultimately the survival of this Republic may depend.

America formerly had a privileged position in the world. Other countries got into conflicts and we stood on the side and watched until we determined where out interests lay, and then we threw in our strength on this side or the other, and that usually tipped the scales.

That fortunate day has gone. Today we are not an observer, we are one of the two main contenders. On one side of the balance is the Soviet Union with 800,000,000 people under its domination. On the other side is the free world, with the 800,000,000 people of the Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, the Mediterranean area, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and a few others. Who controls the balance of power between these two contenders, locked in mortal combat? The other 750,000,000 in the world. Where do they live? They live in Asia. They are the peoples branded as inferior and unworthy human beings under the present laws whose discrimination this bill is designed to correct. And the President has vetoed it.

They live in Korea, Japan, southeast Asia, and across South Asia to Iran. These are the 750,000,000 people who control the balance of power in the world today—and whom the President chooses to affront anew. What happens to them in the immediate future depends in no small degree, in my opinion, on what the United States does; but what happens to the United States in the long run depends on which way those people go. Will it be with the Communists who offer all sorts of lies and fake and fraudulent promises of racial equality? Or with us, who, while not pretending to any perfection and not denying the inequities that still exist, are nevertheless trying, step by step, to correct them?

Is it not better to accept the bill with its real gains, even though it does not correct all that many believe to be inequities, than to reject the great forward steps which it represents in the very areas where we are sustaining our most serious losses? Is it sensible to reject those forward steps just because the bill does not achieve the Kingdom of Heaven on earth?

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to produce positively all the good and justice and brotherhood that we would like to have in the world, but the least we can do is to remove the negative acts of injustice that are in our immigration and naturalization statutes today. That is what this bill does that the President has vetoed.

In his message the President said the bill "repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is the President's veto that repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man, because it keeps our statutes as they are, with hundreds of millions of people in those crucial areas still outlawed because of the color or the pigment of their skin. I cannot believe that in a time of such crisis and such peril, when such gigantic issues are hanging in the balance, we will fail to override the President's veto. We must make clear to watching millions that the representatives of the people of the United States believe in trying to correct things that are inequitable; that we want to improve relations between our country and all the peoples in the world who want to be free; and that because we believe the action of our President to be mistaken and short-sighted, the representatives of the people, as is certainly within their rights, take this action to make this bill the official law of the land.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the veto message of President Truman on H. R. 5678 presents convincing reasons why the President should have vetoed this bill and why the House should sustain his veto.

Among other reasons, the President stressed strongly, and properly so, the unfairness of the so-called national origins clause of the 1924 immigration act as our basic law in determining quotas for other countries.

While the national-origins clause as a basis of our quota allocations was incorporated into the 1924 law, it was suspended from time to time by the Congress until 1929, when it finally became effective.

This is rather clear evidence that the very Members of the Congress who passed the immigration law of 1924 entertained serious doubts in relation to the wisdom, soundness, or fairness of the national-origins clause as the vital part of our organic immigration law in determining quotas that the various countries of the world should have.

I remember well that the first speech I made in the House as a new Member was against the national-origins clause.

And now, over 32 years later, President Truman in a ringing veto message, calls attention to this very clause, its unfairness and the fact that this quota system—always based upon assumptions at variance with our American ideals—is long since out of date and more than ever unrealistic in the face of the present world conditions.

This clause was unrealistic when enacted into law in 1924, and when it became effective in 1929.

It is equally unrealistic now. Its result, if not objective, in 1924 was to reduce far below what was fair and equitable immigration from certain countries of Europe. At that time one of these countries was Ireland, as were the countries of all of southern Europe. The result, if not the purpose, on the other hand, was to give other countries a much higher quota than the rule of fairness and equity called for.

I opposed the national-origins clause before it became operative in law because I considered it unfair, contrary to American fairness, and inconsistent with American ideals. It brought about a quota system that was an insult to many racial groups that made up our people.

For we must remember, heretofore and now, Americans are not a race; they are a people.

Any effort to base a quota system upon such a concept as the national-origins clause is wrong from the outset. While it must be tolerated and adhered to as long as it is the law, the fact that it has been in operation for 32 years does not make it right.

President Truman has made a ringing contribution to a restoration of American idealism and justice in relation to our quota system by his condemnation and repudiation of the national-origins clause.

The bill is the result of 4 years of study and effort by the members of the committee who considered the same. The veto of the President is not a reflection on them. The drafting of a codification or of a new immigration law is a very difficult task. There is much good in the present bill.

However, in addition to the objectionable national-origins clause there are other provisions of an objectionable nature that justifies the action taken by President Truman in vetoing this bill.

For the reasons stated by the President, his veto should be sustained by the House of Representatives.

I include in my remarks a speech I made in the House on February 14, 1929, and appearing in volume 70, part 4, on pages 3472, 3473, 3474, 3475, 3476, and 3477) of the RECORD of 1929:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the subject that I am going to discuss is quite different from the full and able speech which has just been rendered by the distinguished Member [Mr. Garber], who has just preceded me and which I found very interesting. I might say in passing that I have listened to the gentleman on two different occasions and his profound knowledge of the subject that he has discussed has made a marked impression upon me.

One of the most important questions remaining to be determined before this session of Congress is over, is what action will be taken from the repeal, deference, or going into operation of the national-origins clause of the immigration law of 1924. The interest in this question is not confined to any one section of our country; neither is it confined to any one of the so-called nationals that constitute our inhabitants. The action of Congress on this question is being watched closely.

At the outset it must be borne in mind that the controversy over the national-origins clause of the Immigration Act has been misrepresented so as to be made to appear a controversy over increasing or decreasing numerically the number of immigrants that can come to this country. This misrepresentation is very unfortunate because it gives a false statement of facts. The repeal of the national-origins clause has nothing to do with the question of the number of people that shall be permitted to come here each year. The effort to repeal the national-origins clause has been characterized as an attack upon the immigration law of 1924. It is nothing of the kind. It is, in fact, an effort to prevent the law from being ridiculous.

The national-origins clause is a part of the immigration law of 1924. Nobody seems to

know its real parenthood, although one John B. Trevor, of New York City, who was a captain in the Intelligence Department of the Army, detailed in New York City during the war, appears to claim the credit for it.

I have heard that the Ku Klux Klan claims the credit for conceiving it and securing its adoption as an amendment to the immigration law. I am satisfied, however, that their only knowledge of it was after its adoption in the Senate in 1924, as an amendment to the bill that passed the House, and that thereafter the Ku Klux Klan used it as a means of trying to carry out its purposes by attracting additional members to its ranks. It seems rather hard for me to believe that anything that such an organization might sponsor would receive the favorable consideration of either or both branches of Congress.

It appears from the records of the hearings of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which reported the 1924 immigration law that the national-origins clause received little, if any, consideration from the committee. It is quite probable—and so far as I can find it is a fact—that it was not presented to the committee for consideration. In any event, when the bill was reported to the House it was not a part thereof, and during debate an amendment was offered in the House which included in substance the provisions of the present law. The amendment was rejected. The House later passed the bill and while under consideration in the Senate, Senator Reed of Pennsylvania, moved the amendment which inserted the present national-origins clause into the bill. Upon its return to the House it was sent to conference, and the House conferees recommended the adoption of the amendment, which action was taken. Whether or not it is correct, I am informed this amendment was reluctantly accepted by the House in order that the whole bill might not fail of passage.

As I have said before, this is to my mind one of the most important questions that confront us today, particularly in view of the fact that we have only a few weeks left in this session of Congress, and during which period it is essential that some affirmative action be taken in order to prevent the operation of this particular clause. To prevent its operation affirmative action must be taken by Congress. There are two ways in which we can take affirmative action, and when I say "we," of course I refer to both branches of Congress. One is by joint resolution deferring its operation and the other is by enacting necessary legislation to repeal its provisions. The other procedure that we may employ is the passive, inactive negative, do-nothing method, as a result of which, in accordance with the ruling given by the Attorney General, as I understand it, the President of the United States is compelled on or before April 1 of this year to proclaim the provisions of this clause to be in operation. This means that the quotas established thereunder by the President's commission will become operative July 1, 1929.

That President's commission to which I refer was made up of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce (now President-elect Hoover), and they in turn each appointed two members of their respective departments as a joint committee to make a more thorough investigation of the matter.

I realize that men have different opinions and different views on this question. I appreciate the fact they have the right to entertain their views if they are honestly arrived at, and naturally every Member of this House arrives at honest views, so far as my opinion is concerned. I do not use the above language with the intent that you might infer that I have any feeling to the contrary, because you, like myself, are actuated by a desire to render that degree of public service in this body which you feel the best interests of the country demand and which is in accordance with your conscience. [Applause.]

I also considered it my duty to vote as my conscience dictated on any matters which came before any legislative body of which I was a member, and the question of party affiliation never influenced me unless a party principle or responsibility was involved. In that case I followed, and will follow, the principles enunciated by the Democratic Party, because the incorporation of them into law will be for the best interests of the people.

It is my belief that a public servant should represent all elements and political creeds in his district. So, in approaching this question, let me say that I recognize that men in both political parties differ and differ honestly.

I am going to try to impress upon you the fact that the basis of the determination, as provided in the national origins clause, so-called, is almost impossible of ascertainment. It is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact you have to go back 300 years to determine the statistics as to national origin?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And is it not a fact we have not the statistics available?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Exactly. That is in part correct. The basis prescribed by this clause for the establishing of quotas of countries affected has as its object a definite purpose which is unfair and discriminatory, and a reflection upon elements of past immigrants, now Americans, some for many generations, that have contributed so much toward the building up and progress of our country. The basis for computation is also uncertain and leaves the calculation, whichever it may be, to the field of conjecture. The clause provided a method of calculation which is incapable of ascertainment without resort to guesswork. Any such basis is bound to result in quotas which will be discriminatory, if not insulting, in their character. A careful examination of testimony presented to different committees, also books written by some of the proponents, and addresses made on different occasions by some of them justify the assertion that the underlying motive is un-American.

If we are going to establish an immigration policy, let it be definite. Let it be certain. The expression of the principle should be definite and certain, whether it be a closed immigration policy, a restrictive immigration policy, or a partially restrictive policy as set forth in the 1924 act.

Let it be definite and certain, but not left to uncertainty; and let both branches of Congress determine with certainty not only the expression of the principle we believe in, but with certainty as to the quotas the different quota countries shall be entitled to. Not only does Congress, by permitting the national-origins clause to go into operation, evade the duty of making the quotas themselves, but it passes the responsibility to the President's commission, composed of three secretaries, and they in turn pass it on to Doctor Hill and his associates.

I might say at this time that I intend to follow the suggestion made by Governor Smith in his statement after the last election, in which he urged the Democratic Members of Congress to support President-elect Hoover during his term of office on all legislation that relates to the general welfare and progress of the people.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I hope at some not distant time the gentleman will inform the House what the fundamental principles of the Democratic Party are.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think those fundamental principles are so well known that the average man knows them, but I shall be glad to enlighten the gentleman out in the lobby some time.

The first indication of the unreliability and uncertainty of the basis of determination as provided in the national-origins clause was the postponement of its operation until July 1, 1927, in order that the quotas might be established. In order to regulate immigration up to the going into effect of the national-origins clause it was provided in the 1924 act—"that the annual quota of any nationality shall be 2 percent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100."

This, like the national-origins clause, only governed quota countries. The practical operation of the present law meant that 164,000 immigrants constituted 2 percent of our foreign-born population as of 1890, and were allotted among the several European countries in accordance with the terms of this provision. Whether one believes in the policy of restrictive immigration or not, there is no question but what the original provision is at least definite and certain in its theory and operation. While the national-origins clause is certain as to the number of immigrants admissible each year from Europe, which is 153,000, every other provision thereof is unreliable, uncertain, and therefore inequitable.

This would be particularly so in its operation, if it ever goes into effect. I want to call to the attention of the Members that in accordance with the provisions of the national-origins clause the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, as a joint board, each appointed two representatives to try and perform the impossible task therein provided. It is fair to infer from all correspondence made by them that they approached this task with the realization of its difficulty of approximate ascertainment, and the fact that, in the main, they would have to rely upon conjecture. The results have clearly shown that to be the fact. Their work has been tirelessly and unselfishly rendered and yet their reports and findings are the strongest evidence of the human impossibility of performing such a task. In their report on December 16, 1926, will be found the following:

"We have found our task by no means simple, but we are carrying it out by methods which we believe to be statistically correct, utilizing the data that are available in accordance with what seems to us to be the intent and meaning of the law. We have not completed our work, but the figures which we are submitting for your information, though provisional and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be."

What stronger evidence of uncertainty?

Accompanying this report were the quotas which they had determined in accordance with the law, and which, while not complete and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be. These are not my words, but the words of Dr. Hill and his associates.

Thereafter, the operation of the law was deferred until July 1, 1928, and on February 27, 1928, other quotas were recommended by Dr. Hill and his associates. Having in mind the statement above quoted from report of 1927, that the 1927 quotas "indicated approximately what the final results will be," a comparison of these two quotas is very interesting and convincing as showing

further the grave uncertainty of the basis of determination.

Country or area	(1) National-origin quotas submitted Feb. 27, 1928	(2) National-origin quotas submitted Jan. 7, 1927	(3) Present quotas, based on 1890 foreign-born population
Armenia	100	----------	124
Australia, including Papua, etc.	100	100	121
Austria	1,639	1,486	785
Belgium	1,328	410	512
Czechoslovakia	2,726	2,248	3,073
Danzig, Free City of	137	122	228
Denmark	1,234	1,044	2,789
Estonia	100	109	124
Finland	568	559	471
France	3,308	3,837	3,954
Germany	24,908	23,428	51,227
Great Britain, Northern Ireland	65,894	73,039	34,007
Greece	312	367	100
Hungary	1,181	967	473
Irish Free State	17,427	13,862	28,567
Italy, including Rhodes, etc.	5,989	6,091	3,845
Latvia	243	184	142
Lithuania	492	494	344
Netherlands	3,083	2,421	1,648
Norway	2,403	2,267	6,453
Poland	6,090	4,978	5,982
Portugal	457	290	503
Rumania	311	516	603
Russia, European and Asiatic	3,540	4,781	2,248
Spain	305	674	131
Sweden	3,399	3,259	9,561
Switzerland	1,614	1,198	2,081
Syria and the Lebanon (French)	125	100	100
Turkey	233	233	100
Yugoslavia	739	777	671
Total	[1] 153,685	[1] 153,541	[1] 164,647

[1] Including 37 minimum quotas of 100 each.

As a further indication of the uncertainty that existed in the minds of the President's Commission, I quote a letter to the President under date of January 3, 1927:

JANUARY 3, 1927.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of sections 11 and 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, we have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the subcommittee appointed by us for the purpose of determining the quota of each nationality in accordance with the provisions of said sections.

The report of the subcommittee is self-explanatory, and, while it is stated to be a preliminary report, yet it is believed that further investigation will not substantially alter the conclusions arrived at.

Although this is the best information we have been able to secure, we wish to call attention to the reservations made by the committee and to state that in our opinion the statistical and historical information available raises grave doubts as to the whole value of these computations as a basis for the purposes intended. We therefore cannot assume responsibility for such conclusions under these circumstances.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State,
Department of State.
HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce.
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor.

Furthermore, on February 25, 1928, the President's Commission in transmitting the 1928 quotas above referred to said:

"We wish it clear that neither we individually nor collectively are expressing any opinion on the merits or demerits of this system of arriving at the quotas. We are simply transmitting the calculations made by the departmental committee in accordance with the act."

An analysis of the report of Dr. Hill and his associates, dated December 16, 1926, showing the manner upon which calculations were determined is further evidence of the impossibility of a fair determination, particularly in determining what portion of our white population of 1920 is derived from the "old native stock" of 1790. The records of immigration giving the number of immigrants arriving annually from each foreign country from 1820 to 1920 was in part relied upon. It is a well-known fact that a good portion of those who came from southern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and Ulster came on vessels that started from an English port and were listed as emigrating from England. This was particularly true prior to 1870. In the case of Scotland, Wales, and Ulster it makes no difference, because their quotas under this law will be combined into one, but this situation seriously affects the quota that southern Ireland would be entitled to. Such a situation is further evidence of the grave uncertainty of a determination that will not be discriminatory.

The above immigration quotas were printed for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and column No. 1 is the report for 1928, column 2 the report for 1927, both made by Doctor Hill and his associates, and column 3 is the quotas under the present law.

Columns 1 and 2 relate to the national origins clause and the marked difference between them in the short period of 1 year seems to me to be inescapable evidence of the uncertainty of ascertainment.

A comparison will show that under the quotas that will be established if the national-origins clause goes into effect that Germany will be reduced from 51,227 to 24,908; Irish Free State from 28,567 to 17,427; Norway from 6,453 to 2,403; Sweden from 9,561 to 3,399; Switzerland from 2,081 to 1,614; Denmark from 2,789 to 1,234; France from 3,954 to 3,308; while Great Britain and northern Ireland will be increased from 34,007 to 65,894; Austria from 785 to 1,639; Belgium from 512 to 1,328; Hungary from 473 to 1,181; Italy from 3,845 to 5,989; Netherlands from 1,648 to 3,083; Russia from 2,248 to 3,540. These are the most important changes that will occur. As I have said before, the strongest evidence of uncertainty is the difference between the report of 1927 and 1928.

Another year has gone by since the last computation was submitted and which will be the quotas if the national-origins clause goes into effect. It is fair to assume that if a report had been made this year by Dr. Hill and his associates, that further changes would have been noted.

In passing I want it clearly understood that I have the greatest of admiration for Dr. Hill and his associates. They are performing what must be to them an unpleasant task, because of its impossibility of performance. They have performed their work unselfishly and tirelessly. They are simply trying to carry out the law. It is clear from their reports, so far as I am concerned, that they realize that the records are so lacking that they had to rely upon conjecture.

It is significant that the only census taken in the United States prior to 1850 was that of 1790. In the 1790 census only the heads of families were reported, and there was no indication of the land of their nativity or of their ancestors.

Dr. Hill and his associates deemed that they would have to depend in the main upon the sounding of names to determine nativity, and he frankly admitted in the House hearings held in 1927 that names may indicate origin from any one of two or more countries. He further said that in the event of the names having an origin from England or Scotland or Ireland, the probabilities were that because of the predominance of the English of foreign birth and descent at that time the census takers designated them as being of English descent.

The census of 1790 showed the white population of the then 17 States was 3,172,444. The following figures show in detail the population of the several States, with an estimate of the strength of the various nationals therein, which, so far as I can ascertain, is based upon guesswork:

White population in 1790 as classified by nationality in ch. IX of A Century of Population Growth, published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909

Nationality as indicated by name	United States		Maine		New Hampshire		Vermont		Massachusetts		Rhode Island	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All nationalities	3,172,444	100.0	96,107	100.0	141,112	100.0	85,072	100.0	373,187	100.0	64,670	100.0
English	2,605,699	82.1	89,515	93.1	132,726	94.1	81,149	95.4	354,528	95.0	62,079	96.0
Scotch	221,562	7.0	4,154	4.3	6,648	4.7	2,562	3.0	13,435	3.6	1,976	3.1
Irish	61,534	1.9	1,334	1.4	1,346	1.0	597	.7	3,732	1.0	459	.7
Dutch	78,959	2.5	279	.3	153	.1	428	.5	373	.1	19	(1)
French	17,619	.6	115	.1	142	.1	153	.3	746	.2	88	.1
German	176,407	5.6	436	.5	----------	--------	35	(1)	75	(1)	33	.1
Hebrew	1,243	(1)	44	(1)	----------	--------	----------	--------	67	(1)	9	(1)
All other	9,421	.3	230	.2	97	.1	148	.2	231	.1	7	(1)

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

White population in 1790 as classified by nationality in ch. IX of A Century of Population Growth, published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909—Continued

Nationality as indicated by name	Connecticut		New York		New Jersey		Pennsylvania		Delaware		Maryland	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All nationalities	232,236	100.0	314,366	100.0	169,954	100.0	423,373	100.0	46,310	100.0	208,649	100.0
English	223,437	96.2	245,901	78.2	98,620	58.0	249,656	59.0	39,966	86.3	175,265	84.0
Scotch	6,425	2.8	10,034	3.2	13,156	7.7	49,567	11.7	3,473	7.5	13,562	6.5
Irish	1,589	.7	2,525	.8	12,099	7.1	8,614	2.0	1,806	3.9	5,008	2.4
Dutch	258	.1	50,600	16.1	21,581	12.7	2,623	.6	463	1.0	209	.1
French	512	.2	2,424	.8	3,565	2.1	2,341	.6	232	.5	1,460	.7
German	4	(1)	1,103	.4	15,678	9.2	110,357	26.1	185	.4	12,310	5.9
Hebrew	5	(1)	385	.1	(2)		21	(1)	(2)		626	.3
All other	6	(1)	1,394	.4	5,255	3.1	194	(1)	185	.4	209	.1

	Virginia		North Carolina		South Carolina		Georgia		Kentucky		Tennessee	
All nationalities	442,117	100.0	289,181	100.0	140,178	100.0	52,886	100.0	61,133	100.0	31,913	100.0
English	375,799	85.0	240,309	83.1	115,480	82.4	43,948	83.1	50,802	83.1	26,519	83.1
Scotch	31,391	7.1	32,388	11.2	16,447	11.7	5,923	11.2	6,847	11.2	3,574	11.2
Irish	8,842	2.0	6,651	2.3	3,576	2.6	1,216	2.3	1,406	2.3	734	2.3
Dutch	884	.2	578	.2	219	.2	106	.2	122	.2	64	.2
French	2,653	.6	868	.3	1,882	1.3	159	.3	183	.3	96	.3
German	21,664	4.9	8,097	2.8	2,343	1.7	1,481	2.8	1,712	2.8	894	2.8
Hebrew			1	(1)	85	.1	(2)		(2)		(2)	
All other	884	.2	289	.1	146	.1	53	.1	61	.1	32	.1

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.
[2] Included in "All other."

As one indication of the uncertainty of relying on the 1790 census I may mention that it does not take into consideration the size of the families and that some nationalities are quite prone to more productivity than others.

In determining the quotas under the national-origins clause the white population of 1920, numbering about 94,000,000, were divided into two groups, one called "old native stock" and the other "immigrant stock." The census of 1790 was taken as the basis for determining what portion of our population in 1920 were descended from the population of 1790. It was determined that 41,000,000 persons in the United States in 1920 were descendents of the "old native stock." Bearing the fact in mind that all persons who arrived here since 1790, or their descendents, are described as "immigrant stock," and looking through the roll of the Members of Congress it is apparent to me that 80 percent of our membership fall within that class.

When you consider that the first decennial census taken in the United States, outside of the one in 1790, was in 1850; that there are no official records prior to 1790, together with the loss, in the Ellis Island fire in 1896, of records of immigrations that flowed through the great city of New York from 1820 on, the destruction of many historical records by the British, when they occupied the city of Washington in the War of 1812, together with many other matters of consideration, we can then realize the impossibility of establishing quotas which will not be discriminatory to some of our nationals.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact that Dr. Hill testified before the Committee on Immigration that he could only go back about 100 years?

Mr. MCCORMACK. My impression is that Dr. Hill testified that the United States decennial censuses could only go back to 1850; that the records of the ports of entry go back only to about 1820; that is, the immigrants coming into different ports of entry, as distinguished from the facts revealed in the decennial censuses. My observation and study further show that thousands and thousands of immigrants coming from Germany, from Ireland, from Scotland, and from other places were compelled to come over on ships owned by English interests and they were listed as English citizens.

That is not submitted as criticism, but as a piece of evidence. Everything based on conjecture is bound to be discriminatory and offensive to some of our nationals. We are not an English, or an Irish, or a German, or a French nation. We do not want any element to predominate. We are an American Nation. We may have a great feeling of fondness and regard for the land of our forbears, as we should, but above every other consideration we are Americans. The history of the recent war has evidenced the fact that Americanism means the same thing to all of our citizens, irrespective of their national origin—that is, love of flag, country, and that upon which everything that we possess governmentally stands, the Constitution of the United States.

We want Americans. We want the immigrants who come over here—the same as my forbears did two generations ago—to be filled with a love of our institutions. To a certain extent, undoubtedly, they will come here seeking material gain, but in the main they look up to this Government of ours as a land of opportunity. I recognize that conditions might change our immigration policy. That necessity might arise some day when we might consider the advisability of a change, but if we are going to have a change, let it be definite and certain, not only in principle but definite and certain in practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the fact that this uncertainty exists is further evidenced by the report made by the President's commission, comprised, as I said before, of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce—the then Secretary of Commerce, President-elect Hoover. Not only that, but President-elect Hoover in his acceptance speech said he favored the repeal of the national-origins clause. He recognized the impossibility of human determination in accordance with the basis provided in that law. He recognized the offensiveness of it, and he recognized that this was not bringing into effect in America a new policy with reference to the restriction of immigration, because we have it now. We have it now in the act of 1924. Two percent of the foreign-born population as of 1890 means approximately 164,000 immigrants who are entitled to admission from quota countries in Europe each year, and in turn the number to which each country is entitled is simply a matter of mathematics. That can be arrived at. It is a definite and certain enunciation of a principle, and it naturally follows that there is a definite and certain determination of the quotas.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman tell the House how this national origins was determined, based upon what figures, what the present quota is as based on the act of 1924, and what would be the quota of all nationals under the national-origins clause? Has the gentleman those figures?

Mr. MCCORMACK. As I understand it, the present law permits one hundred and sixty-four thousand and a few odd hundred to come in each year, while the national-origins clause authorizes one hundred and fifty-three and some few hundreds to come in each year. Am I correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MCCORMACK. While the national-origins clause provides a maximum of 150,000, it also provides in addition that certain countries which had no quota before or whose computation would be less than 100, are entitled to the admission of a minimum of 100, and that is the reason why it comes to approximately 153,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, the gentleman is opposed to the national-origins provision of the present law?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Precisely.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the quota based on the 1890 census? The present law is based on the 1890 census, as I understand.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes; and that is definite and certain.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the 1890 census as a basis, or some other census—the 1910 census or the 1920 census?

Mr. McCORMACK. To be frank with the gentleman, his question goes into something that I did not intend to discuss, and I am equally frank in saying that I am rapidly approaching a mental state where I realize that through necessity we must close this open door and bring about some kind of a restriction. Whether that should be based on the 1910 census or the 1890 census is just a question of policy, based upon the necessity.

I can see where conditions might change; where in the years to come through depletion in our population, because of some great catastrophe, for example—and population increases either by a greater number of births than deaths or by an increase in immigration over emigration; that is the only means through which an increase in population takes place—and I can see where a principle applicable to one period might of necessity be changed when applied to conditions in a different period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We are legislating for this period.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no objection to the present quota, based on the 1890 census.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. The proposed change would greatly facilitate the administration of the law, would it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman refer to the national-origins clause?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think so.

Mr. GARBER. I mean that the proposed change to a definite basis would greatly facilitate the administration of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the law as it exists at present?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. Now, bearing on that, may I call attention to a statement made by the Commissioner General of Immigration in his annual report for 1925, page 29:

"The bureau feels that the present method of ascertaining the quotas is far more satisfactory than the proposed determination by national origin; that it has the advantages of simplicity and certainty. It is of the opinion that the proposed change will lead to great confusion and result in complexities, and accordingly it is recommended that the pertinent portions of section 11, providing for this revision of the quotas as they now stand, be rescinded."

I am now coming back to 1790. One interesting phase of the evidence about the 1790 census, where it showed a little over 3,000,000 in the 17 States, was in the State of Pennsylvania, as indicating the uncertainty of the 41,000,000 being even approximately a fair estimate of the descendants of the inhabitants as shown in that census.

I do not want to depend upon memory, so let me quote verbatim from the extract which I have here.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In an article written in 1789, as to the immigration into Pennsylvania in the period around 1749, it was said by the writer that—

"In the summer of the year 1749, 25 sail of large vessels arrived with German passengers alone, which brought about 12,000 souls, some of the ships about 600 each; and in several other years near the same number of these people arrived annually."

This is for only a limited period around 1746, and it is fair to assume that some came before and some came afterward, and yet according to the 1790 census there were only 110,000 Germans in the State of Pennsylvania.

But let us go a step further:

"And in some years nearly as many annually from Ireland."

Yet in 1790 there was only an estimated population of 8,000 in the State of Pennsylvania of either Irish birth or Irish descent.

This is some evidence indicating the uncertainty we have in the records prior to 1790. We have absolutely none from 1790 to 1820, and from 1820 our records of ports of entry are entirely unreliable, first, because of giving their birth in the wrong country, in some cases because of necessity; and, second, because the records in the city of New York were destroyed in the Ellis Island fire in 1896. Furthermore, many historical records of the colonial days were destroyed when the British occupied the city of Washington during the War of 1812.

All of these things have brought about an air of uncertainty so that the basis for the determination of national origins is inadvisable, unwise, inequitable, bound to be discriminatory because in the main it is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the present quota law Ireland receives a quota of 28,000, but under the national origins law, if it takes effect, Ireland only gets 8,000, thereby losing 20,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think there have been two corrections made since that estimate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is there anything the gentleman can find from his investigation to show how they base that loss, upon what percentage and how far they have gone back?

Mr. McCORMACK. That basis of 8,330 was an estimate given by Captain Trevor, who, I understand, is the parent of this idea, although the Klu Klux Klan claims the credit for it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The parent of this piece of legislation is Mr. Reed. The House never passed it at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; in the Senate it was an amendment offered by Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania, and right there let me say that if this law goes into effect it is those of German birth and descent and those of Irish birth and descent in Pennsylvania that in the main can take the blame.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I ask the gentleman another question? Senator Reed takes the credit for it, but he borrowed it from Senator LODGE. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; this Captain Trevor consulted Senator LODGE first, who took him to Senator Reed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You will find the date given in the hearings as of March 6, 1924.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is just one more reference I might make. During the past few days a representative of the American Legion unfortunately made a reference with which I am not in accord. I am sorry he made this reference, because I am a member of the Legion and the two other members of my family, two younger brothers, who constitute the whole family, are also members of the Legion. This representative made a statement which is offensive to all of our citizens, and I hope sincerely that the Legion members throughout the country who might be offended by it will not go to the unwise direction of resigning their membership.

The American Legion is a great body. It is a much-needed body, the same as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is another one of our great veterans' organizations, as well as all of the minor organizations which have as their foundation purposes consistent with the progress of our country in establishing traditions which the future generations will be proud of; but in this particular respect, by stating that the Legion is in favor of the national-origins provision, they have taken a position which, if a referendum were submitted to the members of the Legion, would undoubtedly amaze the Members of Congress as to the vote to the contrary in the Legion.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. May I say to my colleague that I have just received three telegrams from three Legion posts in Lawrence, Peabody, and Lynn, Mass., saying that the sentiments which the representatives of the Legion gave before the committee are not in accord with the sentiment of the membership of those posts?

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say at this time that Mr. Connery recently displayed the finest act of courage that I have ever seen on the part of any legislator when he voted for the reapportionment bill. I hope that his constituents appreciate his type of representation.

May I add the danger of this, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going back 300 years and making you and me, who are Americans, and consider ourselves Americans, take a position which would destroy the assimilation which all elements and all races have undergone during the past 300 years, and making not only the foreign born of 1920 take a position on this but every one of us, no matter what the origin of our common ancestors who first came to America may have been?

But going back to the American Legion, it has taken a position on quotas. When they take a position favoring the underlying principle of the national-origins clause, they take a position upon the quotas, and when they do that they make a mistake and they exceed the purposes of their organization.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER. Has the American Legion in convention assembled gone on record in favor of the national-origins scheme for determining the immigration quotas?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand they have, yes; but it was very peculiarly worded:

"Therefore be it resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled, That we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration," That is a primary part, and they may have the right to do that. They could go on record in favor of closed or open or restricted immigration. I do not dispute their authority to do that; but then the resolution continues: "that we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration in the 1924 immigration law with its fundamental national-origins provision, so that American citizenship and economic prosperity may be maintained at the highest possible level."

And in a statement to the Senate Committee on Immigration they said:

"We emphatically uphold the theory underlying the national-origins provision, which is that immigration quotas based upon entire population of the Nation is not only the fairest method for selecting immigrants, but is the most certain method," mark this language, "the most certain method of maintaining in the future the blend of population and the racial mixtures as they exist in America today."

In convention assembled they went on record in favor of that because it was the best means "by which prosperity may be maintained at the present time," the resolution read.

It must be borne distinctly in mind that the quotas cannot be disassociated from the principle itself. The going into effect of the clause automatically established the

quotas, and when the Legion takes a position on the principle they take a position on the quotas established thereunder.

What those quotas will be are a matter of record. Furthermore, the representative said that it was a question between patriotism and slackerism. I also deny such a question is involved. In support of this argument he cited the number of aliens that claimed exemption in the late war. In the first place, the figures do not present the facts correctly. In the second place, the only inferences to draw therefrom is that the nationals of those countries which will receive a reduced quota by the operation of the national origins were the slackers in the late war. This is not only vicious and unwarranted but false. Such an argument is an attack not only on those foreign-born who were here in 1917–18 but upon all generations of Americans of the same blood or descent. Let us see who they are that will suffer by the operation of the national-origins clause and then we can see what elements of our citizenry were insidiously offended and insulted by this argument.

The French, Swiss, Swedish, Norwegians, Danish, Irish, and Germans. All elements representing our best blood, the equal of any other and second to none. In every great crisis their descendants have proven their love for our flag and our institutions of government as set forth in the Constitution. In the Revolutionary War their representation was outstanding, particularly the Irish and the Germans, and the French Government showed its friendship in a way that occupies one of the foremost pages in our history. Are they slackers? Some may think so, but history records otherwise. During the Civil War alone the Irish and the Germans in the service outnumbered the whole army of the South, and each element, as we are compelled to refer to them under this law, had more men in service than any other element of our citizenry. And, yes; after the war was over, and when the men of the South had laid down their arms, and after the death of the great President, which was an unfortunate event for the South at that time, an unthinking North imposed conditions upon the South that were unbearable and inhuman. In the dark days of the carpet-bagging period of the days of reconstruction following the war the only voice raised in Congress for the South were the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York, all of Irish descent, and Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts. It was their voices that finally brought about some degree of reason.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Then the American Legion did not go on record in favor of the national-origins clause?

Mr. MCCORMACK. All I know is what it says in this statement, and from that I draw certain inferences. The gentleman's inferences are as good as mine. I am going to rely on my inference and I do not think the gentleman and I will have any dispute. May I further say to the gentleman that the great agricultural districts of the country have been brought to their present high level by that class of immigrants which the national-origins scheme will discriminate against, and I hope it will be brought to a higher state by the enactment of legislation which will be carrying out the platforms of both parties.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will state that the people of the great State of Wisconsin are absolutely opposed to the national-origins clause, and so are the members of the American Legion in my State. I am not talking about the few officers who may claim to speak for the Legion. The national-origins clause should be repealed. The gentleman is making a fine argument for its repeal.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Some argument has been advanced on the question of certain nationals failing to assimilate. What is the best test of assimilation? To me it is what percentage of immigrants from different countries indicate their permanence and love for America by becoming a citizen. The records of the census of 1920 are interesting in this respect. I will simply read it and allow you to draw your own conclusions:

"The census of 1920 shows that the foreign born from England proper, who were here when that census was taken and who were naturalized, is 64.8; Scotland, 65.6; Wales, 73.5; Ireland, 72.3; Norway, 67.3; Sweden, 69.5; Denmark, 69.6; Netherlands, which has a marked gain, 58.1; Belgium, which has a gain, 55.3; Switzerland, 64.9; France, 60.1; Germany, 73.3; Canada, French, 47.0; Canada, others, 58; and other countries, ranging from 44.7 down to 8.9, every one of the latter of which, under national origins, will gain, with the exception of Rumania."

The argument has also been advanced by certain people that America must maintain a British ascendancy in order that our institutions of Government might be preserved. They say that the operation of the national-origins clause will bring that situation about. Since when has the United States had to depend upon any other country for its existence? The last time that history records that we were a dependency of England was prior to 1776. Yorktown, with its victory, brought about the consummation of our independence. In that conflict for independence, 10,000 men of Irish blood served from Massachusetts alone. Those of German descent, particularly from Pennsylvania, showed their love for the cause of freedom. Likewise, those of Swiss, Swedish, French, Scotch, and other nativities, rendered yeoman service. No one excelled the other. They fought inspired.

We cannot deny, and would not want to deny it, that those of English blood and extraction have contributed in every way in the settling of the Colonies, in the war for independence, and in building up our country and protecting it in time of danger, but we should not discriminate against others who have likewise done their duty.

The operation of the national-origins clause is an affirmative statement by the Congress of the United States that the continuity of our Government is dependent upon England. Such a declaration of subservience should be abhorrent to all who consider themselves Americans.

Mr. Chairman, both parties through their standard bearers in the recent campaign went on record as favoring the repeal of the national-origins clause. Between now and March 4 action will have to be taken in order to prevent its operation. While both parties have responsibilities, the party in the majority will be directly responsible for this iniquitous, discriminatory law unless proper action is taken to repeal or defer its operation. [Applause from both sides of the aisle.]

I have received the following telegrams from American Legion posts:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., *February 14, 1929.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Post opposed to statement of Legion representatives. Do not know of any slackers in this district of nationals mentioned. District predominantly Irish. Exceeded quota in every instance. * * *

COLUMBIA POST, NO. 51, AMERICAN LEGION,
JAMES F. VAUGHAN, *Commander.*

BOSTON, MASS., *February 11, 1929.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Michael J. Perkins Post, American Legion, resents any individual attempting to represent the thought of the American Legion when he says that our neighbors in Europe, whether they be Scandinavian, Jews, English, Greek, Polish, or Irish, are alien slackers. Fortunately our allies and ourselves united as one people. * * *

JOHN J. LYDON, *Commander.*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill when it came before the House, and I am happy to have the opportunity to vote to sustain the President's veto of the measure at this time.

Inasmuch as we have had no good, constructive legislation on immigration for 27 years, it was hoped that the bill presented to us for action would be reasonable and practicable; that it would cure the basic prejudices and discriminatory ills found in the laws now in effect. This was not our good fortune. It is essentially an exclusionist bill; as the President puts it:

> None of the crying human needs of this time of trouble is recognized in this bill.

It is a bill which ignores elementary standards of fairness in dealing with aliens; in the President's words:

> Seldom has a bill exhibited the distrust evidenced here for citizens and aliens alike, at a time when we need unity at home and the confidence of our friends abroad.

The McCarran-Walter bill, in my opinion, contains more inequities than any immigration bill ever passed by Congress, instead of allowing us to show a more humane attitude toward immigration, it threatens to close our doors tighter than ever. It perpetrates a grave injustice upon the peoples of Southern and Eastern Europe. The National Origins formula adopted in 1929 discriminates against them and the bill before us makes the national-origins legislation even more rigid and exclusive. It will reduce to a minimum the number of those admitted from Italy, Greece, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

As for nations like Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, now behind the iron curtain, the excuse is made that there is no need for immigration legislation in their favor, but I am concerned about refugees from those countries and that in the displaced-persons legislation their quotas have been frozen for years to come. Our regular immigration legislation prevents even a single Austrian from coming here before 1955; any Latvian before 2074; no Lithuanians can be admitted before 2087, and not one Pole before 1999. The only hope refugees from those countries have in gaining entrance to the United States is by special legislation which would remove immigration restrictions; the McCarran bill continues to freeze all quotas originally included in the Displaced Persons Act.

As the leading nation of the world, we have held ourselves out to be democratic, generous, and in sympathy with the oppressed peoples of other nations who seek shelter within our boundaries. Passage of the Displaced Persons Act and its amendments bore out our kindly

intentions. Enactment of the McCarran-Walter bill, with its glaring inequities and prejudices, will greatly jeopardize our standing among nations, and our international relations are bound to suffer.

This omnibus immigration bill also fails to provide adequate protection to those threatened with deportation; there is not effective provision for hearings held in deportation cases. It makes it far too easy for the Immigration Bureau to deport people; it would pave the way for the Attorney General to deport an alien for any one of a variety of causes, or to denaturalize a person who may have been a United States citizen for years. The persons affected and being proceeded against are entitled to a fair hearing and necessary protection should be given them under the law.

Our country became great because we opened wide the doors to all who wished to come. Peoples from every country have contributed to our growth, culture, and strength. There should be equality for all in the immigration laws we pass—one nation should not be placed above another.

We can afford to continue to be generous. Certainly, our aim should be to eliminate the inequities and prejudices in our present immigration laws—not to enhance them.

Enactment of this bill will damage our standing as a nation; it will saddle us with poor, unfair, discriminatory laws; it will cause untold hardship to countless persons. Indeed, the bill, considering all its provisions, would be a step backward and not a step forward.

We should sustain the President's veto and work for a measure we can be proud of.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of the President's action in vetoing the McCarran-Walter immigration bill. The President acted bravely and humanely. He acted in the best American traditions and in the best interests of the American people.

While the aim of the McCarran-Walter measure was to codify and revise our immigration and naturalization laws, the bill as it was actually presented to us proposes to write into basic legislation the most discriminatory and restrictive immigration policy this country has ever known. The bill also contains major threats to our civil liberties, to the promulgation of our foreign policy, and to our democratic way of life.

For these reasons I voted against this measure when it first came up in the House last April, and I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

This bill is a dangerous piece of legislation and a threat to the future of our country because the system it prescribes and the methods it proposes are those of the totalitarian and Communist state, or police-state methods. In these crucial days, it is worth while to stop for a moment and reflect upon the direction in which we are heading. Let us remember that even in the worst crisis faced by the American people in the past, they never backed down on their democratic principles and beliefs.

Ours is a government of laws, rather than of men. Our liberties and our way of life must be protected through laws, rather than by dictators.

The McCarran-Walter immigration bill is a step in the direction of dictatorship and police methods. As such, it is contrary to American ideals, principles and traditions. I am happy once again to cast my vote against this bill and I urge all my colleagues to uphold the President's action.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will vote to sustain the President's veto. Nothing that I can say here can improve on the very clear and lucid remarks of the President in his veto message. He has once more demonstrated his great statesmanship and his interest in keeping this country great, and in preserving our leadership of the world.

Coming as I do from a district, populated largely by first and second generation Americans, I have been in the forefront of the fight to amend our immigration laws so that they may keep the doors of this great country open to the persecuted and harassed peoples of other countries who seek sanctuary within our borders. The founders of this Nation were in that same category. The continued admission of immigrants has made us the great Nation which we are today. They have brought to our shores many of their skills, in the arts, sciences, and business, and in my opinion, have made us a better nation, more understanding of the problems of the world; and have helped to bring us to the point where we are in a position of world leadership, and in a position to aid those less fortunate throughout the world.

We have proven, I believe, that democracy in its fullest sense means that peope of all religions and racial backgrounds can live together in peace and amity and produce a force which is unbeatable. The bill under consideration which was vetoed, and rightly so, by the President would jeopardize our international relations. It would freeze into law many of the prejudices now contained in our immigration laws and the policies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. This legislation has been debated at a period when the world is most sensitive to the thinking of the people of the United States. I had hoped that during the past 5 years the new world position of the United States would induce it to take a more humane and democratic attitude toward immigration. The passing of the Displaced Persons Act in 1948 and of its amendments in 1950 contributed to this belief. Our country has offered a haven to nearly 350,000 displaced persons since the beginning of 1949; but now the bill under consideration which contains more inequities than any immigration bill ever passed by Congress, threatens to close our doors tighter than ever.

The strongest criticism that can be leveled at this bill is its injustice to the peoples of southern and eastern Europe. Let us consider what this measure would mean to the people of Italy. It perpetrates against the Italians all the injustices originally included in the Quota Act of 1924 and the National Origins Formula adopted in 1929, really designed to bar people born in southern and eastern Europe. It is no secret that it was then the intention to keep people from southern and eastern Europe out of the stream of United States life due to the prejudices which existed against people from those areas. With regard to the Italians, for the period from 1900 to 1910, Italian immigration amounted to 2,045,877, or an average of over 200,000 a year. By the act of 1921 it was reduced to 42,000 a year. Under the national origins legislation it was further reduced to 5,800 a year. The Walter bill, I believe, would make it difficult to admit even this number; and what is said about Italy might be said with equal truth about Austria, Greece, Hungary, and Yugoslavia and Poland.

As has been so well said in the other body with regard to the different waves of immigration:

> Differences do not mean inferiority. I believe that at times America is enriched by the fact that there are differences. Think of the contributions which the southern and eastern Europeans have made in the field of art and music.

The Senator whom I am quoting went on to state:

> At each stage in American history the recent comer has been looked down upon by those who were already here * * * The tragedy is that sometimes those who came here and were oppressed when they were new immigrants, once they established themselves, looked down upon the recent immigrant.

All Americans should study the implications of these remarks. All proponents of decent, humane immigration legislation had hoped that new legislation would attempt to eliminate, at least in part, the injustices of the National Origins Act. They had hoped that any new long-term legislation would provide for the pooling of the unused quotas under the National Origins Act, which are largely those of Great Britain and Ireland. The National Origins Act set the British quota at 65,721, but in no year have the British used more than a third of this number. The Irish quota was set at 17,853, but from 10,000 to 12,000 of this quota has not been used each year.

One proposal included in the Lehman-Humphrey bill would pool the unused quotas of from sixty to seventy thousand among the countries with very low quotas. This provision would be of great importance in the Italian situation. The Lehman-Humphrey bill would base the quotas on the 1950 census instead of the census of 1920. Since the population in this period has increased by 40,000,000, this would mean consid-

erably increased quotas for the various countries. That bill would also include Indians and Negroes in computing the population on which quotas are based. This would have the effect of upping the British quota very greatly and increasing the number of immigrants who could be admitted from 153,000 to 263,000.

I had not intended to speak at such length, due to the fact that these matters have been so fully explained heretofore and have been covered in the President's veto message. It is my hope that if we sustain the President's veto we may still get legislation which will accomplish these very humane purposes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. THOMAS, the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, who has brought before us today for consideration the conference report on the independent-offices bill.

I want to congratulate him particularly for the stubborn and victorious fight he has led in the conference committee to preserve the will of the House in stopping the abuse of accumulated leave and in securing the agreement of the Senate Members in the conference. He deserves great credit for his fine work.

I also want to give great praise to Congressman TABER, of New York, ranking Republican minority member and to all members of the subcommittee for helping to put an end to the very wasteful practice of accumulated leave. When the report is approved by the House, as it will be, such action will save the Federal Government from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 annually. At the same time it will protect every legitimate right of the Federal workers. This is a great progressive step on the part of the committee and of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another progressive step toward economy in government which ties in with this same department of Federal service by pointing out that late in the session in 1951 the Congress passed graduated leave legislation for Federal employees which reduced, in most instances, the amount of leave with pay, and at the same time increased, in a limited way, leave to postal employees so that all would be treated on more equitable basis. The important part of this reduction in leave, which became effective January 6, 1952, is that it is estimated to save the Government a minimum annually of $175,000,000. It is difficult to be exact. However, from the best information I am able to get it would appear that these two pieces of legislation, if the one before us today is ratified by the House and Senate, should add up to a total saving of a minimum of about $320,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed this legislation rather closely because I was interested to the extent of introducing a bill, H. R. 2378, on February 5, 1951, which provided for graduated reduction of leave and to stop the abuse of accumulated leave. I am gratified that these abuses I pointed out at that time have finally been taken care of at a great saving to the Government.

On February 5, 1951, speaking in favor of my bill, I said:

> Mr. Speaker, if the President and this Congress really want to make savings in the cost of the Government by reducing nonmilitary expenses, I am introducing a bill that will make it possible to save $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 in the next fiscal year and every year thereafter.
>
> My bill will cut back the present 26-day annual leave for all Federal civilian employees in the executive department of the Government to 15 days' annual leave with pay, on and after June 30, 1951.
>
> Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation also provides that, beginning July 1, 1951, all leave thereafter accruing during the year must be used during the fiscal year in which the same is earned.

Mr. Speaker, the abuse of accumulated leave, if gone into carefully, would really amaze the Members of Congress and would certainly justify the action the Congress is about to take. I have been informed on reliable authority that some employees who start at a low salary allow the leave to accumulate, and as they are promoted to higher salaries as they remain in service, this leave is often drawn not based on the lower salary rates but on the highest rate. This is possibly the worst abuse.

Here is another abuse of accumulated leave. There are about 48,000 high-ranking officials in Government agencies and thousands of military employees who write their own tickets so far as leave is concerned. They do not have to sign a leave slip as the great bulk of low salary employees do. They can travel all over the Nation and be absent from their offices whether on business, recreation, or politics, and they still control their leave. There are instances of high public officials, I understand, who when they have resigned, have drawn several thousand dollars in a lump sum for accumulated leave.

An investigation I have conducted this week reveals that one official drew a lump sum of $3,515.12 termination pay and, I understand, another official who recently resigned received a check of $4,000 as a terminal-leave payment. Even some security risks have been paid off in handsome sums when they left the service. Policy-making officials in addition to controlling their own leave usually determine their travel itinerary which in some instances coincides with sporting events, national conventions, winter investigations in Florida, and so forth.

The Comptroller General has reported to the Congress that the accumulations of annual leave of some postmasters, and these are included among the policy making officials who control their own leave, have reached alarming proportions. He points out one case of a postmaster who had not charged himself with a single day's leave for more than 13 years. It is difficult to believe that in such a case a man had not been away from the office to attend even his "grandmother's funeral." CAF 2 and other low bracket employees, of course, would have to charge to annual leave any failure to report for duty.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against permitting a reasonable amount of annual leave; I think it will make for better employment and service. Those in the lower brackets whose time is certified by a superior have little opportunity to violate the intent of the law. My objection is against those in high brackets who certify or, shall we say, who fail to certify their own leave taking.

If there is any justification for annual leave at all paid by the Government or paid by any employer it is for the employee to refresh himself to come back to the office ready to work harder on his job after a period of relaxation. It is not to create a large stake for terminal leave or retirement purposes. If such policies are desirable, they should be approved on their own merits.

I think it would be a good idea for the proper committee of Congress to keep a watchful eye on this accumulated leave to see that any prevailing abuses are not continued in the future.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 112, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—278

Abbitt	Cooper	Hoffman, Mich.
Adair	Corbett	Holmes
Allen, Calif.	Cotton	Hope
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Horan
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Hull
	Crawford	Hunter
Anderson, Calif.	Crumpacker	Ikard
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Jackson, Calif.
	Curtis, Mo.	James
Andrews	Curtis, Nebr.	Jarman
Angell	Dague	Jenison
Arends	Davis, Ga.	Jenkins
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Jensen
Auchincloss	Deane	Johnson
Bailey	DeGraffenried	Jonas
Baker	Denny	Jones, Ala.
Barden	Devereux	Jones, Mo.
Baring	D'Ewart	Jones, Hamilton C.
Bates, Mass.	Dolliver	
Battle	Dondero	Jones, Woodrow W.
Beall	Dorn	
Beamer	Doughton	Judd
Belcher	Durham	Kearney
Bender	Elliott	Kearns
Bennett, Fla.	Ellsworth	Kilburn
Bennett, Mich.	Elston	Kilday
Bentsen	Fallon	King, Pa.
Berry	Fernandez	Lanham
Betts	Fisher	Lantaff
Bishop	Ford	Larcade
Blackney	Forrester	Latham
Boggs, Del.	Fugate	LeCompte
Boggs, La.	Gamble	Lind
Bolton	Gary	Lovre
Bonner	Gathings	Lucas
Bosone	Gavin	McConnell
Bow	George	McCulloch
Boykin	Golden	McDonough
Bramblett	Goodwin	McGregor
Bray	Graham	McIntire
Brehm	Granger	McMillan
Brooks	Grant	McMullen
Brown, Ga.	Greenwood	McVey
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Gross	Mansfield
Bryson	Gwinn	Marshall
Budge	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Buffett	Hale	Martin, Mass.
Burleson	Hall, Leonard W.	Mason
Burnside		Meader
Burton	Halleck	Merrow
Busbey	Harden	Miller, Md.
Bush	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Butler	Harris	Miller, N. Y.
Byrnes	Harrison, Nebr.	Mills
Camp	Harrison, Va.	Mumma
Carrigg	Harrison, Wyo.	Murdock
Chatham	Harvey	Murray
Chelf	Hays, Ark.	Nelson
Chenoweth	Hébert	Nicholson
Chiperfield	Hedrick	Norblad
Church	Herlong	Norrell
Clevenger	Hess	O'Hara
Cole, Kans.	Hill	O'Konski
Cole, N. Y.	Hillings	Passman
Colmer	Hinshaw	Patman
Combs	Hoeven	Patten
Cooley	Hoffman, Ill.	Perkins

Phillips	Scrivner	Vail
Poage	Scudder	Van Pelt
Polk	Secrest	Van Zandt
Potter	Shafer	Velde
Poulson	Sheehan	Vorys
Preston	Sheppard	Vursell
Priest	Short	Walter
Prouty	Sikes	Watts
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Reams	Simpson, Pa.	Werdel
Redden	Sittler	Wharton
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Kans.	Wheeler
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.	Whitten
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Va.	Widnall
Regan	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Riehlman	Springer	Williams, Miss.
Riley	Stanley	Williams, N. Y.
Rivers	Stockman	Willis
Roberts.	Taber	Wilson, Ind.
Robeson	Talle	Wilson, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.	Teague	Winstead
Rogers, Mass.	Thomas	Withrow
Rogers, Tex.	Thompson,	Wolcott
St. George	Mich.	Wolverton
Saylor	Thornberry	Wood, Ga.
Schenck	Tollefson	Wood, Idaho
Scott, Hardie	Trimble	

NAYS—112

Anfuso	Hart	Morgan
Ayres	Havenner	Morrison
Bakewell	Hays, Ohio	Moulder
Barrett	Heffernan	Multer
Blatnik	Heller	Murphy
Bolling	Herter	O'Brien, Ill.
Buchanan	Heselton	O'Brien, Mich.
Buckley	Holifield	O'Brien, N. Y.
Canfield	Howell	O'Neill
Cannon	Irving	Osmers
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Ostertag
Celler	Javits	O'Toole
Chudoff	Karsten, Mo.	Patterson
Clemente	Kean	Philbin
Crosser	Keating	Price
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Rabaut
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Radwan
Denton	Kennedy	Rhodes
Dingell	Keogh	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Kerr	Rodino
Donohue	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Donovan	King, Calif.	Rooney
Doyle	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Klein	Ross
Engle	Kluczynski	Sadlak
Feighan	Lane	Scott,
Fine	Lesinski	Hugh D., Jr.
Flood	McCarthy	Seely-Brown
Fogarty	McCormack	Shelley
Forand	McGrath	Sieminski
Fulton	McGuire	Spence
Furcolo	McKinnon	Staggers
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Taylor
Gordon	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Granahan	Madden	Yates
Green	Magee	Yorty
Hall,	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki
Edwin Arthur	Mitchell	
Hand	Morano	

NOT VOTING—40

Aandahl	Evins	Richards
Abernethy	Fenton	Sabath
Addonizio	Frazier	Sasscer
Albert	Gore	Steed
Allen, La.	Kee	Stigler
Aspinall	Lyle	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Mahon	Tackett
Beckworth	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morton	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Ramsay	Woodruff
Dempsey	Rankin	
Eaton	Reece, Tenn.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fenton and Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Abernethy and Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Eaton and Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may insert their remarks in the RECORD on the veto message, prior to the roll call.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it happens that my first speech in Congress in February 1929 was against the national origins clause. I ask unanimous consent in connection with my remarks that I may include the speech I made in the House in February 1929.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257) amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act 1941 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say firstly that this bill has the unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary. It seeks to extend title II of the First War Powers Act for 1 year. Those powers expire on Monday next, and in a word they empower the Department of Defense to make certain fair and equitable amendments and changes in procurement contracts. For example, in some instances there is permitted extension of delivery dates in appropriate cases and the making of advance payments or partial payments where such payments would not otherwise be authorized. It has permitted the emergency sale of spare parts to civil airlines when necessary to keep airlines operating.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand it is chiefly a matter concerning the Department of Defense, and it is a unanimous report on the part of the committee?

Mr. CELLER. Substantially the Department of Defense—not completely but substantially the Department of Defense. There is a safeguarding provision, namely: the Comptroller General must pass upon all these changes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), is hereby amended by striking out "1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953".

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.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2315)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) "making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 40, 42, 98, 103, 105, 123, 131 and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 28, 67, 76, 77, 79, 82, 87, 119, 124, 127, and 129, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,461,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,590"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,509,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$479,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$321,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,408,460"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$88,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$202,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,085,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$142,235"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,053,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,062,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"Executive direction and staff operations: For necessary expenses in the performance of executive direction and staff operations for activities under the control of the General Services Administration; including not to exceed $97,385 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; $4,140,750.

"Public Buildings Service: For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at the rate of $16,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed $177,335 for expenses of travel; $101,046,030: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

"Federal Supply Service: For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as provided by law; including not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $77,600 for expenses of travel; and the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; $2,154,100.

"National Archives and Records Service: For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law; including preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and not to exceed $23,340 for expenses of travel; $4,868,200."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$133,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,536,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,606,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $455,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of thirty-five thousand dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of thirty-five thousand to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$91,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,275; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,319,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$163,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$974,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$112,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$709,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$240,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,586,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$24,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$118,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,407,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "not to exceed $78,125 for expenses of travel, National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management; not to exceed $408,925 for expenses of travel, State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,875 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for expenses of travel;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,225"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,419,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,240,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,291,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,546,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,530,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$843,382,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$734,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the date named in said amendment insert "July 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,617,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,655,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "four hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,921,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendmend of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,041,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,238,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,252,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "and $320,200 for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to be paid in accordance with regulations established pursuant to law (46 U. S. C. 1126 (b)); $663,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,509,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$138,105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ":*Provided further*, That administrative expenses not under limitation for the purposes set forth in the budget schedules for the fiscal year 1953 shall not exceed $151,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House reced from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions shall not exceed $1,775,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$146,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That expenditures for nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $28,870,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$697,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $32,722,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $142,500 of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,755"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number named in said amendment, insert "one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended by adding at the end thereof and before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "404"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 37, 48, 68, 86 and 130.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
LISTER HILL,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Emergency fund for the President

Amendment No. 1—National Defense: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of the Budget

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,461,200, instead of $3,314,400 as proposed by the House and $3,608,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $59,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $54,000 as proposed by the House and $64,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Counsel of Economic Advisers

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $225,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $208,900 as proposed by the House; provide that the appropriation shall remain available until March 31, 1953, as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to $2,475, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,750 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 7—Expenses of travel: Authorizes the use of $11,590 for this purpose, instead of $10,300 as proposed by the House and $12,865 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11—Construction of memorials and cemeteries: Reported in disagreement.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 12, 13 and 14—Operating expenses: Strike out the provision of the

House authorizing the purchase of automobiles, as proposed by the Senate, authorize the use of $2,509,350 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,230,500 as proposed by the House and $2,788,200 as proposed by the Senate; and consolidate funds for program direction and administration personnel into one fund as proposed by the Senate instead of providing separate limitations for the District of Columbia and the field as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 and 18—Plant and equipment: Authorize the purchase of plant and equipment, as proposed by the Senate; and the purchase of aircraft, including the purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty-five passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; and except from audit contracts with a foreign government, and contracts for source material with foreign producers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 19—Plant and equipment: Reported in disagreement.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $479,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $426,000 as proposed by the House and $532,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—Payment to civil-service retirement and disability fund: Appropriates $321,450,000 for payment to the fund, instead of $321,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $321,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $6,408,460, instead of $6,108,460 as proposed by the House and $6,708,460 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $88,525 for expenses of travel, instead of $78,700 as proposed by the House and $98,350 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are advised that the Federal Communications Commission, under the provisions of Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, are authorized to levy fair and equitable fees in connection with the issuing of licenses. The conferees, therefore, request the commission to give prompt attention to the matter with a view to levying such fees at the earliest practicable date.

Federal Power Commission

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,085,700, instead of $3,935,700 as proposed by the House and $4,235,700 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $202,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,053,800, instead of $3,978,800 as proposed by the House and $4,128,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $142,235 for expenses of travel, instead of $126,470 as proposed by the House and $158,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Accounting Office

Amendment No. 28—Salaries: Appropriates $30,100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,600,000 as proposed by the House. The conference committee is in agreement that foreign offices should be established at strategic points abroad. It is the understanding of the conferees that a sum sufficient to enable the General Accounting Office to initiate this program in the fiscal year 1953 shall be used for this purpose.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriate $1,960,000, instead of $1,835,000 as proposed by the House and $2,085,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,062,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 31—Operating expenses: The conferees have approved the House version of appropriation structure for this activity, which consists of separate appropriations and appropriation paragraphs for executive direction and staff operations; Public Buildings Service; Federal Supply Service; and National Archives and Records Service; in lieu of a lump-sum appropriation under the heading "Operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees provide a total increase of $3,000,000 in excess of the total provided by the House for these four items, and this sum has been distributed proportionately. Adjustments also have been made to provide funds for expenses of travel somewhat in excess of the limitations proposed in the House bill. In accepting the appropriation structure as contained in the House bill the conferees recognize that a few additional auditors may be required to keep accounts under the four separate appropriations, and due consideration will be given to any request for such personnel (not in excess of ten) which may be submitted at a later date.

Amendment No. 32—Emergency expenses: Authorizes the use of $24,300 for expenses of travel, instead of $21,600 as proposed by the House and $27,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34—Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $37,550 for expenses of travel, instead of $33,400 as proposed by the House and $41,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36—Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $9,250,000, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $74,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $66,000 as proposed by the House and $83,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Expenses, general supply fund: Appropriate $14,536,500, instead of $13,998,000 as proposed by the House and $15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $133,900 for expenses of travel, instead of $119,000 as proposed by the House and $148,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of five passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of twelve as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments 41 and 42—Strategic and critical materials: Authorize the use of $160,425 for expenses of travel, instead of $142,600 as proposed by the House and $178,250 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House. No funds have been allowed for the construction of storage facilities and it is the decision of the conferees that such facilities shall be secured through the rental of such space. In the event an emergency should arise in this connection which may demand construction of facilities, approval of the chairmen of the Senate and House Committee on Appropriations shall be secured for the expenditure of funds for such purpose.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,606,000, instead of $3,606,000 as proposed by the House and $5,606,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $237,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $210,000 as proposed by the House and $265,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation on nonadministrative expenses proposed by the House, amended and increased from $374,000 to $455,000.

Amendments No. 46—Defense Community Facilities and Services: Inserts the provision of the Senate amended to provide $112,500 for such purpose instead of $225,000.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 47—Annual contributions: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate and restores the proposal of the House amended to limit during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of not to exceed 35,000 dwelling units.

Amendment No. 48—Annual contributions—occupancy of housing units by subversives: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $8,000,000, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Indian Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $91,400, instead of $89,300 as proposed by the House and $93,500 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $2,275 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,000 as proposed by the House and $2,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $9,319,500, instead of $8,935,000 as proposed by the House and $9,704,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $230,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $205,000 as proposed by the House and $256,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Railroad safety: Appropriate $974,500, instead of $907,000 as proposed by the House and $1,042,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $163,050 for expenses of travel, instead of $145,000 as proposed by the House and $181,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—Locomotive inspection: Appropriate $709,500, instead of $664,000 as proposed by the House and $755,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $112,620 for expenses of travel, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $125,240 as proposed by the Senate.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $48,586,100 for this purpose, instead of $46,522,200 as proposed by the House and $50,650,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $240,050 for expenses of travel, instead of $213,400 as proposed by the House and $266,700 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Amendment No. 60—Land acquisition: Authorizes the use of $24,940 for necessary expenses in connection with land acquisition, instead of $22,375 as proposed by the House and $27,500 as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $118,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $95,000 as proposed by the House and $142,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Renegotiation Board

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,407,800, instead of $4,907,800 as proposed by the House and $5,907,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $235,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $291,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 69—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $101,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House and $112,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $36,772,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,597,000 as proposed by the House; and restores the language of the House placing limitations on the several activities of this agency including limitations on funds available for the use of travel adjusted to provide a compromise figure in each instance on the funds which may be used for travel expense.

Amendment No. 68: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendments Nos. 69 and 70—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,419,500, instead of $2,274,000 as proposed by the House and $2,565,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize use of $10,225 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,100 as proposed by the House and $11,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriate $1,240,550, instead of $1,181,100 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,800 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,600 as proposed by the House and $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Subversive Activities Control Board

Amendment No. 73—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $5,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $4,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,291,375, instead of $1,194,750 as proposed by the House and $1,388,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $13,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 76, 77, 78 and 79: Appropriate $186,027,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $171,270,000 as proposed by the House; authorize the purchase of 220 automobiles of which 150 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of 110 for replacement only as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $1,546,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,375,000 as proposed by the House and $1,718,300 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the provisions of the House requiring a performance bond or satisfactory warranty in connection with the purchase of coal, and placing a limitation on funds available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: Appropriate $843,382,260, instead of $809,382,260 as proposed by the House and $877,382,260 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $3,530,700 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,138,400 as proposed by the House and $3,923,000 as proposed by the Senate. Conferees have approved the full amount of the Budget estimate for research including work in connection with prosthetic appliances and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses, and dietitians.

Amendment No. 82—Hospital and domiciliary facilities: Appropriates $66,316,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $153,600,000 as proposed by the House. It is the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee on conference that the hospital needs of neuropsychiatric veterans, and those veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, should have immediate consideration, and that a careful review of the funds to be available during the next fiscal year should be made with a view to diverting all such funds as may be available for use in the provision of NP and TB beds in the western area of the United States where there is an urgent and growing need for such facilities.

Amendment No. 83—Major alterations, improvements, and repairs: Appropriates $8,750,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 84 and 85—Administrative expenses: Appropriate $734,550, instead of $683,000 as proposed by the House and $786,100 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $9,000 for expenses of travel, instead of $8,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86—Reduction in appropriation, National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: Reported in disagreement.

Independent offices—general provisions

Amendment No. 87—Persons engaged in personnel work: Exempts from the provisions of the section persons engaged on work as committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime Activities

Amendment No. 88—Operating-differential subsidies: Inserts the language of the Senate amendment in lieu of the proposal of the House in connection with the number of voyages for subsidized operators amended to be effective as to new operators on July 1, 1952, instead of July 1, 1951, as proposed in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate a total of $15,617,850 for such purpose, instead of $14,375,700 as proposed by the House and $16,860,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide $8,655,850 for administrative expenses, instead of $8,099,700 as proposed by the House and $9,212,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $145,525 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $130,700 as proposed by the House and $160,350 as proposed by the Senate, authorize the transfer of funds from the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for the employment of four hundred employees, instead of three hundred as proposed by the House and five hundred as proposed by the Senate; provide $1,921,000 for maintenance of shipyard facilities, operation of warehouses, etc., instead of $1,764,000 as proposed by the House and $2,078,000 as proposed by the Senate; of which $2,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,775 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $5,041,000 for reserve fleet expenses, instead of $4,512,000 as proposed by the House and $5,570,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $7,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $6,650 as proposed by the House and $8,325 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102 and 103—Maritime training: Appropriate $3,252,100, instead of $2,795,200 as proposed by the House and $3,990,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $2,238,900 for personal services, instead of $1,881,600 as proposed by the House and $2,474,100 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate the provision of the Senate excluding from the foregoing amount for personal services the pay of cadet midshipmen; authorize the use of $2,000 for contingencies for the superintendent, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House and $2,500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $25,625 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,500 as proposed by the House and $30,750 as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the transfer of $65,540 to the Public Health Service, instead of $55,680 as proposed by the House and $72,500 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate providing for pay of cadet midshipmen, restoring in lieu thereof the House provision for uniforms and textbooks.

Amendment No. 104—State marine schools: Appropriates $663,200, instead of $643,400 as proposed by the House and $1,092,050 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminates the proposal of the Senate providing for the pay of cadet midshipmen at $65 per month and $275 per annum for subsistence, restoring the provision of the House bill providing for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence, amended to provide $320,200, instead of $300,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Restores the provision of the House relating to payment for vessels requisitioned or insured by the Government and lost while so requisitioned or insured.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos 106, 107, and 108—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorize the use of $3,509,500 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $3,371,425 as proposed by the House and $3,647,600 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $6,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $122,760 as proposed by the House and $153,450 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on administrative expenses not under limitation, amended to fix such limitation at $151,000.

Amendment No. 109—Office of the Administrator (prefabricated housing): Authorizes the use of $6,750 for expenses and travel, instead of $6,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 110 and 111—Home Loan Bank Board: Authorize the use of $22,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses for examination of Federal and State chartered institutions, amended to fix such limitation at $1,775,000.

Amendment No. 112—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Authorizes the use of $4,150 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,700 as proposed by the House and $4,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 113 and 114—Federal Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $140,125 for expenses of travel, instead of $130,000 as proposed by the House and $162,250 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses, amended to fix such limitation at $28,870,000.

Amendments Nos. 115, 116, 117, and 118—Public Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $11,534,000 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $10,455,000, as proposed by the House and $12,613,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $697,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $620,000 as proposed by the House and $775,000 as proposed by the Senate; restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses, amended to fix such limitation at $32,722,080; and authorize the use of $142,500 of available funds for expenses in connection with the sale of certain properties, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendments Nos. 119, 120, and 121—Administrative expenses: Authorize the use of $481,200 of available funds for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $467,330 as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $10,755 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,560 as proposed by the

House and $11,950 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of one and hire of passenger motor vehicles, instead of the purchase of two such vehicles as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 122—Limitation on annual leave, civilian officers and employees: Restores the matter stricken out by said amendment, adding thereto a provision to the effect that the section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952.

Amendment No. 123: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 124: Limitation on number of automobiles operated at seat of government: Strikes out the proposal of the House in this connection.

Amendments Nos. 125 and 126: Correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 127: Restriction on compensation of persons acting as chauffeurs: Inserts the proposal of the Senate to except persons on duty in a foreign country.

Amendment No. 128: Prohibition against appointment of personnel and percentage reduction in funds available for personal services: Omits the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment.

Amendment No. 129: Fixes a ceiling of $1,600 which may be paid for the acquisition of passenger motor vehicles, with certain exceptions, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 130: Limitation on funds available for personnel engaged in information, publicity, editorial, and similar work: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 131: Limitation on funds available for pay above basic rates and for transportation of things: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate.

Amendment No. 132: Corrects a section number.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be a motion to recommit by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. In order to be perfectly fair in the matter, I understand I have 1 hour, and I want to yield one-half of that to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. We will have only two or three speakers on this side and I would like to close debate so if the gentleman will use his 30 minutes it will be fine.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, and, in accepting the terms of that offer, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and the question before us, grouped as one problem, is a very simple problem.

The conference report on independent offices, when we went to conference with the Senate, had 132 points at issue. Several of those were technical points. The important point is that out of the entire lot, the committee of conference was in agreement upon all those which I can now group.

In order to save time, the minority managers on the part of the House, did not sign the report and I shall explain our reasons for that. I shall also say that in order to save time we will not attempt, as the items are read by number in the conference report, to amend or change or to return any of those at that time. At the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit, and in order that this matter may be clear in the discussion I shall read the motion to recommit:

I move to recommit the bill H. R. 7072 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House provisions on the number of housing units to be commenced in fiscal 1953—

Which is item 47—

to insist on the inclusion of the money necessary for new hospital construction.

This is for veterans' hospitals and appears as item 82—

to insist on the orderly formula for personnel replacement contained in the so-called Jensen amendment.

That is item 128, which I shall further explain—

and further to insist on the Senate provisions for the appropriations for maritime training.

Items 97 to 103, inclusive.

There was one other item because of which the minority members did not sign the report, and that had to do with the number of steam plants for the Tennessee Valley Authority. But since it is a small matter, whether we discuss it in this conference report or whether we discuss it tomorrow when the supplemental bill comes up, the minority members with whom this was discussed decided not to include that in the motion to recommit.

Why do we bring this back? Because when this subcommittee came to you with the independent offices bill we said to you that these were our best opinions, and in several of those cases, by recorded vote upon the floor, you changed our decisions. We felt that we did not have the right to accept in conference the changes which were made in the Senate and concurred in by a majority of the conferees without bringing it back to the floor for action.

On the floor on March 20 we proposed 25,000 houses. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] offered an amendment limiting that to 5,000 houses. This was carried by a recorded vote. The Senate changed this to 45,000 houses, and by a vote of approximately 2 to 1 in the conference 35,000 houses would be permitted to be started in fiscal year 1953.

There are many people upon this floor who believe that that is a larger number of houses than should be permitted to be started in the fiscal year 1953, and you will have an opportunity to express your opinion whether you agree with the people who think that way.

On the matter of the Jensen amendment I want you to understand thoroughly what the situation is, because I, for one, think it is very important. Actually, in many of the individual agencies for which we are providing money we, between the House and Senate, have cut the amount to an amount equal to or less than the amount which would have been provided in the Jensen amendment. The question therefore arises, why do I ask you to vote on the Jensen amendment to authorize us to insist upon the orderly formula for personnel replacement? Because if we do not insist upon this and send us back to conference the head of an agency, included in this bill, will have the right to remove people to meet the reductions in money and, therefore, in personnel, at his judgment.

The Jensen amendment provided a formula by which people who left the agency for any reason, voluntarily or otherwise, would not be replaced until these figures were reached; and I, for one, think that is an important amendment and that we should insist upon it.

I do not believe that this House knowingly would permit the figure to stand for the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The Senate cut out all construction for the new hospitals for veterans, leaving us in this situation—and please, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here to defend the number of hospitals that have been built, the number of beds in the hospitals that have been built, or the location of the hospitals that have been built. For 10 years I have been endeavoring to induce the Veterans' Administration to make a re-evaluation of the veterans' hospital program. We have built these hospitals, whether or not they were correct; we have built them of a size which may or may not have been correct, and now when we reach the greatest need of all, the need for neuropsychiatric hospitals, with one stroke the other body cuts out the money for the neuropsychiatric hospitals, the NP hospitals.

In the program there were four hospitals, one to be built in the Middle West—that was not in this money and that will come next year—one to be built in the Middle West, Cleveland, of a thousand beds; and two to be built on the west coast of a thousand beds each. We have leveled ground for one of them and have asked for bids. We have acquired the land for the other. We would have to stop the bids and pay a penalty.

We may have put hospitals in the wrong place, we may have built too many general medical and surgical hospitals, but we cannot today deny the hospitals most needed for the veterans where the veterans are today and not where they used to be 10 years ago.

And so, in conclusion, because I do not wish to delay the House, it seems to me that the House should send us back to conference on the four items I have indicated in this particular motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The four hospitals that have been cut out by the Senate, is that in addition to the 16,000 beds the President took away from the VA some years ago?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct as I understand it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances. There is to be no reduction in the number of nurses, dieticians, and so forth?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure that the gentleman from California will agree with me when I interpolate this observation. I think those of us representing the minority side of the subcommittee have always admired greatly our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I, for one, never admired him so much as in the course of the conference on this bill. He did a truly magnificent job and he came back with a magnificent victory on almost all of the 130 items. He saved the important language in the housing clause, he saved the important Thomas rider, he saved a great deal of the matters that are very important in this bill. I am sure the gentleman from California will agree that it is only because of the solemn vote taken in this House on the housing question and on the matter of veterans' hospitals as well as the Jensen amendment that compels us to come back to make sure that the House passes on those vital questions; is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman makes my peroration for me. That is exactly the situation. We greatly admire the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and, furthermore, we bring this bill back with an unusual condition in it—with less money than when it left the House. I think this marks a milestone in the relations between the two bodies.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman explain to us why we have to consider all four of these together?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Because all four are in the minds of some people. You may not be interested in all four, other people are not interested in the ones you are interested in.

I neglected to say anything about the maritime appropriation. I will not go into it at length, but it has to do with the maritime training schools which is an obligation of the Federal Government and which I feel is important.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Is there any possibility under the present procedure to have the four items divided as separate amendments so that there could be separate votes on each one?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; I am making them as one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to explain some points of the Jensen amendment. I want every Member of this body to know that there is nothing in the Jensen amendment any place which keeps a department from reducing its personnel to a greater degree than what is provided for in the Jensen amendment. Also on items which the committee and the conferees have reduced to a greater degree than is provided in the Jensen amendment the figures in the bill still hold good. In other words, the Jensen amendment does not apply to any item that the committee has cut to a greater degree than the Jensen amendment provides. The original Jensen amendment that passed this House would cut the bill passed by the House approximately $50,000,000. It applied to the number of personnel who were on the rolls in each one of these agencies as of July 1, 1952. Hence, any claim that might be made that the committee cuts are greater than are provided for in the Jensen amendment, is simply not a fact.

The minority members of the committee have suggested a compromise which was printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3868. This proposed compromise will not save as much money as the original amendment, because it applies to the budget instead of applying to the number on the rolls as of July 1, 1952. So much for that.

Now regarding the four veterans hospitals which the Senate saw fit to cut out of the House bill. It can be said truthfully and honestly that we Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who have been constantly fighting to cut out waste and extravagance for nonessential expenditures for Government have not and will not economize for the facilities needed for proper care of disabled veterans, and hence we hope the fund for these hospitals will be restored. I shall support the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the public-housing amendment that was accepted by the conference committee. The acceptance of 35,000 units was a matter of compromise. I would have preferred to have seen the entire 45,000 units voted by the Senate accepted by the House conferees, and I would have preferred to see the language of the Fisher amendment stricken from the conference report. The Senate considered this bill, and it struck the entire Fisher amendment including the very harsh language which prevents advance planning by the Public Housing Authority. The conferees reinserted it. I would like to remind the gentleman from California who now seeks to recommit this report to conference, that when he was arguing for the antiadvance planning language, the so-called antileapfrog provision last year, he stated that this provision was even more important than the limitation upon public-housing starts. He said at that time it would prevent the Public Housing Administration from making plans for thousands and thousands of units for years into the future. Personally, I believe advance planning is necessary, but in the interest of achieving a compromise I was willing to abide by the decision of the conferees to accept 35,000 units and to include this language. Let me point out that under this language, the number of units that may be constructed in any single year is entirely within the control of the Congress.

The only matter in controversy, therefore, is the number of public-housing units that shall be constructed this year. The conference approved 35,000 units. Is this an inordinate number? Does this number even approach the number contemplated in the Public Housing Act of 1949 which this House adopted? Of course not. That act provided for the construction of 135,000 units each year. This number is 100,000 less. It is less than half the number approved this year by the Bureau of the Budget.

Moreover, in the Housing act of 1949, it was contemplated that the number of public-housing units would be constructed at a rate of 10 percent of the total number of housing starts. The number we are asking the House to approve today does not even approximate that ratio. In the year 1949, for example, we had over a million private housing starts. In 1950, there were more than 1,400,000 private housing starts. In 1951, despite defense cutbacks, there were over 1,100,000 private housing starts, and this year bids fair to pass even the mark set during 1951. In addition, it must be remembered that the Government has provided tremendous advantages to the private building industry which must be considered in the total picture as well. The Federal Government has provided reserves and investment insurance in savings and loan institutions with resources totaling $17,500,000,000 serving 12,000,000 individual borrowers and investors. Through the Federal Housing Administration there have been more than 15,000,000 housing loans totaling more than $25,000,000,000, enabling more families to own their own homes and builders and renters to greatly extend their business. The Government has guaranteed 2,500,000 home loans to veterans, totaling more than $15,000,000,000 and has provided over $2,750,000,000 for Government mortgage purchases. This has given tremendous impetus toward the construction of private homes, and the sum total of all the investment by the Government toward stimulating the construction of private housing is in excess of $70,000,000,000.

Much has been said about the fact that this is socialized housing. The effort is made by using this term to conjure up a horrible implication toward public housing. It was not so very long ago that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in a speech in the other body appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, pages 4600–4601, stated the following:

> The question we have to meet, in addition to private housing, arises from the tremendous number of slum dwellings, of indecent dwellings, in many cities in the United States, and to some extent in the rural districts, which have gradually developed. We have a system of private enterprise which has built millions of

houses for us over the years, and yet, regardless of the fact that that system has been free, the houses at the bottom have steadily deteriorated, and there are approximately five or six million homes the rentals of which are about $15, because the homes have deteriorated. Many of them are gradually being replaced, and will be replaced through private enterprise. But I, myself, became convinced that there was nothing to show that private building in the future, any more than private building in the past, would ever eliminate the slums; and the result of simply tearing them down is to develop slums in other areas exactly as the previous slums were developed.

The difficulty arises from the fact that housing is still more expensive than it ought to be for the income of the people. Today the fact still is that the people's income is such that families that are perfectly able to pay for their food and their clothing and their other activities are unable to pay a rent sufficient to obtain a decent house.

He also stated:

If we can reduce the cost of housing I should say we might eliminate the problem of public housing, but otherwise there is a very considerable group of persons who are unable to pay for decent houses, but who are able to pay for everything else.

The question is, What can the Government do about it? It cannot be said that the Government has no interest in the problem. The Government has gone into it through FHA and through private housing. The Government has an interest in seeing that the lower-income groups have decent homes. It has long been recognized in this country and in England and elsewhere that there is an obligation of government to see that every family shall have a minimum amount of food in the form of relief. We have long recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for medical care should be given a minimum of medical care. We have recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for education should be given a free education. We have gone further in education than we have in the other fields. We have not, until within the past 10 years, recognized a similar obligation with regard to shelter. I very strongly believe we have that obligation. I believe that if we desire to have reasonable equality of opportunity for the children of this country they must be allowed to grow up in a situation in which there is at least decent shelter in which families can live as human beings and can receive a start in life free from crime and free from the demoralization of character resulting from living in a slum area.

Today housing is a more difficult problem than is relief or medical care. We have tried different methods. Can it be solved through the giving of relief? Can we solve the problem simply by paying tenants a sufficient amount to enable them to pay their rent, if they receive a very low income or no income at all? The general answer is that that will not solve the problem. There are still slum areas, and in all probability we shall not improve them. The persons who own them will simply receive larger rents. They may put the housing in better condition, but no one will build a new home on the chance that 10 years from today someone may not be receiving relief. We do not know whether it will work.

What about the question of private industry doing this job? To use the words of the same gentleman as they appear later in the speech:

There has been much criticism of the bill by real estate boards and private contractors. As the bill is written, there is not the slightest competition with private industry. We provide in the bill that no one shall be allowed to occupy a house in one of these areas if he is paying within 20 percent of the rental which must be paid for housing of a reasonably decent character in the particular community. As we have limited the terms of the bill, no private industry is justified in making the claim that there is any competition with industry in the type of public housing proposed in title VI. So far as I can judge, no way can be discovered to eliminate slums, unless while we are reducing the cost we are helping private industry.

Further in his speech the Senator stated:

A complete housing program cannot be carried on unless we are prepared to provide some public housing at the bottom of the scale, and set an example, help eliminate slums, and take the edge off the problem at the bottom.

I doubt that any of the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle who are opposing this conference report and the construction of public-housing units, and I doubt that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], who would cut the number of housing units to 5,000, can successfully claim that the gentleman from Ohio is a Socialist or is in any way the champion of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, this report is a compromise. In conferences we cannot get everything we want, although I think that under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] the House won a victory in the conference. I think the House should support the conferees and vote down the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the citizen gets a loan for construction and that loan is paid by the citizen, the Government does not put up the guarantee, and simply because the citizen meets his own obligation.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What has the Government furnished, then? The Government is carrying an insurance policy on the Federal housing, financed by local banks for the use of the citizen.

Mr. YATES. That is correct, except I should like to point out to the gentleman that I was attempting to enumerate the financial aids given by the Government to private enterprise for the construction of private housing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One is money out of the tax box, the other is something entirely different.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows we make appropriations every year for the Federal National Mortgage Association, for example. The appropriations bill that will be considered tomorrow contains almost $1,000,000,000 for the Federal National Mortgage Association. That sum is being appropriated out of the taxpayers' pockets. It will be repaid later, it is true, but nevertheless there is a current appropriation for private housing purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the $1,000,000,000 used for?

Mr. YATES. For secondary mortgages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, sure, but again if the citizen pays the obligation, the Government does not have to pay it.

Mr. YATES. That is true, but the question we are debating is whether the Federal Government shall help those who cannot afford to purchase private housing or pay current rentals. I believe it should. To use the phrase of the senior Senator from Ohio, "I believe that if we desire to have reasonable equality of opportunity for the children of this country they must be allowed to grow up in a situation in which there is at least decent shelter in which families can live as human beings and can receive a start in life free from crime and free from the demoralization of character resulting from living in a slum area."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for so kindly yielding time to me.

We are in a situation here where an effort is being made to dress up a motion to recommit the conference report to the conferees, in order to scare those who want to vote for the 35,000 public-housing units into voting for it and killing the provision for these units. A vote could easily have been taken on each particular item of the four in the motion to recommit as it came up, but they have been lumped together in a motion to recommit expressly for that purpose. I will prove that, and I do not think any Member should be taken in by it. It is perfectly legitimate but my point is that no Member should succumb to that bait.

People in the big cities are going to be watching this vote. This is a public-housing vote. The conference report is giving them this year 35,000 units, 3.5 percent of the million housing units to be produced this year. Last year the Congress gave them 50,000, which is 5 percent. The House has just taken off most of the controls because Members apparently believed there were more materials available, and that the defense emergency is not too great a limitation on them. But that action on the Defense Production Act cannot be justified if at the same time a very minor percentage of public housing is being denied and reduced even below last year.

Now for the proof: What the movants hope for on this motion to recommit is to go back to the Senate and insist upon the amount the Senate gave for maritime training, not the amount the House gave; the amount the Senate gave is a few hundred thousand dollars more. I ask you, is that put in for window dressing or because they really and seriously are interested in taking that back to the Senate? Generally, they would be expected to insist on what the House did and not to try to get what the Senate did. No; this is a package to try to induce you to defeat this particular conference report because it contains a small 35,000 public-housing units. I hope you will not be taken in by it.

We have just lost seven people in a flash fire in substandard housing in New York. There are 50,000 such buildings in

the city of New York. The State and the city—and that is true of many of the great cities—have tried to meet this obligation for better housing and much has been done, but not nearly enough. They cannot meet it and the help of the Federal Government is urgently needed.

Forty percent of our population have families earning less than $3,000 per year. For that 40 percent of the population this conference report is providing only 3.5 percent of the housing units expected to be started in the next fiscal year.

I assure you the conference committee and the Appropriations Committee will be able to work out all of these problems about the veterans' hospitals and the other matters they are putting into this motion to recommit, if they want to, but what is being attempted by this kind of a motion is to scare those who are willing to give this bare fragment of public housing to the millions who need it so urgently, from doing it. I do not think we ought to be scared and I ask you to vote down the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that the motion to recommit is what might properly be termed a trick motion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] pointed his finger at that very fact, and clearly conveyed to the Members of the House the combination of four factors which constitute nothing but a trick motion. Two of the hospitals that are involved here are in California I am informed. It would be very interesting to know some of the history that took place in the conference committee in relation to some of the items in dispute. The gentleman knows when he offers his motion to recommit that you cannot demand a separate vote on each one of the four items. If it was an amendment before the House, you could have a separate vote on the different items. You could have a separate vote on housing and you could have a separate vote on any one of the other three items, if any Member so demanded. But on a motion to recommit on a conference report, you cannot demand a separate vote on any of the component matters which constitute the motion to recommit. The 35,000 units for public housing is about one-half of what was recommended in the budget message of the President. As I remember, the President recommended appropriations which would build 75,000 housing units. When the Committee on Appropriations reported its appropriation bill, it provided an appropriation for 25,000 units. A motion was made to reduce it to 5,000 units, which on the roll call the House adopted. The other body inserted appropriations in the bill for 45,000 units, and the House conferees agreed upon 35,000 units, but, retained the so-called provision which prevents leap-frogging. The important part of this motion to recommit is public housing. There is no question about that, and the other part is the Jensen amendment. The other two items are just thrown in for the purpose of confusing and for the purpose of getting Members into an embarrassing position, if it can possibly be done. If this motion should prevail, I hope my friend, the gentleman from Texas, will cross up such an attempt and bring back in disagreement the various items. That is if the motion should prevail, and I hope it does not; I hope he will bring them back so that they can be put to the House on a separate vote, and thus prevent this trick motion to recommit from being carried successfully into operation.

We are going to either adjourn or recess on July 5. One thing is certain: We have to do that in connection with the two coming national conventions. That is the only fair thing to do. We would like to adjourn. If we cannot adjourn, we certainly will have to take a recess due to the fact that the Republican convention starts on July 7. If we are going to adjourn, we have to get the appropriation bills out of the way, and certainly we cannot take a chance, if we do expect to adjourn, on recommiting appropriation bills, because, in my opinion, that is the one thing which will prevent an adjournment sine die. I hope, in view of the trick motion which is offered, that it will not be carried, and that the House will not recommit the conference report, and I hope between now and July 5 the various appropriation bills will be disposed of so that we can adjourn sine die. It would be very interesting if it were possible to obtain the real history of what took place in the conference committee in relation to some of these veterans' hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope the House will not retreat from the stand it took on March 21 against socialized housing, when we had a record vote on that occasion.

I am not at all surprised that the advocates of public housing are at least satisfied with the so-called compromise of 35,000 socialized units, the construction of which will begin during the next fiscal year.

Let us see how much of a compromise this is. I hope, even though at this last minute when we are already hearing that warning that we are nearly through and that we have to rush things through without thinking them through, I hope the House will stand up this afternoon on this important issue and say that we can sit here until Christmas, if necessary, in support of the vital principle that is involved in this socialized housing program.

On March 21 the House, on a record vote of 168 to 192, announced that it wanted no more than 5,000 of the socialized housing units to be begun during the next fiscal year, including the so-called leapfrog provision that has been referred to, which was a fine thing. It went to the other body and there, by a very narrow margin, the House figure was not accepted. The vote was 31 to 37. A shift of three votes on the part of the other body would have accepted the so-called Fisher amendment and it would not even have been in conference. So apparently there is very substantial support in the other body for the position that the House took. Despite that fact, the conferees apparently not informed about the extent of the support which our position had in the Senate, instead of a compromise of a reasonable figure they go to 35,000. Now they come in and say, "Yes, but we have got the entire leapfrog provision in there so that they cannot commit themselves for future years." That is well and good, but it does not attack the evil that is involved in this socialized housing program. It does not do anything to help stop the evil of this thing that is going on.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, I could discuss a number of the factors that are involved. I have made some study of it recently, but we do not have very much time. The big cry you always hear is that this is slum clearance and we have to get rid of the slums. Recently I have seen repeated evidence of the fact that many of the larger projects are built on vacant land, practically built entirely on vacant land. Recently the city of Los Angeles in an important referendum voted 3 to 1 against a 10,000-unit program out there. The newspaper report said 80 percent of the land that was purchased for that construction was vacant, not slum clearance. Instance after instance of the same thing is going on all over the country. This is not a slum-clearance program. That is an incidental thing. It is a good vote-getter. It sounds good. Nobody is in favor of slums. But after all is said and done, it is one of the most expensive housing construction operations ever undertaken anywhere. If you will just study the details of this it is absolutely appalling. I will refer to it briefly.

These units actually cost, according to the figures put out by the Public Housing Authority, more than $12,000 in Federal subsidies donated to the local housing authorities, and which are applied on the payment of the bonds that are sold on Wall Street and throughout the country. Then the local contribution, after taking the "in lieu" contribution, amounts to about half that amount. Therefore, each individual unit is costing the American taxpayers, either on the local level or the Federal taxpayers, a total of more than $18,000. The total cost of the 30,000 units added in conference amounts to more than $500,000,000. The American taxpayers have to pay that. It would be much cheaper for the Government to donate these housing units to these people and not be bothered with this tremendous cost and all the social evils that are involved in it.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman mentioned the Los Angeles situation. The voters of that city went to the polls and voted 3 to 2 against public housing in Los Angeles. Is the

gentleman aware of the fact that the Housing Administration has said it does not make any difference what the people of Los Angeles want; we have a valid contract with the city of Los Angeles; we are going to build the public housing there and it does not make a bit of difference what your people think about it?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is exactly correct; and it is amazing how inconsistent, how absolutely inconsistent the Public Housing people are in promoting these projects and foisting them upon the people all over the country. Would it surprise the gentleman to learn that in this bill they have nearly $1,000,000 for traveling expenses for this agency? This is for nearly a thousand people, I think 919—that they want to send all over the country just to traipse around and promote and impose this program, including many, many misrepresentations, I can assure the gentleman, imposed upon local city councils who do not know just what they are getting into; and many of them are begging and pleading to be released from the projects.

Mr. Speaker, a vote to recommit this conference report is a vote against socialized housing, a vote against recommiting is a vote for socialized housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Texas that we have but one speaker. Would it not be proper for him to use all but his last speaker on his side before I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I will close the debate.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has no other speaker?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to clear up two or three things about this situation.

The increase above the House figures of 30,000 units: What does it mean? It means that every month after these housing units go into operation there is paid a subsidy of approximately $32.50 for every apartment or individual in a housing project. And what does that mean over the lifetime of the project? It means, as the gentleman from Texas has told you, $12,160 on 30,000 units; it means $364,800,000. That is what you are voting on; it is not any little subsidy; it is not any little item; it is, to my mind, a great big swindle, because you could hand these people dollar-free units to live in cheaper than that in almost any place in the United States. It is the most outrageous way of handling anything that I ever saw invented, and it is about time that we stopped that kind of contribution and subsidy.

There has been an effort here to dodge the issue. It was absolutely impossible to offer a motion to recommit this bill unless everything that we wanted to raise was put in it.

I am going to tell you because somebody who has preceded me expressed an interest in some of the things that took place over in the conference with reference to the veterans' hospitals. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] opposed accepting the approximately $100,000,000 cut that the Senate had made in veterans' hospitals and he specified the places where the need existed. He said there were insufficient neuropsychiatric hospitals to take care of the real serious veterans' cases resulting from the Korean situation. That is what took place and that is why he did not like it. He was the one who did the talking on the part of the minority.

Now, why do we want the Jensen amendment? Why do we need it? We need it for the protection of the Federal civil-service employees who are in the various departments so that the cuts and reductions that are made will not result in the firing of people. The normal attrition of these departments is in every case sufficient to take care of the reduction. That is the fair way to approach the matter, it is the honest way to approach it, and that is why so many of us have been anxious to have the Jensen amendment.

I hope the membership of the House will put its stamp of disapproval on further efforts at socialized housing with enormous subsidies, designed ultimately to break the United States, because the kind of housing they put up is never as good as the kind that private capital puts up. I hope that we can get down to a situation where we will permit ordinary folks to build houses instead of having the Federal Government do it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will prevail.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the motion to recommit is not carried, will the items in dispute be taken up one by one for a vote?

Mr. TABER. No. If the motion to recommit fails, the previous question will be moved on the conference report, and you will have to vote it up or down. In other words, shall we take the conference report with everything in it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There will be no opportunity to vote on the hospitals and on the other items?

Mr. TABER. You cannot vote on anything except on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is an outrage to cut out the hospital here in Washington. The Mount Alto Hospital is horribly overcrowded. You cannot get men who are dying into it. It is an outrage to cut that out, and I think also there should be housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman is correct. There are 500 beds in Washington and there are 3,000 beds which we do need for the NP patients.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will prevail and that we may have a better bill presented to us, and in saying that I am not throwing stones at the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], because he is a very able member of the Appropriations Committee and he handles things very cleverly. But the situation is such that we ought to have uppermost in our minds first the interest of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article appearing in the Washington Post.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post yesterday morning, buried back in the inside pages where many Members may have missed it, was a report by George Gallup, the director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, headlined "Majority Prefers Democrats as Best for Their Interests."

This survey by the Gallup poll shows that a clear majority of white-collar workers, of farmers, and of manual workers answered Democratic when asked "Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or Democratic—do you think will be best for people like yourself?" Business people, of course, answered the other way—that is understandable.

The atrocious actions taken on the bill before the House today to weaken the stabilization controls demonstrate clearly why the Gallup poll got the kind of answers it did to its question.

The Republican Party was in here fighting to get higher prices for business all down the line. At whose expense? At the expense of the rest of the people—of the consumer, the farmer, the white-collar worker, the teacher, the pensioner, the veteran, the workingman.

I know that some of our Republican colleagues have lost confidence in the Gallup poll because it was off base on the 1948 election. We all know what happened—the results came in from the field indicating a Democratic victory and the pollster experts just could not believe that was accurate, so they adjusted a little here and there. When the pollsters, however, ask fair, straight-out questions which put the issues clearly and squarely up to the person being interviewed—as this survey reported this morning did—and if they do not go adjusting the results but let them speak for themselves, then they are more likely to be accurate.

The solidarity of the Republican side of the House last Friday, yesterday, and today in jamming through some of the amendments on price control to give inflation another shot in the arm proves once again to the voters which party represents them and which party represents the special interests.

One thing Gallup points out is the sad state of the Republican Party's influence with the farmers. The farmer has been hurt by inflation, just like everyone else who has to work hard for a living. Amendments put in here last year to weaken price control did not help the farmer—although some of them were supposed to, according to their sponsors—but instead, they hurt the farmer

by raising the cost of everything he buys and reducing his income.

This article says:

The attitude of farmers in today's survey is of significance, particularly since it was the farm vote which helped Truman win in 1948. The farmers—

The article adds—

again give the nod to the Democrats today.

The complete article, Majority Prefers Democrats as Best for Their Interests, is as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

MAJORITY PREFER DEMOCRATS AS BEST FOR THEIR INTERESTS

PRINCETON, N. J., June 24.—When it comes to a question of self-interest or the "pocket-book nerve" of the American voter, the Democratic Party has an advantage over the GOP.

More people consider the Democratic Party best for people like themselves, than choose the Republicans, according to interviews just completed with a national cross section of voters.

The survey put this question to the voters interviewed:

"Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or Democratic—do you think will be best for people like yourself?"

The vote is:

	Percent
Democrats best	42
Republicans best	37
No difference	13
No opinion	8
	100

All those who voted "no difference" or "no opinion" were asked this second question:

"If you had to make up your mind today on which party has your best interest at heart—which would you choose, the Republican or Democratic Party?"

This showed 6 percent Republican, 6 percent Democratic and 9 percent still undecided—making up the 21 percent answering "no difference" or "no opinion" on the first question.

The results high light the central problem of the Republican Party in trying to win this year's election.

That is, many political observers believe that the "pocket-book nerve" influences the way many people vote.

The attitude of farmers in today's survey is of significance, particularly since it was the farm vote which helped Truman win in 1948.

The farmers again give the nod to the Democrats today.

Manual workers also indicate a marked preference for the Democratic Party, whereas business and professional people list the Republicans as best for their interests.

White-collar workers are more evenly divided with the Democratic Party being favored.

Here is the vote, combining the two questions, by occupation groups.

	Democrats best	Republicans best	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Business and professional	32	58	10
White collar	48	43	9
Farmers	50	42	8
Manual workers	54	37	9

President Truman's popularity has increased in recent weeks, although it still remains comparatively low.

Today's survey however, would indicate that the strength of the Democratic Party should be judged not in terms of Truman's popularity but in terms of the very evident appeal which the party has to the voting public.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE].

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of the report of the committee, which recommends a compromise figure of 35,000 federal-aided dwelling units during the next fiscal year.

I believe this figure is too low. We need more public housing, not less.

Our public housing developments fulfill a definite need. They give decent housing at moderate rentals to our own people who could not afford it otherwise.

In New York City, for example, where the Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates that it take a minimum of $4,083 a year to support a family of four, only four-person families with incomes below $3,000 can be admitted to federally-aided housing projects. The rents average $37 per month. There is no place in New York City outside of public housing where families in this income category can find a decent place to live at a rental they can afford.

The projects built under the Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949 must meet the requirements established by the Public Housing Administration, which administers Federal aid to public housing. This means that we can be sure that every new apartment meets American standards so far as space, light, and air are concerned; that there is sufficient open space around the buildings for the children to play in—in short, that every apartment built is one which is fit for an American family to live in.

Although the Federal Government provides financial aid and sets up certain architectural and administrative standards which the local housing authorities must meet, the emphasis has been and still is on local initiative. The local housing authority selects the site for a new project, hires private architects to draw up the plans, lets contracts for construction of the project, and operates the project with its own personnel after construction is completed.

The country's housing authorities, by and large, have carried out their functions in a workmanlike and efficient manner. The authority with which I am best acquainted, of course, is the New York City Housing Authority. Under the leadership of its chairman, Philip J. Cruise, and its executive director, Gerald J. Carey, the New York City Housing Authority has achieved an enviable place among the most highly esteemed governmental agencies in the country. Governmental officials, architects, and engineers from every quarter of the globe, as well as from all parts of the United States, come to New York City each year to inspect the Authority's projects and to study its methods of operation. The Authority has been fortunate in being able to work with a city administration whose leaders, including Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri and Comptroller Lazarus Joseph, are keenly aware of the need for low-rent housing in New York City. I want you to know that we are proud of our public-housing developments in New York City. They have razed slums which were eyesores and replaced them with modern buildings beautifully landscaped and affording plenty of light, air, and play space for children.

We still need public housing. The growth of our population; the substandard condition of a large portion of our supply of housing; the abnormal shortage of residential construction from 1930 through 1945; and the cost of homes built since 1946; are the reasons why we should continue our public-housing program.

We often tend to forget that the United States is still a growing country. Between 1930 and 1940 the population of the continental United States grew by 9,000,000. In the following 10-year period our population jumped by another 19,500,000, and since 1950 we have been expanding at an average of 2,500,000 each year.

In addition to providing homes for the huge increase in population, there has been and still is an urgent need to replace the tremendous number of slum dwellings and other substandard homes we had at the beginning of the period I have been discussing, as well as to replace the homes which have been destroyed by disasters such as floods and fires, or which have deteriorated to a point where they are no longer fit for human habitation. In 1950 we had 2,500,000 homes which were described by the Housing and Home Finance Agency as "dilapidated," an additional 4,000,000 without toilet or bath, and 2,000,000 more which had no running water of any kind. The picture of millions of American children growing up under such conditions is not one we can view with complacency.

During the period 1930–1952, with the exception of the last 6 years, the amount of residential construction has been far below normal. In the early 1930's the depression brought construction almost to a halt. Building activity improved later in the decade, bringing the total of dwelling units started between 1930 and 1940 to 2,700,000. With the start of World War II residential construction was paralyzed again. Even with the abnormally high rate of construction since 1946, the total number of units started between 1940 and 1950 was only 5,700,000. About 2,500,000 units have been started since 1950, making a total of about 10,900,000 for the period 1930 to 1952.

The rapid increase in construction costs since 1946 has of course, put new private housing far out of the reach of low-income families. Nor have a substantial number of old dwelling units been left vacant by the families who moved into postwar housing. Many of these families were newlyweds who had never had a home before; many of them had been sharing apartments with in-laws or relatives. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that every new home meant an

old apartment for a low-income family to move into.

For these reasons the need for public housing is still acute. The New York City Housing Authority, for example receives an average of 4,000 applications per month from families with incomes under $3,000 a year, in spite of the fact that it has a backlog of more than 500,000 applications. But there is no need to cite statistics on this point. Every time I take a walk through certain sections of my own district in the Borough of the Bronx, or in other sections of New York City, I am appalled by the thousands of ramshackle, overcrowded slum buildings in which so many of our families—many of them families of war veterans—must continue to live because they do not earn enough money to pay the rents demanded in available private housing.

At this point let me pause to bring to the attention of the Congress one specific area in my congressional district which shows the dire need for increased housing units. I refer specifically to what is known as the Washington-Claremont area of the borough of the Bronx, New York City. In this area there is a preponderance of old-law tenements. The area is known to have the oldest houses in the central Bronx. The buildings are not only old, but contain many violations. There are quite a few buildings in the area which were condemned and which, as a result of demands for increased housing, were reopened. Most of these buildings were so arranged as to provide single rooms for housing for entire families. The perniciousness of such an arrangement is pointed up by the fact that in one such reopened, condemned building there were five infant deaths within a short period of time.

This area is much more congested than the rest of the county of the Bronx with an average of 266 persons per occupied area, as compared with 66 persons elsewhere in the borough and 91 persons for the city as a whole. Health area No. 24, which includes most of the Washington-Claremont area I am referring to, has a population density that is even greater—355 persons per acre. This is hardly a desirable condition and militates against an adequate home life for children. Available information from the police department on juvenile delinquency in the area indicates that youth delinquency is more serious with substandard conditions and as a result, the forty-second precinct covering most of the Washington-Claremont area is one of the precincts having the highest volume of delinquents in the borough. The youth board for the area also reports that the highest incidents of delinquency in the borough of the Bronx are found in this area.

Similar conditions prevail in other cities, I am sure, and in rural areas as well.

I want to point out, however, that a continuation of our public housing construction program would benefit not only low-income families. There are millions of families in the middle-income category—let us say those with incomes of $4,000 to $8,000 a year—who are now living in quarters they consider inadequate because they are overcrowded or for other reasons and who are, of course, ineligible for low-rent public housing. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 provides for Federal assistance to cities which seek to redevelop slum areas by clearing the slums and selling the cleared areas to private investors for approved purposes, such as construction of apartment houses designed for middle-income families.

A number of projects have already been planned under title I of the 1949 Housing Act. The problem that arises in almost every case, however, is, what to do with the families who are now living in the old building which must be destroyed before the title I projects can be started. Many of these families are within the income limits for public housing, and it would be a comparatively simple matter to relocate them to new public housing projects to be completed within the next few years. Continuation of the public housing construction program, laid down in the Housing Act of 1949 is necessary in order to clear the title I on projects now in the planning or development state. The action we take on this bill will therefore affect middle-income families as well as low-income families.

Now we come to a point which is very important in these budget-conscious days—what would it cost the Government if we authorized the start of construction of 75,000 units in the coming fiscal year? Based on past experience with federally aided public housing, we can estimate that it would cost the United States more than $30,000,000 a year in subsidies for a period of not more than 40 years. This is certainly a modest price to pay for the addition of such valuable permanent assets to our economy—assets which will serve as an investment in democracy, and which will stand our people in good stead for the next century, come good times or bad, come peace or come war.

While we consider costs, we should also consider the cost of not continuing our public-housing-construction program. This is not a cost that can be measured in dollars and cents, but it is a very real cost nonetheless. It can be measured in terms of bad citizenship, of disease, of juvenile delinquency, of reduction in the number of young men who will be capable of meeting the Armed Forces' physical standards 5 years hence, 10 years hence, 25 years hence. The price of our failure to continue building decent homes for low-income families is far too high. We simply cannot afford to cut off Federal aid to low-rent housing.

In taking action on this bill, let us remember that ours is still a growing country—growing at the rate of 2,500,000 persons per year. The need for low-rent housing is going to increase, not decrease, and it is our duty to look to the future in making our decisions now. By the year 2000, the tanks, the planes, and the battleships for which we have appropriated billions of dollars—an expenditure which I think was and still is essential—will long since have been scrapped and forgotten, but the housing projects we build now will still be standing as proof to the historians of that era of the foresight and statesmanship of America's political leaders in the mid-twentieth century.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, if we slaughter the administration's public-housing program, we betray hundreds of thousands of our population in the lower income brackets who must rely upon us for adequate housing at prices they can pay. Furthermore, we would seriously obstruct our defense production and mobilization plans and efforts.

Shelter is an absolute necessity to everyone. Keeping a roof over their heads has become one of the gravest problems of all to our people. The housing shortage remains acute; we have never begun to catch up with the housing needs of our fast-growing population, and they have been pyramiding since the beginning of World War II. Before any constructive housing program could be put into effect and real results accomplished after the last war, we were forced again to channel materials to defense production. All this has somewhat hampered the building of homes and housing projects, but we must recognize the seriousness of the housing shortage and our duty to provide decent housing for the many thousands who are desperate for a place to live.

In any highly populated metropolitan area we find tragic housing conditions. Numbers of families are herded together in a small apartment; unhappiness, discontent, ill-health, juvenile delinquency are among the evils which are a direct result of poor housing conditions. Many persons are forced to live in a deplorable state—in basements overrun with vermin and rodents; in damp, dingy, uninhabitable places which are occupied only because there is no other place to go. Dozens of persons are forced to use the same kitchen and bath; children and babies sicken and die; lives are endangered—all because suitable housing is not to be had. The 1950 census figures show that more than 11,000,000 nonfarm dwellings are substandard. There is no excuse for this in this great country of ours; there is no good reason why every American should not be able to enjoy a decent place to live.

Veterans of World War II who looked forward to occupying their own homes after the war are still forced to live with relatives or in furnished rooms. A happy life with his wife and family in a place of his own is still only a dream to most veterans. After their sacrifices for their country the deserve better treatment than this from us.

When Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949 it promised our people that the underprivileged and ill-housed could look forward to housing they could afford. We authorized a level of 135,000 public-housing units per year, and even at that rate many persons could not expect relief for years. However, that number of units would have alleviated the housing shortage somewhat, and at least the people could hope.

At this time we are fighting those who would destroy the housing program, and who would utterly defeat the will of Congress as expressed in the Housing Act of 1949. They would betray those who expect us to keep our word now; they would undermine the faith of the people in their Congress. The enemies of the public-housing program are grasping at any excuse to sabotage the housing program at the expense of the homeless and helpless thousands who are relying upon us.

I maintain that there is no reason why we should not adhere to our original purpose and provide for the 135,000 units per year authorized heretofore. Granted, there are shortages of materials and that our defense program must have first consideration, we also know that private industry contemplates building 1,000,000 new units during the coming year. If private industry can accomplish that much, it is obvious that the Federal Government has no excuse for cutting its own housing program to the bone. We must remember that the persons Congress had in mind when it passed the Housing Act of 1949 will not be benefited by private industry's accomplishments; they cannot afford the homes now being built; low-cost housing is the only answer to the needs of those in the low-income brackets.

The proposed reduction in housing units in the bill now before us would result in serious hardship to the people of New York City where lack of housing is a heartbreaking and terrible problem. It would delay four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year; would reduce the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to a little more than 2,000. Projects in the entire New York area would be affected; planning would be delayed. The sad consequences of a reduced number of housing units cannot be measured, and what is true of New York is also true of thousands of other cities and communities in our country.

If we fail to provide housing for our people, we undermine our defense production program. We have been told by spokesmen for the aircraft industry that the Nation's critical housing shortage is a major reason for the dangerous lag in United States plane production. One aircraft corporation official in California recently stated that when his firm found it necessary to expand from 5,900 employees to its present 24,460 it had to hire 40,000 to reach that total because of the high turn-over due to lack of housing. He said that between 25 and 60 percent of all employees hired by four San Diego plane firms quit and returned east because of the lack of housing. This is only one example; many other important defense industries are similarly handicapped.

We must remember that those in the lower-income brackets are the very ones who carry the heaviest part of the defense load and who are called upon to make the greatest sacrifices. They are the laborers, the low-wage earners, the factory workers, who are turning out the ammunition, planes, and other defense-production items. They work until they are ready to drop; they are spending every ounce of physical and mental energy in the defense effort. Surely, they are entitled to a home when their day's work is done; they deserve to know that their families have decent living quarters, and that their children's health is not in jeopardy.

As I have said before, those in the lower-income brackets, the underprivileged, and the homeless, received our pledge of help in 1949. To break that promise would be a stark betrayal of all those whom we allowed to hope for decent housing. When we deny homes to our people, we take away more than shelter—we deny them security, peace, mental as well as physical health, and we weaken the fundamental structure of our democracy—for in a true democracy the home is the foundation.

Let us aim for the 135,000 units as originally planned in the Housing Act of 1949; let us fulfill our promises to the American people. I say there is no reason why we cannot do so. If we do not provide housing, we will fail miserably in our duty to our people and our responsibility for the security of our Nation.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion to recommit will prevail. I shall address myself to that portion of the motion referring to maritime training.

Mr. Speaker, the Kings Point Maritime Academy is in my district. About 10-years ago it was dedicated—in ceremonies in which the late President Roosevelt took part—to take its place alongside of Annapolis, West Point, and the Coast Guard Academy—another great national academy—to train men as officers in our merchant marine fleet.

Since the end of World War II only one group has raised its voice against Kings Point and that group is composed of maritime unions who apparently feel that their unions will be affected adversely if our maritime fleet is manned by graduates of Kings Point. No protest comes from any other source.

The records of Kings Point graduates are such that all of us can be justly proud of them.

The attempt to scuttle Kings Point each year should end. The cadets should continue to receive their monthly allowances, the Academy should be allowed to keep the teaching staff intact. A vote for this motion to recommit will insure this.

Mr. Speaker, the pride of America—the liner the *United States*—as we all know—is going to make her maiden voyage to England on the 3d of July.

I hope my colleagues will bear with me when I call attention to the fact that on this great ship there will be large representation in its officer personnel, by men who are graduates of the United States Maritime Academy at Kings Point, which is in my district.

The *United States* is going to try to smash the record of the *Queen Mary*, which has held the blue ribbon for crossing time since 1938. Many of us will recall that the *Queen Mary's* time was 3 days, 20 hours, 42 minutes. Her average speed was 31.69 knots.

There will be 52 deck and engine room officers who will be intent in their job to beat the *Queen Mary's* record.

I should like to point out that of the nine deck officers on board the *United States*, six are Kings Point graduates.

Of the 43 engine room officers, 12 are Kings Point graduates.

I know that the whole country will be watching the maiden voyage of the *United States* on July 3 next, and I think all of us are expecting that she stands better than simply a good chance to recapture for the United States the Atlantic crossing blue ribbon, which has been in British hands now for over 100 years.

We will be hoping that the United States will again win the speed record which she held for many years during the days of the clipper ships.

Kings Point will be very strongly in evidence when this ship sails, not alone in navigational personnel, but in engineering officers. The motive power of this ship is tremendous, developing 163,000 horsepower.

Under the captaincy of Harry Manning, Kings Point graduates who will be among the deck officers come from all over the United States .

The first deck officer of the ship—a Kings Point graduate of the class of 1942—is Richard W. Ridington, of Conshohocken, Pa. The third officer, another outstanding man, is John S. Tucker, of Belmont, Mass. He is a 1950 graduate.

Here are the names of additional deck officers on the *United States*, and I know that Members of Congress who represent them will welcome the information that their districts are intimately represented in the maiden voyage of the *United States:*

Third officer: Paul L. Krinsky, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Second officers: Asterio Alessandrelli, Louisiana; Samuel L. Ely, Zelienople, Pa.; Kenneth E. Pederson, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Here are the engine room officers.

The second officers are: Nicholas Landiak, Andover, N. J.; Joseph H. Lion, Arlington, Va.; Winton T. Ames, Hampton, Va.; William H. Van Cott, Elmhurst, N. Y.; Edward M. Almburg, St. Petersburg, Fla.

Third engineering officers are: Michael Squillace, Detroit, Mich.; James D'Andrea, Weatherby, Pa.

On this ship we also have three junior third engineering officers: Donald A. Prew, West Haven, Conn.; Arthur C. Taddei, Newport, R. I.; James B. Keating, Long Island City, N. Y.; and Louis Paehler, Brownsville, Tenn., and Lawrence C. McCloskey, Hamlin, Pa., both of whom are licensed junior engineers.

Throughout the years that Kings Point has been in operation, this great institution has paid a great return on the investment that our country has made there.

It is noteworthy that on this great new ship—the *United States*— we should have such a large representation of Kings Pointers. It goes to show that not only is Kings Point paying off in her contributions to our security program, through the creation of Naval Reserve

officers, but that she is making a vital contribution to our maritime industry.

Graduates of Kings Point are serving your country in vital capacities. Let us build up—not destroy—this great national institution.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now it is called socialized housing. The sloganeers are at it again. Anything for a name.

Sleep on stones and you are in free enterprise. Sleep in a low-income housing unit, and you are socialized. My, my.

Reminds me of Molière's Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme. The fellow got rich at midlife. Called a tutor. Asked him what he could learn. "Poetry, literature, prose, arithmetic." "Can you teach me prose?" "My dear sir," he was told, "you have been using it all your life."

Same with housing. From caves to the Eighty-second Congress, people have liked living under a roof. Only today if you want a home instead of a cup of coffee, and are willing to pay a modest price for it, but cannot get it, you are told to stop being socialized.

If some people could bottle up the sun they would sell you sunshine—at a price. And if you could not afford to buy it, but still wanted it, they would tell you to stop being socialistic. Same with oxygen. Too bad.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment to cut out the 35,000 housing units. I oppose the motion to recommit. I am for all the housing we can get.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the hour is growing late, and I would like to try to summarize this thing as fairly and as succinctly as I possibly can. But first I must acknowledge those kind words that my close personal friends, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said about me. I am so reminded about what happened down in my little home town of Nacogdoches, Tex. One of the old colored boys was having a birthday, and some member of the family called on Mose to congratulate him. And he did a good job congratulating Mose. But Mose said, "Boss, you are trying to substitute kind words for a nice present."

Well, my friends, seriously, if the committee has done a reasonably good job, back us up now. Now is the time. We have worked hard, and I will give you some facts and I know you will be delighted to hear them. It is once in a blue moon, and everybody on this floor knows it is true, that the House version prevails; that when the House has gone to conference with the Senate in the last 10 years, 99 out of every 100 times the Senate has raised us. Now, is that not true? No one will deny that. Yet we have done a reasonably good job. We bring you back a conference report that is $24,000,000 less than the amount you voted out of this House. No one will deny that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot deny my friend.

Mr. TABER. If you figure in these extra 30,000 housing units, is is $340,000,000 more.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is exactly right. I am talking about the appropriated funds. I am not going to hide anything from you. And we are not counting $125,000,000 in one item, and another, where we said no telling how much, on the maritime item regarding payments for vessels lost where insured by the Government. We are talking about the appropriated funds, and this is the first time in many a year that a conference report has come back here at a lesser figure. We have always been raised. Can that be denied?

Mr. TABER. Oh, the Senate has almost always raised us.

Mr. THOMAS. Sure.

Mr. TABER. The conference reports have been higher, generally, than the House figure.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you so much. Then my statement is correct.

Let us get right down to specific things. As has been pointed out here, we have a Mother Hubbard motion to recommit, which is perfectly legal, and it cannot be separated. You have to vote it up or down.

First, let us take the housing problem. Last year and this year, for 2 years, your subcommittee has taken the punishment. It was the subcommittee that originated the cuts. It was the subcommittee that put the tough language in. Now, give us credit for that. It had not been done before.

If the House wants to take this subcommittee to task, even after we have restored that tough language, and you know it is tough, if the House wants to kill this thing, why not kill it entirely? You have that opportunity. Do not wait till your subcommittee takes all the punishment on this cutting and then come in and say you do not like what we have done.

We are going to do the best we can with whatever instructions you may give us. I hope you do not give us any, but we are not going to quibble with you, we are not going to cry, we are going to do whatever you tell us to do and we are going to do it the best we can. Whether we can do what you suggest is another thing.

Bear in mind the other body is one-half of the show. Bear in mind that they are elected for 6 years and we are elected for only 2 years, so they can stay here about three times as long as we can if they want to assert their prerogatives.

What did they do? They kicked out the tough language. Let us be honest about it. You know, your language is far more important than the number of your units, and I will explain it to any fair-minded person on this floor, and you are all fair. I believe in you.

Someone said something about Los Angeles. If you had had this tough House language you would never have had the Los Angeles situation. There it is. They had a contract for $100,000,000. The people repudiated it. But they had their legal representatives, the people had authority, they had bound them with a contract, and now the people say, "We do not want it." Now, it is a contract, yet the people say, "We want out of it."

I might add that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in an effort to be helpful to his people in California—and Los Angeles is not in his district—and the committee went several miles out of their way to help straighten out that situation. Let the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] do the testifying. I believe he will testify that it is just about satisfactorily straightened out by virtue of your subcommittee trying to help.

Again we go back over to the Senate and say, "You knocked out that tough language, but now you see the light and put it back in. Now we want you to back up on your own language." Of course, they can say to us, "Well, we will give you maybe your 5,000, but we want you to kick out your tough language." Where would you be then?

Without your tough language, and I say this to my good southern friends, and I am still one of you, and I say to my good friends over here that without this tough House language, and there are 610,000 units uncommitted out of the 810,000 authorized in the bill, they can tomorrow commit the whole 610,000 units, and you would be obligated to build them.

Again, my distinguished friend from Texas was wrong. It is not a partial payment by the taxpayers of the United States for these houses, it is a 100 percent payment.

It is going to cost you $336,000,000 a year for 40 years. Roughly that is just about $13,500,000,000, and it is a 100 percent contribution. Now by keeping this tough language of the House in, you have it in the palm of your hand and they can never build them unless you authorize it. Do you want to swap off the difference between 35,000 and 5,000 units for 610,000? You are too good at arithmetic for that; are you not? I am talking now to the people who want to kill the bill altogether.

I have been honest and frank with you to the best of my ability. There is the picture. If you want to send it back we are going to do the best we can for you, but remember the other body can sit here three times as long as we can, and they are a coequal part of the Congress with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the other item I wish to call to the attention of the House is the amendment of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa. We all admire and we all love BEN JENSEN. This bill carried that amendment last year. On top of that amendment which was carried last year, what did your subcommittee do? Now listen to me. We made those agencies, every one of them with perhaps one little exception, absorb that 10 percent pay raise. That is a cut in personnel. A good many of these agencies had increased duties, there is no getting around that. Because you passed the laws last year telling them to do these things. That is not the fault of the agencies, and certainly

it is no fault of your subcommittee. The other body threw out the Jensen amendment and substituted the Ferguson amendment. Your conferees asked them to yield on both points, and they did. The reason they did is because we took the figures, and I have them here, agency by agency, and I can give you the exact dollars and cents, if you want me to take the time to read them, but anyway your regular subcommittee cuts in personnel costs as they left the House, were $85,000,000, and under the Ferguson amendment they were $40,000,000. So you cut just about 105 percent deeper than the Ferguson amendment.

The Jensen amendment says 10 percent—not below the budget estimate—no—your subcommittee and this House cut as deeply as that. The Jensen amendment says 10 percent on top of what you have already cut. But then it says with "with several exceptions" and one is the General Accounting Office, one is employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3, amounting to about 14,000 employees and then there are about 127,000 Veterans' Administration employees excepted. There are only 282,000 positions in the entire independent offices bill as presented in the budget, and yet 55 percent of them are exempted at one fell swoop.

I am not saying anything about what is provided in the other bills, but this House has already cut this independent offices bill as deeply as it can be cut. Frankly, the Jensen amendment would go deeper because it says 10 percent below that which you have already cut, but when you exempt 55 percent of them, the cut would be very, very little.

Yet some of these regulatory agencies, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, have been cut too much. A great many of our colleagues have come to the subcommittee one by one and said, "This agency has been cut too much. This one has been cut too much." There is more truth than poetry in it. So I respectfully ask you not to send this bill back to conference.

Those are the two big things. The other is martime training, which will add to the bill $500,000 increase on the taxpayers, all to subsidize a single industry. That is all it is.

The other item has to do with veterans hospitals. If I may, I will tell you what happened in conference. It is no secret. There was nothing happened in conference that was irregular. In fact, I had to admire JOHN PHILLIPS, if I may affectionately call him that in violation of the rules of the House. The Senate cut out five hospitals, two in California, two in Ohio, and one in the District of Columbia, at a total cost of $87,000,000. There have been hundreds of newspaper articles written in our daily papers, and I am surprised at my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER], because he said many time that we had too many bed vacancies. Of course, he was right, The facts proved it.

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

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

Mr. TABER. That was on the beds that were vacant, and they are in the medical section rather than the neuropsychiatric.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right, but they are still vacancies. You have always been against building more hospitals. Now you ask us to build five more.

Now, in conference, here is where you have to admire him—I went down to Mr. PHILLIPS and I said, "If you need an NP hospital in California, your population has increased, we know that, say so. Now is the time to write it in here." He said, "I am not talking for my own district." You have to admire the gentleman, do you not? I renew that proposition now. I know that California is growing fast, and when we come back here if JOHN PHILLIPS says California has to have a hospital, I will lead the procession for you, Mr. PHILLIPS.

None from Illinois were cut out. Now, there is a situation. We have a 20 percent bed vacancy in a great many hospitals.

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

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment, if I have time.

You are still under your authorized program of $822,500,000. You are still going to complete and put in operation 59 hospitals. With the old ones and the new ones you will have 179 hospitals in operation throughout the United States for the veterans by June 30, 1953. We all know that the vacancies run from 5 to 20 percent, and in a great many it is more than 20 percent. We have put $15,000,000 in this bill this year, and we will double it next year, whatever the budget estimate is, to convert these vacant general hospital beds into neuropsychiatric beds. Now, that makes sense. You have started that program this year and we will continue it and we will give them every dollar that the budget requests, and if the budget does not request enough we will go over the budget for that purpose, and that will take care of these five hospitals.

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

All time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope you will vote down this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 7072, to the committee of conference, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House provisions on the number of housing units to be commenced in fiscal year 1953 (item 47); on the inclusion of the money necessary for new hospital construction (item 82), and on the orderly formula for personnel replacement contained in the so-called Jensen amendment (item 128), and further, to insist on the Senate provisions for the appropriations for maritime training (items 97 to 103, inclusive).

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 144, noes 150.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 181, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—195

Abbitt	Gavin	Nelson
Adair	George	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Norrell
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Greenwood	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Ostertag
Arends	Gwinn	Patten
Armstrong	Hagen	Patterson
Auchincloss	Hale	Phillips
Ayres	Hall, Leonard W.	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Potter
Beamer	Harden	Poulson
Belcher	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Bow	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bramblett	Hill	Regan
Bray	Hillings	Riehlman
Brehm	Hinshaw	Rivers
Brooks	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Brownson	Hope	Ross
Bryson	Horan	Sadlak
Budge	Hunter	St. George
Buffett	Ikard	Saylor
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Schenck
Busbey	James	Scrivner
Bush	Jenison	Scudder
Butler	Jenkins	Secrest
Byrnes	Jensen	Shafer
Chatham	Johnson	Sheehan
Chenoweth	Jonas	Short
Chiperfield	Jones, Hamilton C.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jones, Woodrow W.	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Smith Va.
Colmer	Keating	Smith, Wis.
Cooley	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Corbett	Kilburn	Stanley
Cotton	Kilday	Stockman
Cox	King, Pa.	Taber
Crawford	Larcade	Talle
Crumpacker	Latham	Teague
Cunningham	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Vail
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Van Pelt
Dague	McConnell	Van Zandt
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Velde
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Vorys
Denny	McGregor	Vursell
Devereux	McIntire	Weichel
D'Ewart	McVey	Werdel
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Dondero	Mahon	Wheeler
Durham	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Meader	Williams, N. Y.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Willis
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Gamble	Murray	Wolcott
Gathings		Wood, Ga.
		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—181

Andrews	Bentsen	Camp
Anfuso	Blatnik	Canfield
Angell	Boggs, Del.	Cannon
Bailey	Boggs, La.	Carrigg
Baker	Bolling	Case
Bakewell	Bolton	Celler
Baring	Bosone	Chelf
Barrett	Brown, Ga.	Chudoff
Battle	Buchanan	Clemente
Beall	Buckley	Combs
Bender	Burnside	Cooper
Bennett, Fla.	Burton	Coudert

Crosser	Hull	O'Konski
Dawson	Irving	O'Neill
Deane	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
DeGraffenried	Jarman	Passman
Delaney	Javits	Patman
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Dingell	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Dollinger	Judd	Polk
Donohue	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Donovan	Kean	Price
Dorn	Kelley, Pa.	Priest
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
Eberharter	Kennedy	Rains
Elliott	Keogh	Reams
Engle	Kerr	Rhodes
Fallon	King, Calif.	Ribicoff
Feighan	Klein	Riley
Fine	Kluczynski	Roberts
Flood	Lane	Rodino
Fogarty	Lanham	Rogers, Colo.
Forand	Lantaff	Rogers, Fla.
Forrester	Lesinski	Rooney
Fugate	Lind	Roosevelt
Fulton	McCarthy	Scott, Hardie
Furcolo	McCormack	Scott,
Garmatz	McGrath	Hugh D., Jr.
Gary	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Gordon	McKinnon	Shelley
Granahan	McMullen	Sheppard
Granger	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Grant	Mack, Ill.	Sikes
Green	Madden	Sittler
Gregory	Magee	Smith, Miss.
Hall,	Mansfield	Staggers
Edwin Arthur	Marshall	Taylor
Hand	Merrow	Thomas
Hardy	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Harris	Mills	Tollefson
Hart	Morano	Walter
Havenner	Morgan	Watts
Hays, Ark.	Morrison	Whitten
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Widnall
Heffernan	Multer	Wier
Heller	Mumma	Wilson, Ind.
Herter	Murdock	Withrow
Heselton	Murphy	Wolverton
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Yates
Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Howell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—55

Aandahl	Eaton	Rankin
Abernethy	Evins	Reece, Tenn.
Addonizio	Fenton	Richards
Albert	Frazier	Robeson
Allen, La.	Gore	Sabath
Aspinall	Hébert	Sasscer
Barden	Hedrick	Spence
Bates, Ky.	Hoffman, Ill.	Steed
Beckworth	Kee	Stigler
Bennett, Mich.	Kirwan	Sutton
Bonner	Lyle	Tackett
Boykin	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Mason	Trimble
Carlyle	Mitchell	Vinson
Carnahan	Morris	Welch
Cole, N. Y.	Morton	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Pickett	Woodruff
Dempsey	Powell	
Doughton	Ramsay	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

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

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 522)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in accordance with section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

This report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covers the 2-year period ending March 31, 1952. The first special report on the Fund and Bank was submitted in May 1948 and the second such report was submitted in May 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 523)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the friends of Puerto Rico are deeply concerned regarding the Senate amendment of the resolution approving the Constitution of Puerto Rico.

The Congress, like an individual, becomes the target of ridicule and suspicion when a promise is broken.

Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress granted the people of Puerto Rico the right to adopt their own constitution. Certain limitations were contained in that act—"no amendment to this constitution shall alter the republican form of Government established by it or abolish its Bill of Rights."

On June 4, 1951, 506,185 American citizens—registered voters of Puerto Rico, with full confidence in the Congress—voted on the constitutional referendum, that is, to adopt Public Law 600; 387,016 voted in favor of a constitutional convention.

On August 27, 1951, 92 delegates were elected by the people of Puerto Rico to a constitutional convention created under authority of Congress. For 62 days they labored and deliberated—delegates composed of all walks of life and from three of the major political parties of the Island.

On March 3, 1952, 457,562 American citizens—again exercising the right of franchise—voted on the adoption of the Constitution written by these citizens of the United States under the authority of Congress; 374,649 voters—82 percent—cast their ballots in favor of adoption of their constitution.

I witnessed this election. Some of the aged were taken to the polling places on stretchers so that they might vote. I saw literally thousands in rural areas walking miles through the hot sun to the polling places to exercise their rights which, as a proud people, they cherish—rights given them by Congress—the right of self-government.

In addition to Public Law 600, both major political parties made pledges to the people of Puerto Rico. The Democratic platform of 1948 stated:

> We urge • • • immediate determination by the people of Puerto Rico as to their form of government and their ultimate status with respect to the United States.

The Republican platform of 1948 stated:

> We favor eventual statehood for • • • Puerto Rico.

Both pledges are clear and without reservation.

The amendment to the Senate Resolution provides "that no amendment to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be effective until approved by the Congress of the United States."

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a one-man lobby, Leonard D. Long, of

South Carolina, has succeeded in thwarting the aspirations of more than 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico. This man is being sued by the Government of Puerto Rico for $1,000,000 in unpaid taxes. He has publicly threatened to use his money and influence to defeat the constitution which the people approved on March 3, 1952, by a 4 to 1 vote.

Through his press agents in Miami, led by Arthur Curtis, Long has paid for a campaign of vilification against Governor Muñoz-Marín and the administration in Puerto Rico.

If the House accepts the emasculated Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which the Senate has approved, Leonard D. Long will have convinced 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico and liberty-loving peoples of the world that our high-sounding protestations of anticolonialism are insincere to the degree that one man, such as Leonard D. Long, can wield more power than can the entire people of Puerto Rico.

Here is a situation where an individual has found an honest government he cannot buy—so he seeks to destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not so late in this Congress, I would introduce a resolution asking for an investigation of Leonard D. Long and his activities in Puerto Rico; I would ask for an investigation of F. D'a Carpenter, formerly with FHA in Puerto Rico, who was removed from his post; of Herman Bailey, formerly with FHA in South Carolina, who resigned shortly after Carpenter was fired. I think the Congress should know who paid Bailey's expenses at luxury hotels in San Juan.

It would also be interesting to know what connection, if any, Franklin D. Richards had in the Long activities in Puerto Rico. Such an investigation might properly be the subject of action in the Eighty-third Congress.

I say now, Mr. Speaker, in the Eighty-third Congress one of my first acts will be to introduce a bill to amend the resolution approving the constitution by striking out the amendment inserted by the Senate requiring congressional approval of constitutional amendments. I hope this will be done in conference now.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a "constitution," as we use that word with reference to civil government, means the framework, the fundamental, organic law of a nation, State, or commonwealth.

The virtue of a written constitution is that it is adopted by the people in their sovereign capacity as electors; it can be changed only by the people; it is as binding upon departments and officers of the Government as upon the individual citizen.

Like the constitutions of the several States, the constitution of Puerto Rico must conform to the Constitution of the United States. No language inserted by the Senate can create a greater safeguard against improper amendments than the Federal Constitution.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the people of South Carolina would say if we passed a law requiring them to submit any amendments to their constitution? Would not the ghost of 1861 rise and fight again?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude without paying tribute to a great American, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín. He is the first elected native governor of the islands.

His first and foremost interest is the United States. He feels that a strong, thriving Puerto Rico is in our best national interest. Each time he accomplishes his ambition to better the life and progress of his island, he puts the accomplishment on display in the showcase of Latin and South America, for that is Puerto Rico.

What we do now, Mr. Speaker, will live in memories for many years. We can keep our word and recognize the dignity of man. We can grant self-government to worthy and qualified citizens of the United States—or, we can destroy good will in Latin and South America. We can offend several million fine American citizens. We can break faith with hundreds of the dead of Puerto Rico's Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment now lying in their graves in Korea.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a cablegram I have received from the distinguished Governor of Puerto Rico:

FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

No blow against the hopes of our people could have been harsher than amendment to constitution in the Senate which takes away all sense of political equality from this constitution process that we have all engaged in such high hopes and good faith. A constitution that cannot be amended by the people to whom it applies within definite limits previously accepted freely by themselves, such as the limits in law 600 and the applicable provision of the Federal Constitution, is not a constitution at all. Free citizens can be conceived to accept such limitations, but not to have voted to consent to them. I earnestly hope that a remedy can be found in conference committee. If the desire is to create the legal assurance that section 20 would not be put back in the future nor section 5 modified again to its original language specific provisions could be made to that end without doing the most serious moral harm to a very fine good people who are your loyal fellow citizens.

Best regards,

LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to adress the House on Monday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PROCEEDS FROM SPORTING EVENTS CONDUCTED FOR AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2282)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, 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 numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions by individuals for charitable contributions) is hereby amended by striking out '15 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '20 per centum'.

"(b) Section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions) is hereby amended by striking out '15 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '20 per centum'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House provides that, subject to certain limitations, a corporation primarily engaged in the furnishing of sports programs may conduct a sports program exclusively for the benefit of the American National Red Cross without including the proceeds from the program in its gross income.

The Senate amendments make no change in the provisions of the House bill relating to the American National Red Cross. However, the Senate amendments provide for the amendment of section 23 (o) of the

Internal Revenue Code so as to increase, from 15 to 20 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income, the limit for income-tax deductions for individuals for contributions to charitable, educational, religious, and other organizations specified in such section 23 (o).

The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report would be to adopt the substance of the Senate amendments, together with a technical amendment to section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code changing the cross-reference in such section to section 23 (o) of the Code.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted an article for extension in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer it will require two and three-quarter pages at an additional cost of $231. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

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

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

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 684, relative to establishment of the seaward boundaries of inland waters and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday next and 1 hour on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday, July 3, and that the special order granted him for today be vacated.

NAVAL CARRIER AIRCRAFT

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, it is with great pride and interest that I invite the attention of the House to the performance of the naval aircraft flown from carriers in the attack on the North Korean power plants. The New York Times of yesterday reports that the hydroelectric power complexes at Suiho located near the northwest corner of Korea were attacked on June 23 by Navy dive bombers launched from aircraft carriers operating off the east coast of Korea in the Sea of Japan.

Douglas Skyraider aircraft, each carrying 5,000 pounds of bombs, made the initial attack on Suiho supported by carrier based (F9F) Panther Jet Fighters to attack the defending antiaircraft guns. Ninety tons of bombs were used to destroy this plant.

The Navy attack aircraft were followed on the target by Air Force F84 Thunder Jet Fighter bombers. The power plant suffered many direct hits, and is believed to be destroyed. Other installations were heavily damaged.

These planes came all the way across Korea from the Sea of Japan to deliver a surprising and devastating attack with almost surgical precision. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will be noted how a relatively few number of planes can be used effectively. If ever proof were clear, I am satisfied that the mobility, flexibility, precision and readiness of carrier-based planes are warrant for this Nation's urgent need for aircraft carriers as a part of our country's power in the air.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House will place the carrier back in the appropriation bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called today on the Talle amendment I was unavoidably detained in other duties and I did not have the opportunity to cast my vote. Had I been present I would have voted for the Talle amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1271, a bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture. Subsequent to the introduction of this bill a number of other Members of this Congress introduced similar bills to solve the same problem. All of these Members were thoroughly familiar with the problem to be solved and are to be highly commended for their interest in the matter. Immediately after these bills were filed, word went out from some source that the bills were designed to exploit child labor and the Members began to receive communications from all directions condemning these bills. I take violent exception to the sinister method that was employed in misrepresenting the true purposes of this legislation. Most of the mail that I received on the matter came from sources outside of my district and in the great majority of instances from sources outside my State. Also most of these communications were from city dwellers who had not the slightest conception of the problems of the farmer or the plight faced by many members of American society who depend upon harvest work for their livelihood. These communications came from people who would be the first to cry and complain if the supply of food, clothing, and other farm products were curtailed because of inability on the part of the farmer to harvest his products. They set up a great hue and cry about having the interest of children at heart. I yield to no one in my interest for the welfare of children. As most of you know, I have a sizable family, and do my best to take care of them. Certainly if there is anyone in the United States who is primarily interested in the welfare of children, it is the gentleman from Texas who is addressing you now. The truth is that these centralized Government advocates, who know how to run everybody's business but their own, have done a great injury to a large segment of American society and at the same time have exempted from the application of the law certain entertainment fields that produce no products for human consumption or raiment.

I want to give you a brief history of the situation so that you will understand what has and will be done under this legislation unless it is corrected as I have suggested in my bill. In the original Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 it was provided that the oppressive child labor provisions would not be applicable to children employed in agriculture except while they were legally required to attend school. Under this provision the question of whether or not a child could or could not be employed in agriculture depended upon the State laws, both labor

and school attendance laws. Those are the laws that should have controlled. However, the Department of Labor, in its efforts to assume jurisdiction over the entire citizenry of the United States, received reports from its various agents that they were finding it difficult to keep up with the State laws and to carry out the purpose that they had intended to carry out by the Fair Labor Standards Act, that is, to control and regulate the activities of working people all over this country regardless of the field in which they were employed. However, they were unsuccessful in getting any changes in the law until 1949, at which time they prepared and submited some language that was most innocent looking with which they proposed to correct the Fair Labor Standards Act, and so told the Congress. The language was devised as an amendment to section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act and reads as follows:

> The provisions of section 12 of this title relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while so employed, or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions or in radio or television productions.

Section 13 (d) was also added, which provided as follows:

> The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 of this title shall not apply with respect to any employee engaged in the delivering of newspapers to the consumers.

The effect of these amendments was to say this: that the provisions of section 12 (c) which read as follows: "No employer shall employ any oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," do not apply to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions or in radio or television productions, or to any employee engaged in delivering newspapers to the consumers, and does not apply to children working in agriculture on the condition that the children working in agriculture cannot so work while school is in session in the district where they are working. If this last condition was a good condition to put on children working in agriculture, I ask the simple question: "Why was it not a good condition to put on child actors, performers, and newspaper boys?" The truth is that agricultural work is not oppressive child labor and the act so declares.

In other words, if this language is so good, as the Department of Labor would have you believe, why did not they insist that it apply to everyone alike? Only recently the Congress passed a bill providing that children could be allowed to appear in the District of Columbia in theatrical performances late at night. I ask you, is it good sense to penalize a child of poor parentage who in many instances is called upon to help in feeding and clothing himself and the other members of his family, while at the same time special laws are passed so that theatergoers may enjoy seeing a small child traipse across the stage at 11:30 p. m.? What kind of business is it that denies to an American child the right to learn that advancement in life must depend upon one's individual ability to work and assume responsibility?

I have had numerous conferences with the officials of the Department of Labor, from the Secretary of Labor down through the ranks, in an effort to remedy the situation by administrative application. In every instance I have been advised that the Department is looking out for the welfare of children and does not intend to change the interpretations of the law under which they are now proceeding. I have asked them why they exempt the different business that I named above, the theatrical and other groups. Their only explanation is that in those fields arrangement is made for the education of those children separate and apart from the public-school proceedings. The thought occurred to me, and has caused me much concern, that all of the records of this Congress and several preceding Congresses have divulged a number of Communists and Communist fellow travelers in several industries. But none of the records of the Congress have divulged any Communists or fellow travelers among the farmers or their helpers. Are they trying to instill in these children that they are charges of the State and will be taken care of by the State? Such a program would eventually lead to the child refusing to recognize the authority of his own parents and saying, "I do not have to work; the Government through the Department of Labor is going to look after me." That is not the kind of principle that this country was built on. I worked in the harvest fields when I was a child, as did many of the other children in my community and in my State, and I challenge any group of people anywhere to show me better Americans than live in the State of Texas. The officials of the Department of Labor told me that under the 1938 act they found it most difficult to enforce the law. What they meant was that they found it difficult to accomplish the purpose that they set out to accomplish in the first instance, and that was to centralize control over all workers in the United States, every man, woman, and child, and to regiment them under Federal edict. Of course, none of us should expect these Federal workers to extend themselves insofar as their responsibilities are concerned. Are we supposed to pass laws to make it easier for them to perform their duties and dictate to the taxpayers that are paying the bills, so that they will be sure to have plenty of holidays and be in good physical shape to enjoy them? I say "No." I charge that the 1949 amendment (13c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which I have above referred to, has not helped the children of this country, but on the contrary, has done irreparable injury to the economy of a large segment of American society, and I stand ready to prove my charges.

I represent a district in West Texas that is overflowing with sound, solid basic Americans who have been brought up on the principle that in order to reap you must sow. The south end of my district produces a great amount of cotton, as does the district of the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, and the Honorable FRANK IKARD, who have worked hard to correct the situation. Since this section of the country has been inhabited, the crops have been harvested by migrant workers of several nationalities and colors, including those of Latin-American descent, those of Negro descent, and many white families. This of course has been a tradition with these people, who begin their activities in the lower Rio Grande Valley where the crops are early. They harvest these crops and work north as the harvest season progresses in that direction. They get into the northern part of Mr. MAHON'S district, Mr. BURLESON'S district, and Mr. IKARD'S district in the late summer and early fall, and on into my district and into Colorado, the Panhandle of Oklahoma, and Kansas in the early and late fall. The great majority then return to their homes in the southern part of Texas, where they and their forebears have lived for generations. By following this method they accumulate enough money during that season of the year to provide them with sufficient sustenance through the winter and to enable them to send their children to school and to properly clothe and feed them. These people are a closely knitted people insofar as family life is concerned, and the family usually travels together in a group with other families. They have their children with them, and those who are large enough help their parents in the fields in harvesting the products. In my particular district the harvesting of cotton is commonly referred to as "boll pulling," that is, the entire boll is pulled off the stalk and subsequently carried to the gin where the cotton is separated from the seed and the boll. This, of course, is paid for by weight, that is, so much for each hundred pounds of bolls pulled.

A family with several children, and many of them have 8, 10, and 12, can by working together earn enough money during the harvest season to give them a good living during the winter and spring months. The children are under the constant surveillance of their parents and obey them. The family ties are strong, and the families work as a unit cooperating one with the other. These families flood the post offices in our section of the country with postal money orders which they are sending home as savings to see them through the winter and spring. In 1950, the year that the 1949 monstrosity amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act first went into effect, these people, in complete ignorance of what had been done to them, their economy and their families, blissfully commenced their operations as they, their fathers, and grandfathers had done. When they reached my district and the northern part of Mr. MAHON'S district, they were confronted by agents of the Department of Labor who advised the farmers that if they hired the children, they could be taken into court and fined $10,000, that these children were supposed to be in school because school was in session in the districts where the farm products were ready for harvest. The

farmers became frightened, as they, too, were wholly unaware of what the fast boys in Washington had pulled. The school authorities in these districts understood that a Federal law had been passed requiring these children to be placed in school. Nothing was done by the Federal agents to straighten out that misunderstanding. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act is not a compulsory school attendance act. There is no provision in it which requires a child to attend school. This was not told to these people, and they, in their desire to abide by the law regardless of how damaging it might be, tried to work the children of these migrant workers into the schools. The result was that the school facilities were absolutely inadequate. Children of Latin-American descent who could not speak English were placed in schoolrooms with children who were in regular attendance in the schools. The result was that the migrant children in many instances did not know when to turn the page of the book unless they watched their seatmate or some other child in the schoolroom. The situation also presented a health problem, as you can well understand, in these overcrowded, congested schoolrooms.

The migrant workers did not understand, and the farmers did not understand. The migrant workers soon found out that the mother and father of seven or eight children ranging between the ages of 4 and 14 years could not possibly pull enough bolls in a day to feed 10 hungry mouths, much less clothe them. They also found out that the children who were under school age quickly noticed the separation of the family and were much harder to control on the site of the field where the mother and father were trying to work, than they ever had been before. The situation left the migrant workers with two choices. One was to appeal to the public-welfare authorities for assistance, and this many of them did. The public-welfare authorities soon discovered that they were confronted with a problem with which they were not remotely prepared to cope. Efforts were made by these authorities, but the funds for that purpose were quickly exhausted and there were no more to be had. The other choice left to the migrant worker was to return to his home in south Texas and half starve himself and his family through the winter months without sufficient funds to clothe his children so that they could attend school. The situation that was faced by these migrant workers also shook their very character to the roots. I have had many of them plead with me with tears in their eyes to help them out so that they could work and meet their own responsibilities.

To give you one pointed example I tell you about a case in the fine town of Memphis, Tex., in Hall County. I was on a trip back to the district in 1951 and was visiting with the editor of the newspaper. A fine looking Latin-American came into the newspaper plant and asked if I was the Congressman. I told him that I was. Tears came into his eyes and he said: "Mr. Congressman, you have got to do something to help me. I have three children; two of them are of school age and are healthy and strong and want to work. Not many days ago the little girl fell and broke her arm, and I had to take her to the hospital. I stayed with her until she had been properly treated. I have a little boy 10 years old who is a fine boy. He goes to school and he wants to help me, but the law says he cannot. My wife is not too strong, and both of us together cannot pull enough bolls in a day to feed our family and to pay our bills. I am an honest man and I have always paid my bills, and I want my son to be an honest man and I want him to pay his bills, and I want to teach him how to do it. If you will let my son help me and my wife, we can pick enough so that we can save and in a few weeks we can pay the doctor's bill and we can pay the drug store and we can pay the hospital bill, and that is what we want to do."

I do not need to tell you how deeply I was moved by this plea. However, I had to tell him that I did not have the authority to let his boy help him, but that I had been fighting for a correction of this law and would continue to do it. I had to tell the man that I did not have the power to help him be an honest man and to help him teach his son how to work and how to be an honest, good American citizen. I did not tell him that the Department of Labor or the Federal Government was going to keep him up nor that they were going to keep his son up. Had I done so, he would have been insulted, and he should have been. He was an honest American citizen whose hands had been tied behind him, about which I could do nothing.

Another Latin-American family who had been working for one particular farmer for years came to his farm in the fall of 1950 prepared to harvest his crop. The farmer told him that he was very sorry but that he could not employ anyone but the mother and the father. The Latin-American gentleman asked why. The farmer told him because the Government had passed a law. The Latin-American gentleman summed the situation up in one sentence. He shrugged and said, "The Government make law I can't work children; let Government make law to feed my children."

These children that I am talking about are not denied an education. They attend schools in accordance with the school attendance laws of the State of Texas, yet they are by Federal law required to run loose and are denied the right to work. Their standard of living is lowered simply because some bureaucrats are sticking their noses into businesses that they know nothing in the world about.

The bill that I introduced is in exactly the same language as the 1949 amendment, with one exception. It provides that the oppressive child-labor provision shall not apply to these children during school hours for such school district if the child has been excused by the superintendent of schools or equivalent official of either the school district where the child is employed or the school district where he has his legal residence. This simply means that the school authorities with whom we all entrust the custody of our children in both urban and rural districts have the discretionary authority to allow these children to work in harvesting the crops. It does not in any manner circumvent State attendance laws. It simply puts the problem and the responsibility back in the States and localities where it rightfully belongs. In addition, it provides a means by which the Labor Department agents could easily enforce the law. The children or their parents would have to have some evidence showing that they were not in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The officials of the Department of Labor have told me that they are afraid of my bill because of possible political influences that might be exerted in the localities. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress if the Department of Labor is in any position to be casting a shadow or a cloud upon any local agency about the exercise of political influence. Frankly, I would much prefer to entrust the welfare of my children to school superintendents in these various districts than to permit them to become pawns of the State at the hands of a bureaucratic, centralized agency in Washington.

Several of the farmers of my district and of Mr. MAHON's district came to Washington at their own expense and testified before the Committee on Education and Labor. They did an admirable job of presenting the entire problem and a solution. The Labor Department wanted to be heard before that committee, but to this day they have never appeared before the committee on this particular matter, or so I am informed. Recognizing the fact that the delay in getting this legislation out was becoming longer and longer, I placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition, petition No. 10, to bring this bill before the Congress. Needless to say, there have not been many signers on that petition. Some have the policy of not signing discharge petitions as a matter of principle, and I do not question their judgment in that respect. However, I do at this time urge you to acquaint yourself with this problem, to sign this discharge petition, and get this legislation through this Congress before the harvest season starts. Unless it is passed, you can expect to hear many, many complaints from the farmers of this country and from these migrant workers, whose economy has been upset, and everyone of those complaints will be justified.

Some people have said, "Why not close the schools during harvest season?" I am prepared to answer that. Such a philosophy would have worked 20 years ago, when school districts were small and there were many rural schools. However, in the progress and advance of education during the past 20 years the school systems have been concentrated and central educational plants have been set up and utilized. The red schoolhouse in the rural community has been closed, and in many instances torn down, and the children are being carried in school busses to small or large towns in the localities in which they live. A number of the students in these central

school plants do not work in agriculture, and I have been advised that in most instances the ratio is about 75 percent out of agriculture and 25 percent in. Now, would it make sense to close a school system and penalize 75 percent of the children in a school district who are not in agriculture and would not be employed in the harvest of the crops? Would it not be much sounder to stop this arbitrary regulatory power that has been assumed by the Department of Labor, and permit these people to conduct their own business, as they have so successfully done for many generations?

The Labor Department tells me that they want these children to go to school, and I say to the Labor Department that these children do go to school. If it is their position that these children are not going to school, why do not they advocate a Federal school attendance law, instead of trying to go through the back door and slip up on these people with a larger statute and impose upon the farmer a responsibility not his. If it is wrong for these children to work in the fields during school hours from a child-labor standpoint, then it is just as wrong for these children to work in those fields after school and on week ends. The truth is that they are not interested in whether or not agricultural work is oppressive child labor or whether or not these children get an education. This 1949 amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act is nothing in the world but a device devised by the Department of Labor to cut off a labor supply in agriculture. By doing this, they feel that it will be another step in their attempt to organize farm labor. If they are allowed to get away with it, it is not only going to upset the economy of these harvest workers, and put many of them on public charity, but it is going to break every small farmer in this country. It will also result in the greatest contribution in our age to juvenile delinquency.

The Department of Labor was not satisfied with the trick language that was placed in the 1949 amendment and that experience has taught us is definitely an unworkable monstrosity. The Department went further, and on the 13th day of March, this year, the Secretary of Labor invoked a regulation under his regulatory powers contained in the Fair Labor Standards Act. This regulation is printed in the Federal Register of Thursday, March 20, 1952, at page 2399. I want all of you to get that Register and read it. The Secretary of Labor has not only robbed the farmers of the source of labor to harvest their crops and upset the economy of the migrant harvest workers, but has now made a bookkeeper for the Government out of all farmers in this country. He has decided that the farmers must keep records, which are a complete biographical sketch of every child that works on the farm. Of course, the farmer does not have enough to do now trying to fill out forms for all the other departments of the Government, he must now set aside time to write a biography about every child that pulls a boll, cuts a head of lettuce or picks a peach on his farm. Of course, these records are much more important to human beings than the crops that could be raised by the farmer while he is sharpening his pencil and writing these biographies. The farmer by this regulation becomes a Federal employee without compensation, without social security, without pension benefits, without week ends off, and without holidays. I do not hesitate to tell you that I do not think the farmers of this country intend to take any such treatment as that.

In conclusion, I want to talk about the injustice that is being done to these children. I have seen many of them and I know many of them. I know many who have gone to school on the earnings that they have made in the cotton field, and in many instances they have saved enough money to carry them on to the higher institutions of learning. I can look out across this Chamber and see men entrusted with the affairs of this Nation who have spent many long hours in agricultural work and who learned many things in that field that have stood them well through the years. The children of today are no different from the children of yesterday, who are the leaders of today. They can learn much, as you and I did, in the fields when we were young, of God's bounties and what they mean to the human race. They can learn what it means to commune with nature, to see and appreciate God's creatures in all their glories. They can better understand the separation of the good from the bad and develop the character that is so essential to a full life.

I have complete and abiding faith in the honesty, the fairness and the decency of the American farmer, and the children of this Nation affected by this legislation will be better entrusted to the characteristics of those true Americans, than to bureaucratic control of a Washington agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and to include an article appearing in the New Republic.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in two instances.

Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. TABER).

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. GREEN and to include a commencement address by Frank C. Nash, of St. Joseph College, Philadelphia.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. FLOOD to extend his remarks at the end of title I of the bill H. R. 8210, the Defense Production Act, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement by Mr. Paul Kasimer before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include an article.

Mr. CANFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan; and

H. R. 6854. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announces his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; and

S. 1537. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARCADE, for an indefinite period, on account of health.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for Thursday, June 26, 1952, on account of death of father.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1608. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $71,750 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1609. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Iwao Inaba or Harry Owao Inaba, alias Harry I. Kida, file No. A-4892595 CR-36120, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1610. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to certain cases involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1611. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON. Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8190. A bill to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7397. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7876. A bill relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8321. A bill to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8371. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 8372. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the State of Idaho for certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 8373. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8374. A bill authorizing the Attorney General to enter into agreements with States holding preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, providing for the making of certain grants to such States, and the certification by the Attorney General of the names of candidates for inclusion on ballots prepared by such States for use in such elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 8375. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8376. A bill to repeal section 117 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the taxability to employee of termination payments); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8377. A bill to amend section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that amortization deductions shall not be granted when to do so might tend to promote an undue concentration of economic power; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT (by request):

H. R. 8378. A bill to amend section 4 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARY:

H. Res. 710. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Annie G. Heinmiller, widow of A. W. Heinmiller, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Res. 711. Resolution to exclude consideration of productivity as a part of wages by the Wage Stabilization Board; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 25, requesting to make available the necessary funds and take all necessary steps to prevent a decrease in the number of beds required in the area of New Orleans and vicinity to adequately treat and hospitalize sick veterans, and particularly tubercular veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8379. A bill for the relief of Richard Brenneis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 8380. A bill for the relief of Elzbieta Grzymkowska Jarosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8381. A bill for the relief of Cornelio Plata Lobero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 8382. A bill for the relief of Michael David Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8383. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Claplanhoo of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8384. A bill for the relief of Faiga Kunda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stella Rebner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 8386. A bill for the relief of Lech Szczepan Korgol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8387. A bill for the relief of Agnes Alberta R. Nixon Francis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8388. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Maemori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8389. A bill for the relief of George Reichman; 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:

776. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 92 residents of the city of Marion, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

777. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Rev. Wesley R. Hutchings, Beaumont, Tex., and other citizens, of Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to H. R. 2188, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and ban its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

778. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Charles L. Childe, of Cresco, Iowa, and 13 other citizens, urging passage of H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1952

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before whose face the generations rise and fall, we pause with reverence and contrition, knowing that it is a good thing to give thanks unto Thee, to show forth Thy loving kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness every night. We come asking that Thou wilt cleanse our purposes and desires, as in Thy name we face the tasks committed to our hands. We would put our hands in Thine and walk with Thee in trust and peace. When the way is uncertain, the day dreary, the problems baffling, inspire us to perform well our daily tasks, asking light for but one step at a time. Keep our lips clean and our thoughts pure. May we never doubt that at last truth and righteousness shall claim their rightful throne. May Thy kingdom come in us and through us: In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 27, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 779. An act for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syquia;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Marteri, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals;

S. 1555. An act for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Doreen Iris Neal;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Else Neubert and her two children;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Sister Stanislaus;

S. 1843. An act for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig; and

S. 2706. An act for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Mr. TABER had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross.

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

H. R. 6366. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants; and

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from 5 o'clock this afternoon until next Monday morning, in order that I may attend a Republican assembly in Massachusetts, on June 28, at which, I believe, I am to be asked to be the presiding officer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until July 14, if the Senate does not recess or adjourn prior to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the year ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7391. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1861).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 324. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1862);

S. 1993. A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1863); and

S. 2727. A bill to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force