

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, July 1, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1957:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Dwinell, John S., O41467.

To be lieutenant colonel

Farnum, Charles W., O42743.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 294, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3311; title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

To be major

Gardner, Henry S., MC, AO3041946.
Hogan, Henry W., MC, O4022367.
Stealey, Robert L., MC, O977278.
Tucker, Francis de S. Jr., DC, O1725839.

To be captain

Anderson, Martin F., DC.
Boyer, Carl W., Jr., MC, O4046944.
Bursen, Paul E., MC, O4056364.
Butler, Donald E., MC, O1321150.
Creveling, Robert L., MC, O4051112.
Fehl, Merle L., DC, O4069952.
Floyd, Charles H., MC, O4056187.
Gillespie, Harold R., MC, O4043777.
Goldblatt, Harry, MC, O4067893.
Griggs, Kendrick L., MC, O4068001.
Hattori, Takashi, MC.
Hudson, Thomas L., MC, O4025059.
Khouri, Eli, Jr., MC.
Loe, Hardy D., Jr., MC, O4056200.
Luekens, Claude A., Jr., MC, O2273728.
Ostrander, Clinton F., Jr., DC, O1892484.
Singer, Lawrence R., MC, O4069897.
Slezak, Roy M., MC, O4050978.
Stebler, Michael E., MC.
Usrey, David C., MC, O1941879.
Vitner, Saul, MC, O4043430.
Watts, William H., JAGC, O2272010.

To be first lieutenant

Barr, Virginia M., AMSC, J100145.
Bradley, William B., MC, O4056217.
Burlack, Marion F., ANC, N900455.
Corso, William A., DC.
Costello, Barbara R., ANC, N804158.
Dorison, Ezra E., MC.
Foy, Robert E., Jr., MC.
Galaszewski, Stanley M., MC.
Green, Philip S., MC.
Hemenway, Mary, AMSC, M2903.
Johnson, Merrill C., MC.
Jones, Lee Roy G., MC, O2105036.
List, Virginia E., AMSC, M2929.
Llorens, Alfred S., MC.
Lofton, Juliet P., ANC, N805152.
Magruder, Levin F., Jr., MC.
Morgan, Richard A., Jr., MC, O2282852.
Olien, Carl J., Jr., JAGC, O4057868.
Penner, Robert, MC.
Pifer, Charles L., MC.
Roberacker, Janet A., ANC, N804750.
Salloni, Samuel J., MC, O4077961.
Schreiber, Otto J., MC, O2284100.
Shaffer, Ronald P., DC.
Shinaberger, James H., MC, O2283099.

Thomas, Romulus B., MC.
Walker, Jack B., DC.
White, John J., MSC, O4017048.
Wilkes, John D., MC.
Williams, Homer E., MC.

To be second lieutenant

Carpenter, Lois E., WAC, L1010880.
Dee, Jean P., WAC, L1010899.
Geissinger, Amy D., ANC, N805698.
Martin, Julia M., ANC, N901522.
Steelman, Lois M., WAC, L1020655.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer from the Department of the Air Force to the Army Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

To be captain

Rader, Marjorie A., 21199W.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

To be first lieutenant

Hornback, Richard G., O994816.

To be second lieutenant

Behrens, Helmer H., W2206103.
Chaney, Bobby J., O4063768.
Harrell, Wilford R., Jr., O4010892.
Kurgvel, Jaan.
Miller, Clemith J., Jr., O4031494.

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 Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Bastron, Frederick C. Moore, James O.
Gannon, Richard B. Stone, Winifred O.

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 Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Ackerman, William J. Fry, James R.
Adams, Eural E. E., Jr. Furlong, William J.
Aimi, Alfred C.
Amaral, David J.
Arnold, Bruce D.
Bailey, Dwayne S.
Baker, George T.
Barron, Bennie G.
Bizzell, Word G.
Boley, Clyde J.
Boyd, Eugene T., Sr.
Briley, Sidney E., Jr.
Brockway, Frank N., Jr.
Brown, Fred M.
Butler, Robert W., O4070814.
Calvert, George H.
Chapman, Thomas R.
Clark, Donald R.
Clarke, Edward F.
Clem, John M., IV
Cole, Jerry N.
Conley, James A.
Contos, Spiro J.
Coop, Harold L., Jr.
Cordell, Terry D.
Corey, Robert J.
Currie, Joe L.
Damrill, Ronald E.
DeGraw, Andrew E., Jr.
Dennison, Gary V.
Dillon, Oliver W.
Doherty, Theodore L., Jr.
Erickson, DeWayne D., O4062437.
Eskra, Michael J., Jr.
Fassl, Laverne F., O4085639.
Flick, Rudolph M., Jr.
Fiske, John R.
Fitzgerald, Donald G.
Flick, William R.
Fogle, William L.

Meeks, Norman L.
Mermagen, William H.
Mernaugh, Paul F.
Miller, Edward H.
Miller, Thomas W.
Miner, William R.
Moore, James W.
Murphy, Malcolm J.
Najera, Pete M.
Nale, Billy E.
Nash, Tom P., Jr.
Neuroth, John B.
Nielsen, Norman C.
Nix, Crispus C.
Oaks, Clarence B., Jr.
Oden, Lesley E.
O'Neil, Joseph P.
Panneton, Alfred G.
Penick, Billy R.
Plonk, Donald C.
Poteat, James D.
Proffit, Ray B.
Rahn, William E.
Reese, Cleland F.
Reuter, Edwin F.
Revels, James W.
Riddle, Walker M., Jr.
Ross, Paul M.

Rutherford, Frank E.
Ryan, Gerald E. P.
Sarver, Richard E.
Schwendinger, Charles J.
Sherwood, Dan L.
Stiff, Frederick F.
Strubi, Jacob F.
Sugg, Phillip S.
Summers, Frank B.
Swann, Roscoe A., Jr.
Sweitzer, William J.
Tear, Harry R., Jr.
Temple, William F.
Terrana, Vincent
Thomas, Edward J. F.
Tynes, Theodore R., Jr.
Upham, Laurence B.
Veselka, Herman J.
Ward, William A.
Waters, Carroll M.
Whelan, Donald J.
Williams, Jerry R.
Williamson, Kenneth C.
Wood, Nelson V.
Zirkle, Michael N.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Maj. Gen. Edgar Carl Erickson, O171317, a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, member of the National Guard of the United States, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau, for a period of 4 years to date from June 23, 1957, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3015.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1957:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board, for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1957.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art our refuge and strength and our help in times of trouble, we are again coming unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, compelled by our necessities and constrained by Thy love.

Thou knowest that we are greatly concerned and disturbed about the present condition and future welfare of our Republic and the problem of its defense and security.

Grant that all our citizens may be inspired with an indomitable courage and determination to save our beloved country from those corrupting influences and evil forces which are seeking to undermine and destroy our national life.

May our chosen representatives daily give testimony that they have a lofty sense of duty and responsibility and are earnestly striving to achieve blessedness for all mankind.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Burlerson, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 1752. An act for the relief of Frank J. and Mae T. W. Burger;
- H. R. 2964. An act to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States;
- H. R. 3477. An act relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska;
- H. R. 3836. An act to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended;
- H. R. 3837. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
- H. R. 4945. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in West Palm Beach, Fla., to the Port of Palm Beach District;
- H. R. 6692. An act to authorize the transfer of the Coyote Valley Indian Rancheria to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 7050. An act to amend the law with respect to the recoupment of funds expended in cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., because of the attendance of Indian children, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 7249. An act to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia;
- H. R. 7259. An act relating to marketing quotas and price support for fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco;
- H. R. 7835. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Hospital Center and facilities in the District of Columbia and for other purposes;
- H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to waive the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens; and
- H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.
- The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:
- H. R. 3400. An act to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; and for other purposes;
- H. R. 3558. An act for the relief of Ernest Hagler;
- H. R. 4159. An act for the relief of Z. A. Hardee;
- H. R. 6306. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes";
- H. R. 7238. An act to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds for medical and other remedial care;
- H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

- H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;
- H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and
- H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on the problem of Hungary.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 20. An act for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith;
- S. 140. An act for the relief of Jan Szpytman;
- S. 178. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edgar J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith;
- S. 439. An act for the relief of Susan Tsiang Ho;
- S. 554. An act for the relief of Giorgio Giordanella;
- S. 609. An act to amend the act of June 24, 1936, as amended (relating to the collection and publication of peanut statistics), to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines, and for other purposes;
- S. 651. An act for the relief of Sister Clementine (Ilona Molnar);
- S. 669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Giorgio and her children, Antonio Giorgio and Menotti Giorgio;
- S. 789. An act for the relief of Herbert T. King; his wife, Chang Si-Ling King; and his daughter, Chen Hsiao-Ling King;
- S. 811. An act for the relief of Fannie Alexander Gast;
- S. 823. An act for the relief of Maud Abraham;
- S. 832. An act for the relief of Matilda Strah;
- S. 846. An act for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes;
- S. 850. An act for the relief of Stavros Manouos;
- S. 862. An act for the relief of Barbara L. Weiss;
- S. 875. An act for the relief of Vuokko A. Bingham;
- S. 876. An act for the relief of Katharina Theresia Beuying Keyzer;
- S. 957. An act for the relief of Calogero Maniscaleo;
- S. 960. An act for the relief of Fotina (Theresa) Wardini;
- S. 969. An act to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor;
- S. 1007. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman;
- S. 1048. An act for the relief of Matilda Hajos;
- S. 1053. An act for the relief of Poppy Catherine Hayakawa Merritt;
- S. 1082. An act for the relief of Katina Apostolou;
- S. 1097. An act for the relief of Françoise Beyronneau;
- S. 1102. An act for the relief of Adolfo Camillo Scopone;
- S. 1174. An act to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowings of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;
- S. 1240. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Tullios;
- S. 1244. An act for the relief of Teiko Watanabe Holderfield;
- S. 1251. An act for the relief of Florinda Mellone Garcia;

- S. 1253. An act for the relief of Myung Ok Shin;
- S. 1283. An act for the relief of Garth Cecil Briden;
- S. 1309. An act for the relief of Susanne Burka;
- S. 1311. An act for the relief of Maria Gradi;
- S. 1361. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River";
- S. 1363. An act for the relief of Vassilios Kostikos;
- S. 1397. An act for the relief of Angelina Mastro Mone (Angeline Mastroinni);
- S. 1417. An act relating to the affairs of the Osage tribe of Indians in Oklahoma;
- S. 1508. An act for the relief of Salvatore LaTerra;
- S. 1510. An act for the relief of Reginald S. Levy;
- S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno;
- S. 1718. An act to amend section 201 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relative to the terms of office of members of the Civil Aeronautics Board;
- S. 1774. An act for the relief of Yee Suey Nong;
- S. 1817. An act for the relief of John Panagiotou;
- S. 1823. An act to authorize the conveyance of Bunker Hill Island in Lake Cumberland near Burnside, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for public park purposes;
- S. 1838. An act for the relief of Charles Douglas;
- S. 1848. An act for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi);
- S. 1918. An act to amend Public Law 31, 84th Congress, 1st session, to increase the authorization for appropriation to the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office;
- S. 2027. An act for the relief of Vendelin Kalenda;
- S. 2161. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1955 (69 Stat. 725);
- S. 2212. An act to amend the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954;
- S. 2299. An act to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933;
- S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee to represent Congress at the 350th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Va.;
- S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission for the publication of certain documents; and
- S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution favoring Congressional recognition of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum to be located at Oklahoma City, Okla.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON as members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 57-14.

HUNGARY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H.

Con. Res. 204) expressing the sense of Congress on the problem of Hungary, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. KELLY of New York, and Messrs. HAYS of Ohio, SELDEN, FULTON, and BENTLEY.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7441) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the Agriculture appropriation bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Will the gentleman withdraw that request?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

COMMITTEE SESSION DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave of absence for tomorrow on account of official business in my district.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Adair	Diggs	Powell
Allen, III.	Fogarty	Reece, Tenn.
Balley	Grant	Reed
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Saylor
Beamer	Gwinn	Taylor
Bentley	Holtzman	Teague, Tex.
Bowler	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Buckley	Lennon	Thursell
Cannon	McConnell	Whitener
Celler	Machrowicz	Whitten
Christopher	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Colmer	O'Konski	Zelenko
Coudert	Pelly	
Dawson, III.	Porter	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

HOUSING ACT OF 1957

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6659) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, to improve the availability of mortgage credit, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6070) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 648)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6070) making appropriations for the sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recom-

mend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 28, 29, 31, 32, 43, 48, 51, 52 and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45, 54, 59, and 60, 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 "\$2,360,000"; 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 "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$222,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$130,339,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$117,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$48,400"; 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 "\$1,515,000"; 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 "\$10,530,000"; 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 "\$153,300"; 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 "\$1,750,000"; 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 matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of not to exceed sixty-two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; 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 "\$1,135,000"; 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 "\$16,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$402,500"; 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 proposed by said amendment insert "\$175,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$350"; 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 "\$219,250"; 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 matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$4,000"; 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 matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$5,000"; 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 "\$1,046,000"; 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 "\$21,763,400"; 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 "\$10,344,000"; 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 matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; 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 "\$1,250,000"; 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 "\$675,000"; 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 "\$1,377,000"; 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 "\$1,100,000"; 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: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment and in lieu of the sum named therein insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 27, and 41.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
CLARENCE CLANNON,
C. W. VURSELL,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LESTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
LEVERETT H. SALTONSTALL,
KARL MUNDT,
CHARLES POTTER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

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. 6070) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying con-

ference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 1—Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2—Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows: Appropriates \$2,360,000 instead of \$2,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,417,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Administrative expenses, employees' life insurance fund: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

Amendment No. 4—Operations: Authorizes \$750,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$598,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$335,000 shall be available for investigations relating to Federal river development projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$325,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes \$251,250 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$237,000 as proposed by the House.

General Accounting Office

Amendment No. 7—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes \$1,600,000 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

General Services Administration

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service: Authorize \$222,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$205,300 as proposed by the House and \$238,650 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate \$130,339,000 instead of \$127,464,000 as proposed by the House and \$133,214,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that of the increase provided above the House allowance \$1,000,000 is for the rental, operation, and protection of leased space.

Amendment No. 10—Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings: Authorizes \$260,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$270,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Sites and expenses, purchase contract and public buildings projects: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate prohibiting use of funds during fiscal year 1958 in connection with Federal office building Numbered 7 on square 167 in the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 12—Payments, public buildings purchase contracts: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13—Construction, public buildings: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14—Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 15—Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service: Authorizes \$170,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$120,000 as proposed by the House and \$192,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—Expenses, supply distribution: Authorizes \$117,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$110,000 as proposed by the House and \$123,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service: Authorize \$48,400 for expenses of travel instead of \$44,750 as proposed by the House and \$52,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate \$7,263,000 as proposed

by the Senate instead of \$7,254,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service: Authorize \$27,500 for expenses of travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House; and appropriate \$1,515,000 instead of \$1,330,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—Strategic and critical materials: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24—Strategic and critical materials: Delete language proposed by the Senate to establish a mica buying station at Santa Fe, New Mexico; and delete language as proposed by the Senate relating to the availability of funds.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Administrative operations fund: Authorize \$10,530,000 instead of \$10,230,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,830,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize \$153,300 for expenses of travel instead of \$137,700 as proposed by the House and \$168,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes language proposed by the Senate creating 10 additional grade GS-16 positions at the field level. The conferees are in agreement that such positions are necessary and urges the Post Office and Civil Service Committees to accomplish the objectives of the Senate language as soon as possible.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Salaries and expenses: Delete language proposed by the Senate providing that the salary of a general counsel shall hereafter be at grade GS-18 and the agreement of the conferees on Amendment No. 28 is equally applicable to this situation; and authorize \$1,750,000 for nonadministrative expenses in connection with site inspection and audit of slum clearance and urban renewal, college housing, and public facility loan projects instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Administrative expenses, housing studies: Deletes item inserted by the Senate for administrative expenses in connection with housing studies.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 32 through 40—Salaries and expenses: Authorize \$200 for purchase of newspapers as proposed by the House instead of \$500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the purchase of 62 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only instead of 80 including 62 for replacement as proposed by the Senate, and delete language proposed by the Senate authorizing purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor; authorize \$1,135,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$1,085,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,185,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate \$16,750,000 instead of \$16,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize \$1,363,500 for railroad safety activities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the House; authorize \$956,600 for locomotive inspection activities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$950,000 as proposed by the House; authorize \$225,000 for defense mobilization functions as proposed by the Senate.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 42: Authorizes \$402,500 for expenses of travel instead of \$380,000 as proposed by the House and \$425,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Deletes language proposed by the Senate authorizing the purchase of motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$71 million for salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70 million as proposed by the House.

National Capital Housing Authority

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$38,000 for maintenance and operation of properties, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40,000 as proposed by the House.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 46: Authorizes \$175,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House and \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Authorizes \$350 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals instead of \$300 as proposed by the House and \$400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Restores House language relating to high school science and mathematics teachers.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 49: Authorizes \$219,250 for expenses of travel instead of \$197,500 as proposed by the House and \$241,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 50: Provides for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle instead of forty-four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Deletes Senate proposal to reappropriate \$35,000.

Amendment No. 52: Restores House language relating to registration, classification, and induction activities of local boards.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 53: Provides for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle instead of six as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Authorizes \$17,500,000 for the loan guaranty program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$18,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Authorizes not to exceed \$1,046,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$992,200 as proposed by the House and \$1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$21,763,400 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of \$20,773,800 as proposed by the House and \$22,763,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Authorizes \$10,344,000 for medical research instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,344,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Authorizes the purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles instead of one hundred as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$2,826,250,000 for compensation and pensions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,840,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates \$784,047,000 for readjustment benefits as proposed by the Senate instead of \$787,987,000 as proposed by the House.

Independent offices—General provisions

Amendment No. 61: Deletes Senate proposal relative to annual inventory reports on real property.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 62: Authorizes \$1,250,000 for administrative expenses of the Board instead of \$1,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63: Authorizes \$675,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation instead of \$650,000 as proposed by the House and \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 64: Authorizes \$1,377,000 for administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, college housing loans, instead of \$1,327,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,427,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: Authorizes \$1,100,000 for administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, revolving fund (liquidating programs), instead of \$970,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,940,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore House language amended to provide \$600,000 for nonadministrative expenses instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Authorizes \$12,420,000 for administrative expenses, Public Housing Administration, instead of \$12,305,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,170,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
CLARENCE CANNON,
C. W. VURSELL,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 22, insert "Provided further, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3. On page 4, line 1, strike out "\$123,800" and insert "\$309,500,"

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. As I understand it, this amendment deals with certain employees' life insurance companies or associations. The Government has taken over 15 and this amendment would permit the Government to take over the other 9. Why is there any distinction between the 15 that the Government did take over and the 9 we refused to take over?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there have been a lot of misstatements made about this and there has been much pressure placed upon the

membership about it and, therefore, I think a statement is in order at this time.

In the first place there are about 149,000 members involved. The House some 18 months ago refused to put up money for taking over these companies. We figured that the Government was giving about 2,156,000 Federal employees the best life insurance deal on the market. The Government was paying one-third of the cost. Everybody was satisfied and happy. They thought it was right and fair.

We went to the other side and as usual, in those days at least, they put additional funds in the bill, and in conference the amount was compromised. The Civil Service Commission knew that the House had refused to approve their request to put the Government in this losing insurance business, and that is what it is, the taking over of private concerns. The Civil Service Commission did what was in violation of the House instructions. That is the truth of the matter.

Mr. MARTIN. That is not the question I asked. You did it for 15, why do you not do it for the other 9? Should not there be equal justice?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Civil Service Commission made a mistake, let us not turn around and compound it and lose another \$60 million. If you turn this down the legislative committee will right that matter. This is a rank discrimination if you favor the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. It is discrimination as I see it if we deny the legislation for the nine remaining associations.

Mr. THOMAS. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman. You will be giving 150,000 Federal employees 2 subsidized Government policies when the other 2 million Government employees only get 1.

Mr. MARTIN. Why did you discriminate in the first place and bail out 15 associations?

Mr. THOMAS. The Civil Service Commission did that and I think it ought to be corrected. The first step toward correcting it is to deny them these funds.

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

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

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that these 150,000 Government employees paid for this insurance just exactly as did those in the other 15 companies. You had, as I understand it, 24 of these companies that provided group insurance for Government employees before the Government established its group-insurance plan for its employees. The Government has taken over all 15 of them. All 24 are on exactly the same basis. Having taken over 15 of the companies, it will be rank discrimination not to take over the other 9, whose members will lose everything they put into these companies.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, now, wait a minute. That is some more propaganda that the life insurance delegates have been putting out. I think my friend from Virginia has been buttonholed by them and it has taken effect on him. The Government is not hurting anybody here. The Government did not ever tell

any of these associations to go into business or to get out of business.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the law passed by Congress direct the taking over of all the 24 associations?

Mr. THOMAS. No. These associations are just like any other insurance companies. If they get out and hustle business, they are going to make money. To be perfectly frank about it if you will excuse a personal reference, I am a member in one of these associations, and the one I belong to, without any virtue on my part, refused to sell to the Government. Why? Because they are making money. In the last 3 or 4 years they have increased my benefits 50 percent without increasing the premium one dime. It is just the weak ones that want to unload on the Government. The Civil Service Commission knows that these weak ones have been looking for an out to unload on the Government for 5 years, and this is their opportunity. If you want to give away \$65 million or \$70 million, this is a good opportunity to do it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GARY. If the Government had no obligation, then why did the Government take over the 15?

Mr. THOMAS. For the simple reason the Civil Service Commission did it against the advice of the House. Now, if you want to compound it and give away another \$60 million, that is a different matter.

Mr. GARY. Against the advice of the House in what respect?

Mr. THOMAS. They did not have the funds.

Mr. MARTIN. Your own report in the supplemental appropriation table says that the cost would be \$22 million.

Mr. GARY. On all of them.

Mr. THOMAS. The Civil Service Commission says that the cost to take over the associations will be \$33 million. My guess is that before you get through it will be nearer \$60 million, and on top of that you are going to spend \$150,000 every year sending out policies, having stenographers credit the premium payments and so on. So, I am surprised at my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. He is a free enterprise man, and I admire him for it. Here he wants to put the Government into a losing life insurance business.

Mr. MARTIN. I repeat I believe in treating all fairly and on the same basis. That is all I am contending for.

Mr. THOMAS. How are you going to treat the 2 million Government employees who have only one policy? Are you going to give them 2 policies? If you treat them alike, you will have to do that, you know.

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

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

Mr. BROYHILL. Well, the gentleman knows that the current Federal Employees Life Insurance Company does not take care of the Federal employees when

they retire except on a small percentage on their original amount.

Mr. THOMAS. We do not write the policies, and nobody is going to vary the terms of the policies. That is a matter that is set by the policy itself.

Mr. BROYHILL. The Federal Life Insurance Company is driving these small companies out of business.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. The gentleman is making a speech that he cannot back up. If these people want to get out and hustle up business, they would be doing more business than they could say grace over. The gentleman from Virginia does not give up because money is tight. He is still doing business, and these people will be doing business, too, but these weak ones want to unload on the Government, and certainly the gentleman is bound to know that.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Alexander	Coudert	Montoya
Allen, Ill.	Dawson, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Aspinall	Diggs	O'Konski
Bailey	Durham	Porter
Baker	Fogarty	Powell
Barrett	Grant	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Green, Pa.	Reed
Bowler	Gubser	Robison, Ky.
Breeding	Gwinn	Saylor
Buckley	Holtzman	Taylor
Celler	Landrum	Whitener
Chlperfield	Lennon	Wigglesworth
Christopher	McConnell	Wilson, Calif.
Cooley	Machrowicz	Zelenko
	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what the gentleman from Texas would say if a group of Government employees got together and organized a grocery store and it went sour, would the gentleman feel we ought to come in and bail them out?

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly would not and I think that is on all fours with the situation here.

Mr. TABER. That is what I thought. For that reason I am inclined to feel that we should go along with the gentleman. I wonder how it would be if they went in the gasoline business, should we bail them out?

Mr. THOMAS. No. And you will not have to bail them out now. I may say to the gentleman from New York, if the managers of these companies will go out and work and sell insurance like everybody else does, they may continue. The policy of the average Government employee is less than six or seven thousand and they are buying insurance on the outside.

Mr. Speaker, this question has been well debated and I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 115, noes 88.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 22, after the figure insert: "Provided, That the Administrator of General Services may enter into contracts during the fiscal year 1958 for which the aggregate of annual payments for amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not exceed the unused portion of the \$12,000,000 limitation applicable prior to July 1, 1957, under the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 343)."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we, on the agricultural appropriation subcommittee, are faced with a serious problem before us here this afternoon, and I am endeavoring to secure a solution of that problem. In all probability, if permission is granted, we will be able to file a conference report tonight. Now, it seems to me that any move designed to prevent us from filing such a report can do nothing but harm, because Sunday is the final day in this present fiscal year. I am making this statement, Mr. Speaker, to request that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], ask for permission to file a conference report on this particular bill by midnight tonight. I see no present evidence on their part to do so, and I shall have to from time to time make observations here this aft-

ernoon, Mr. Speaker, until we do get that right. I feel it is very important.

The SPEAKER. The request was made this morning, but it was withdrawn at somebody's request.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, might I say in response to that that we were in conference at the time and I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], asked to have it set aside. He did not officially object, but all I want done is that the proper person in connection with my committee or the full committee ask for this permission to file a report, and if the gentleman from Virginia or any other Member decides in his own conscience that he wants to take on the responsibility to object, why, that, of course, is his business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see either of the gentlemen suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota on the floor.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi is present, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Mississippi desires to make the request, the Chair will certainly entertain it.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry. I did not hear the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It was simply to the effect as to the need for filing a conference report tonight, and I hope you will make that request.

Mr. WHITTEN. The request was made earlier by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] while we were attending a conference, and I now renew the request. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 7441, which request was made earlier today.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have the conferees agreed?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Do I understand, then, if the report is filed tonight, the bill will be brought to the House tomorrow? Would that be the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. Personally, I would confer with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the House leadership prior to asking for that.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman think that the membership of the House should have some opportunity to examine the report, in the event it is filed, or in the event there is an agreement, before they are called upon to vote on it?

Mr. WHITTEN. I merely asked permission to file the report by tonight.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. If the gentleman insists on his request, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has objected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it within my right at this time to offer a motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13, page 11, line 5, strike out "\$2,125,000" and insert "\$2,145,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,145,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available for the planning of a border station at Dunseith, N. Dak., at a total cost of not to exceed \$300,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, my distinguished friend and highly capable chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I shall first ask a division of the question. I am then going to ask the House to defeat the pending motion to recede with regard to amendment in disagreement No. 13, and later to accept a motion which I shall make to insist on disagreement with the other body.

The SPEAKER. There may not be two motions pending at the same time. The gentleman will have to divide that question, too.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not offer the motion to insist at this time. I said I intended to offer it if the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recede is not agreed to.

Earlier this year 2 subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations were presented with a program for the construction of 16 border stations along the Canadian border for the customs service of the Department of the Treasury and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. At that time there was included in the list of 16 proposed stations 1 for Dunseith, N. Dak., at a cost of \$30,000, to be appropriated via the Treasury Department-Post Office appropriation bill, and \$30,000 to be appropriated via the Department of Justice appropriation bill, a total cost of \$60,000.

The unanimous action of both subcommittees, the subcommittee on the Treasury-Post Office bill, headed by

Messrs. GARY and CANFIELD, and the subcommittee on the State-Justice bill, headed by Mr. COUDERT and myself, postponed the program for a year. This action was concurred in by the House and concurred in by the other body. As a matter of fact, neither Department appealed to the other body. We now find the Dunseith station in the instant bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, at a cost, not of \$60,000, but up to \$300,000.

The following is the information which was submitted to the State-Justice Sub-

committee on Appropriations earlier this year:

The overall estimate has been developed on the basis of average conditions, as follows:

Station building: 1,400 square feet at \$15.....	\$21,000
Canopy: 960 square feet at \$5.....	4,800
Utility lines.....	2,500
Approaches and driveways.....	2,700

Total for station without living quarters.....	31,000
Cottage and garage, each unit.....	14,500

The entire program recommended for the fiscal year 1958 is summarized hereunder:

Location	Annual admissions	Cost of station	Cottages		Total cost	I. and N. cost
			No.	Amount		
1. Dunseith, N. Dak.....	79,000	\$31,000	2	\$29,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
2. Connecticut Lakes, N. H.....	18,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
3. Roseau, Minn.....	31,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
4. Pinecreek, Minn.....	38,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
5. Sarles, N. Dak.....	12,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
6. Hannah, N. Dak.....	20,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
7. Turner, Mont.....	13,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
8. Del Bonita, Mont.....	7,000	31,000	1	14,500	45,500	22,750
9. Andrade, Calif.....	170,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
10. Lukeville, Ariz.....	146,000	2,000	4	58,000	60,000	30,000
11. Lancaster, Minn.....	20,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
12. Ophelm, Mont.....	12,000	\$31,000	2	\$29,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
13. Antler, N. Dak.....	15,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
14. Maida, N. Dak.....	17,000	31,000	2	29,000	60,000	30,000
15. Morgan, Mont.....	19,000	31,000	2	\$4,500	35,500	17,750
16. Porthill, Idaho.....	95,000	10,000	2	29,000	39,000	19,500
Total.....		446,000		454,000	900,000	450,000

¹ Additional power installation required.

² Renovation of existing cottages.

³ Alteration and improvement of existing station.

DUNSEITH, N. DAK.

There are no available Government-owned quarters for housing the inspection facilities of this Service or the Customs Service at Dunseith, N. Dak. No adequate privately owned building is available for rental. The present inspection office is located at a rented tourist cabin, a distance of 14 miles from the border. There are a number of roads leading from the main highway going east and west which can be used by the public without requiring them to pass the inspection point. The building where the inspection office is located is in a very poor state of repair and is not the type of structure that a person would expect for a Government office. Within the last 5 years the number of persons admitted annually has increased from 26,000 to 79,000. The port is open 24 hours daily in summer and from 8 a. m. to midnight in winter. Two immigration officers and one customs officer are regularly assigned. A tract of land 800 feet by 150 feet is owned by the Government at the border. It is proposed to construct a station for the joint use of the Immigration and Customs Services and two cottages for personnel in residence at the border.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in order to same time, if my distinguished friend from New York will allow me to interrupt briefly, perhaps I can bring this matter to a head very quickly. This subcommittee is in the position of being an innocent bystander. We have put a provision in here for building five border stations that were presented to this subcommittee in the regular order. The cost of these ranged from \$300,000 to \$400,000 each: 2 in Texas, 1 in California, 1 in New York, and 1 in Maine. This item was approved by the House, and went over to the Senate, and lo and behold, we found they put in one similar in character and kind in North Dakota. Canada has built one right across the border to cost \$400,000, and

the committee report as prepared by the Senate stated that the United States should build one on the North Dakota side for \$300,000. Since the committee did not have any evidence on it, we took the word of the other body. We did put a limitation in there, however, that they could not spend more than \$300,000. Since there were five already in the bill, not objected to by the House, I repeat, we are again in the position of being an innocent bystander, and as far as I am concerned the House has the facts and the House can vote its sentiments in the matter.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask our chairman if it is not true that the facts disclose that our own station is 13 miles away from the border, and there is some apparent need for a station?

Mr. THOMAS. There was nothing too much out of line about it.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. It is also true that the General Services Administration comes under the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee, and all of these stations are to be built by the General Services Administration?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this thing came up before the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee and the estimate was sub-

mitted by the representatives of the Customs Service. This is what it says: "Dunseith, N. Dak., customhouse, \$30,000, total cost, \$60,000." This item is in the bill for \$300,000, or five times as much as the cost estimated by the Department.

Frankly, if I had known that yesterday when I was over at the conference, or if the gentleman from Texas had known that, I am sure there would not have been anything in here for more than what the departmental estimates were. There have been other projects that are not involved. Therefore, it would seem to me that the situation ought to be corrected and the limit of cost that the Department set up be approved rather than some figure of \$300,000, or five times that amount. If that were to be done, we would have to have an amendment offered that would provide for that limitation.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is the \$20,000 figure to which the gentleman referred for planning or for construction?

Mr. TABER. No; there is \$20,000 for planning. How they get \$20,000 for planning a \$60,000 building is a little beyond me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has explained the situation a good deal better than I can. I have here the sheets of justifications with regard to this station, presented to the State-Justice Subcommittee on Appropriations. This sheet clearly says that the total cost for Dunseith, N. Dak., shall be \$60,000, of which \$30,000 would be appropriated to the Treasury Department and \$30,000 to the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the House should vote down the pending motion.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say that perhaps this matter can be cured right quick by voting down the previous question.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not familiar with the technical arrangement here and I am not qualified to speak about that. However, it just so happens on numerous occasions on going up to Canada I have had occasion to go through this Dunseith place. The Canadians have a magnificent building there.

Mr. THOMAS. It cost \$400,000.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course that is no reason perhaps for us to have anything comparable to that, but I must say that the gentleman from North Dakota and I have discussed this many times. That little ramshackle place on our side is really not good enough for the carrying on of the duties of the people who are there. So I do not know whether it ought to be \$60,000 or \$30,000. It does seem to me, of course, that \$20,000 for planning of a \$60,000 building is some-

what out of joint. But certainly from my own personal observation something should be done with our station there at Dunseith. If that could be worked out in a reasonable fashion it would seem to me that it would only be doing justice in this situation.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that there are 16 stations along the American borders where new buildings are needed. The Bureau of Customs requested an appropriation for those 16 stations for this next year. The stations are used for two purposes. They are used for customs and they are also used for immigration purposes. Therefore, they asked that the cost of the buildings be divided between the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice. Consequently, the same list was submitted both to the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations and to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Justice. Neither subcommittee is against this building program. All of these stations ought to be built as rapidly as we can build them. But in view of the demand for economy at this time and in an effort to cut down the budget as much as possible and not to do any building at this time which is not absolutely necessary, both subcommittees cut all 16 of these stations out of the report. If this action is adopted by the House now, you would be putting 1 of these 16 stations back in. I submit to the Members of the House that the program ought to be considered as a whole and not with respect to just one station.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is will the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 13?

The motion was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, does not the motion come too late?

The SPEAKER. The motion is in order at this time.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14 on page 11, line 7, insert "Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia: For an additional amount for expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, authorizing the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District, \$1,710,000, to remain available until ex-

ended: *Provided*, That the limitation on the total amount for completion of the hospital center is increased from \$21,700,000 to \$23,410,000: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall become effective only upon approval of the increased authorization proposed in S. 2194 and/or H. R. 7835, 85th Congress."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$1,710,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$1,500,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "\$23,410,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$23,200,000".

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 13, line 5, insert "Funds available for."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 13, line 8, strike out "including" and insert "during the current fiscal year shall be available for".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 17, line 3, insert "Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be thereby increased more than 5 percent: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$5 million."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be thereby increased more than 2 percent: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2 million."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 20, line 19, insert "for the making of special investigations and reports and".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "for the making of special investigations and reports (not to exceed \$500,000) and".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3373) to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Clause (2) of section 101 (a) of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1028), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to any person engaged by the United States under a contract for his personal services outside the continental United States or in Alaska or the Canal Zone; or".

(b) Clause (3) of section 101 (a) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) to any person employed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or the Canal Zone as a civilian employee paid from nonappropriated funds administered by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service, Navy Ship's Store Ashore, Navy exchanges, Marine Corps exchanges, officers' and non-commissioned officers' open messes, enlisted men's clubs, service clubs, special service activities, or any other instrumentality of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense and conducted for the mental, physical, and moral improvement of personnel of the Department of Defense and their dependents; or".

(c) Section 101 (a) of that act is amended by adding the following new clause:

"(4) to any person employed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or the Canal Zone by the American National Red Cross;".

SEC. 102. Section 102 (a) of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1031), as amended, is amended by striking the last proviso. This amendment shall not affect benefits adjudicated thereunder prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 201 (b) of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1033),

as amended, is amended by changing that part of the section which precedes the numbered clauses to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'war-risk hazard' means any hazard arising during a war in which the United States is engaged; during an armed conflict in which the United States is engaged, whether or not war has been declared; or during a war or armed conflict between military forces of any origin, occurring within any country in which a person covered by this act is serving; from—"

(b) Clause (3) of 201 (b) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the discharge or explosion of munitions intended for use in connection with a war or armed conflict with a hostile force or person as defined herein (except with respect to employees of a manufacturer, processor, or transporter of munitions during the manufacture, processing, or transporting thereof, or while stored on the premises of the manufacturer, processor, or transporter); or"

(c) Section 201 (c) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'hostile force or person' means any nation, any subject of a foreign nation, or any other person serving a foreign nation (1) engaged in a war against the United States or any of its allies, (2) engaged in armed conflict, whether or not war has been declared, against the United States or any of its allies, or (3) engaged in a war or armed conflict between military forces of any origin in any country in which a person covered by this act is serving."

(d) Section 201 (d) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'allies' means any nation with which the United States is engaged in a common military effort or with which the United States has entered into a common defensive military alliance."

(e) Section 201 (e) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'war activities' includes activities directly relating to military operations."

(f) Section 201 (f) of that act is repealed.

Sec. 104. Sections 101 (b), 104 (a), 201 (b), and 206 of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1028), as amended, are amended by striking out the words "enemy" and "the enemy" wherever they appear and inserting the words "a hostile force or person" in place thereof.

Sec. 105. Title II of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1033), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Sec. 208. Titles I and II of this act may be cited as the 'War Hazards Compensation Act.'"

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE DEFENSE BASE ACT

Sec. 201. (a) Section 1 (a) of the act of August 16, 1941 (ch. 357, 55 Stat. 622), as amended, is amended by inserting the following new clause between clause (4) and the last 5 lines:

"(5) by the American National Red Cross outside the continental United States or in Alaska or the Canal Zone;"

(b) Section 1 (b) of that act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'public work' means any fixed improvement or any project, whether or not fixed, involving construction, alteration, removal, or repair for the public use of the United States or its allies, including but not limited to projects or operations under service contracts and projects in connection with the national defense or with war activities, dredging, harbor improvements, dams, roadways, and housing, as well as preparatory and ancillary work in connection therewith at the site or on the project;

"(2) the term 'allies' means any nation with which the United States is engaged in a common military effort or with which the United States has entered into a common defensive military alliance;

"(3) the term 'war activities' includes activities directly relating to military operations."

(c) Section (1) (e) of that act is amended by striking the last sentence and by substituting the following two sentences: "Upon the recommendation of the head of any department or other agency of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, in the exercise of his discretion, may waive the application of this section with respect to any contract, subcontract, or subordinate contract, work location under such contracts, or classification of employees. Upon recommendation of the head of the American National Red Cross, the Secretary of Labor may waive the application of this section to any employee or class of employees of the American National Red Cross, or to any place of employment of such an employee or class of employees."

Sec. 202. The act of August 16, 1941 (ch. 357, 55 Stat. 622), as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"Sec. 5. This act may be cited as the 'Defense Base Act.'"

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 301. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of June 30, 1953 (67 Stat. 134), are repealed and section 101 (c) of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1030), is reenacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 201 of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1033), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words 'July 1, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1958.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6523) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the United States shall pay compensation as hereinafter specified for the disability or death of an employee resulting from personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty, but no compensation shall be paid if the injury or death is caused by willful misconduct of the employee or by the employee's intention to bring about the injury or death of himself or of another, or if intoxication of the injured employee is the proximate cause of the injury or death.

"(b) In any case where an employee within the coverage of this act or any extension thereof, who is employed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in the Canal Zone, suffers disability or death from a war-risk hazard, or suffers disability or death during or as a result of capture, detention or other restraint by a hostile force or person, his disability or death shall in the administration of this act be deemed to have resulted from personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty, whether or not the employee was engaged in the course of employment when the disability, or disability resulting in death, occurred or when he was taken by the hostile force or person. This subsection shall not apply to any person (1) whose residence is at or in the vicinity of the place of his employment, and (2) who was not living there solely by virtue of the exigencies of his employment, unless the person was injured or was taken while he was engaged in the course of his employment. Nothing contained in this subsection shall affect the payment of compensation under entitlement of this act derived otherwise than by reason of this subsection."

Sec. 2. Section 40 of the Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, is further amended by adding, after subsection (1) the following five new subsections:

"(j) The term 'war-risk hazard' means any hazard arising during a war in which the United States is engaged; during an armed conflict in which the United States is engaged, whether or not war has been declared; or during a war or armed conflict between military forces of any origin, occurring within any county in which a person covered by this act is serving; from—

"(1) the discharge of any missile (including liquids and gas) or the use of any weapon, explosive, or other noxious thing by a hostile force or person or in combating an attack or an imagined attack by a hostile force or person; or

"(2) action of a hostile force or person, including rebellion or insurrection against the United States or any of its allies; or

"(3) the discharge or explosion of munitions intended for use in connection with a war or armed conflict with a hostile force the United States or any of its allies; or

"(4) the collision of vessels in convoy or the operation of vessels or aircraft without running lights or without other customary peacetime aids to navigation; or

"(5) the operation of vessels or aircraft in a zone of hostilities or engaged in war activities.

"(k) the term 'hostile force or person' means any nation, any subject of a foreign nation, or any other person serving a foreign nation (1) engaged in a war against the United States or any of its allies, (2) engaged in armed conflict, whether or not war has been declared, against the United States or any of its allies, or (3) engaged in a war or armed conflict between military forces of any origin in any country in which a person covered by this act is serving.

"(l) the term 'allies' means any nation with which the United States is engaged in a common military effort or with which the United States has entered into a common defensive military alliance.

"(m) the term 'war activities' includes activities directly relating to military operations."

Sec. 3. Section 5 (b) of the act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, 59 Stat. 505), as amended (5 U. S. C. 801), is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 5 (b) of the act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, 59 Stat.

505), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words 'July 1, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1958.'

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 300 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction and equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Honorable George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, who has been serving the Government of the United States for the past several years as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has sent to the President a letter in which he is advising the President that he does not seek reappointment to that position and expects to retire on June 30, 1957, at the end of his present term.

Mr. McConnaughey is one of the outstanding citizens of Ohio and served our State for many years as a member of and later as chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. He has had a distinguished career in both State and Federal service. At one time he was in charge of renegotiation of contracts for the Federal Government as well as occupying the position he now holds as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

It is to be regretted that he has seen fit to leave the public service and those of us from Ohio who know him well want to commend him for what he has

done as a representative in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following correspondence between Mr. McConnaughey and the President of the United States:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter advising me of your plan to retire from Government service upon the completion of your present term as a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

While I fully understand and appreciate the reasons for your decision, it is, of course, with regret that I learn of it. Both as Chairman of the Renegotiation Board and as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, you have rendered able and distinguished service to the Nation and to this administration. I trust that it has given you a great deal of personal satisfaction to carry on in these important posts of duty and that the knowledge of your contribution in each of these fields will continue to be a source of pride for you.

In thanking you for all that you have done, I want also to convey to you my very best wishes for your success and happiness in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My term as a member of the Federal Communications Commission ends June 30, 1957. Due to personal considerations I feel I must retire from Government service upon that date.

It has indeed been a privilege to serve in your administration as Chairman of the Renegotiation Board and the Federal Communications Commission. To have been permitted to serve in these positions under the leadership of the most able President of the United States during my lifetime has been a most delightful experience and I shall always cherish the memories of this service.

If, Mr. President, I can ever be of any service to you, I hope you will command me. Respectfully yours,

GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues from Ohio may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Mr. McConnaughey's leaving the Federal Government.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Brown] in paying tribute to the distinguished public service of my constituent, Hon. George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, upon his retirement as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

A level-headed, able, thoughtful lawyer, a man of unswerving integrity, he has served as a member and as chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, and was in charge of renegotiation of contracts for the Federal Government before coming to the Federal Communications Commission. He has served his State and Nation with distinction,

and deserves the gratitude of our country.

He, his wife, and his five sons are my longtime personal friends. My congratulations and best wishes go to him and to them, on his long service and his honored retirement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS FOR ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1428) to authorize furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING ENLARGEMENT AND REMODELING SENATORS' SUITES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 299 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1429) authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural,

mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction and equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 1430, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes an increase in the authorization for the construction of the Senate Office Building which was originally passed in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1948. The original authorization was for \$20,600,000. This bill increases the authorization by \$2,846,000, making a total authorization of \$23,446,000.

Now, there has been expended or placed under contract all of the authorized amounts, and in order to complete the building for occupancy in January 1958, it will be necessary for this authorization to be made. The committee has gone into the matter thoroughly, and the bill simply provides for the building requirements in order to complete the project that was commenced in 1949.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill provides for an increase of 2 million plus.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. \$2,846,000.

Mr. GROSS. Nearly \$3 million. And, it provides for construction and equipment; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, the equipment that it refers to is the elec-

trical equipment and appurtenances, such as elevators and the other necessary incidentals that go with a structure such as this. Historically the building commissions of the Senate and the House have always treated the normal equipment such as furniture and other articles necessary to properly house the Members as being separate items.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is the question I wanted to ask the gentleman, since the word "equipment" is used. And, there is a bill following, I understand to provide furniture, rugs, and other things.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that the reports on the two bills make that distinction, that the word "equipment" is not to be used synonymously with the word "furniture."

Mr. GROSS. May we assume that this is the last construction appropriation to be asked for completion of the new Senate Office Building?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As far as I know, I will say to the gentleman, this amount will be sufficient to complete the project. It is almost completed now, and this increased item is necessary to take care of the subway system from the Capitol Building to connect the new and the old Senate Office Building. It was occasioned by the authorization of the House of its new building. The main reason for the change in the plans was that brought about by the authorization of the new House Office Building and also the need for some increased costs that were not foreseen back in 1948.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether or not any of this money will be used to complete the roof, or is it completed?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to say to the gentleman if the roof was not completed, I would be glad to vote against this, because then we might save quite a bit of money in fixing the building up, and so forth. I want the gentleman to understand that I opposed this appropriation when it originally came before the House and I am still opposed to more buildings of this type on Capitol Hill at this time.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statement of our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones]. I fear that my good friend, Mr. Jones, is somewhat in an embarrassing position. I feel certain that he does not like this legislation any more than the gentleman from Ohio.

We are discussing S. 1430, which authorizes a new Senate Building. I would respectfully refer Members to the minority report which is found on pages 6 and 7 and signed by the minority members of the Committee on Public Works, with one exception:

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned, opposed committee approval of S. 1430 because no authorization had been previously approved for the appropriation of funds for construction of a new

Senate Office Building by the legislative committees having jurisdiction under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The Rules of the House provide that the Committee on Public Works shall have jurisdiction of "measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings." On April 10, 1947, S. 723, to authorize the Senate Office Building Commission to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate, was referred to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives pursuant to the Rules of the House. The committee subsequently reported S. 723 and it ultimately became Public Law 169, 80th Congress, and this constitutes the only authorization for the new Senate Office Building considered by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives. Public Law 169, 80th Congress, authorized \$25,000 for preliminary plans and estimates of cost for a new Senate Office Building; it will be noted that it carried no authorization for the appropriation of funds for construction. To date, \$20,600,000 has been appropriated for the building, and S. 1430 properly seeks the authorization necessary to support an additional appropriation of \$2,846,000 in order to complete the building. The undersigned wish to point out that a bill similar to S. 1430 for authorization of appropriation should have preceded the item in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1948.

Since the Committee on Public Works of the House, in considering the basic authorization for the new Senate Office Building, saw fit to limit its authorization to preliminary plans and estimates of cost, it is clear that the Committee on Public Works of the House desired detailed information regarding plans and estimates of cost before entering upon legislative authorization for the construction of the building.

This statement does not presume to relate to procedure in the Senate of the United States; it is confined to procedure in the House of Representatives. The procedure followed in the House with respect to authorizing legislation for the new Senate and House Office Buildings is not in conformity with House rules.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR.
RUSSELL V. MACK.
HUBERT B. SCUDDER.
MYRON V. GEORGE.
FRANK J. BECKER.
GORDON H. SCHERER.
GARDNER R. WITHEROW.
WILLIAM C. CRAMER.
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
FRED SCHWENDEL.
EMMET F. BYRNE.
EDWIN B. DOOLEY.
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD.
S. WALTER STAUFFER.

Mr. Chairman, in this minority report we call attention to the fact that this legislation, authorizing the construction of this building, did not follow the usual procedure and what we contend are the Rules of the House in order to get authority for this construction.

Some years ago, about 1948, the Committee on Public Works authorized an expenditure of \$25,000 in order to make plans and surveys for this project. I might add that in the Committee on Public Works for some time there has been legislation asking for authorizations for new construction, for buildings to house the legislative Members.

Lo and behold, a few weeks ago, the Committee on Public Works had presented to it a bill asking an increase in the authorization of \$20,600,000 by an

addition thereto of \$2,846,000. The minority side raised the question with the Architect of the Capitol, "Why are you coming to the authorizing committee today and asking for an increase when you did not come to the proper committee for authorization of the original amount?" It was brought out that about 61 percent of the project is completed. May I quote from the testimony:

Mr. MCGREGOR. Now you are asking for an additional authorization?

Mr. STEWART. That is correct.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Did you get the original authorization for that particular building from a legislative committee of the Congress?

Mr. STEWART. It came from the Appropriations Committee, sir.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right. If you got it from the Appropriations Committee, why are you coming to the legislative committee for additional money? Why do you not go back to the same fellows who started this project?

Mr. STEWART. I must plead with you. I can tell you how and what happened. I cannot tell you why, in my position.

That is the position we of the Public Works Committee found ourselves in.

We recognize that this building is 61 percent complete. As to the authorization, I think under any interpretation of the rules it would be very questionable whether it was properly authorized, but I respectfully say to you the building is 61 percent completed. They are asking for an increase of \$2 million. I am not sure that this will be enough to complete it. So I think the Appropriations Committee and those who did authorize this in the first place find it getting a little bit too warm for them, so they come to the proper legislative committee to get an authorization. I am leaving it to you to decide whether or not you want to vote for it. I respectfully refer you again to the minority views that set forth that this authorization was never properly made by a legislative committee.

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

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

Mr. MUMMA. In the first line of the title of the bill are the words "Increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction equipment." Should that not be "construction and equipment"?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think that is a technicality. In the hearings it was brought out that that particular equipment was a part of the construction because they referred to electrical appliances and elevators. I might say you notice it did not say "furniture," and we will bring that up later and I think will discuss it a little more in detail for the furnishings of that building.

Mr. MUMMA. In the report they say "construction and equipment." The gentleman is in the construction business. They could buy a steam shovel under that authorization, could they not?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think that is true. They could buy whatever they want. But one thing about it, they will have to come back and get some more money from us. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that we are trying to hold it down. However, the gen-

tleman's interpretation is correct, it is "construction and equipment." That "equipment" covers a host of sins.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. May I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if the Senate committee does acquire that steam shovel he is talking about, we will have an opportunity to vote on it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I pay my respects to the gentleman from Alabama. He has certainly been fair in this legislation. Again I say it has been a very difficult task.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount of \$20,000,000 fixed by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), as the limit of cost for construction and equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate is hereby increased by \$2,846,000.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1430) increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate, pursuant to House Resolution 300, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURNISHINGS FOR ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1428) to authorize furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1428, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second bill of a series to complete the Senate Office Building and to provide that the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of

the Senate Office Building Commission can proceed to acquire the furniture necessary to furnish the new office building which is expected to be completed in January of 1958. This amends the act of April 28, 1904, which originally established the Office Building Commission.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman just said that the appropriation we provided in the last bill which we just passed would complete the building.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Then this bill is strictly for furniture and furnishings?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. How much do they want for that?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is no way to predetermine that because the articles have not been selected. This gives the authorization to the Senate Office Building Commission to direct the Architect of the Capitol to make such selections as will be necessary to supply the furniture and other articles needed to complete the building.

Mr. GROSS. Do we do that ordinarily with other agencies and departments of government?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. So far as I know, since the original act of 1904 was passed, that has been the procedure.

I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the resolution was passed in 1947 authorizing the expenditure of \$15,000 for the Senate Office Building Commission to make a study of its housing needs. As a result of the report of that Commission, authorization was included in the second deficiency appropriation bill of 1948. So the House and the Senate have had plenty of opportunity to review this problem. There has not been any disagreement as to the conduct of the Commission or as to its authority or its purpose. So far as I know, Mr. Chairman, there has always existed a comity between the two bodies. Therefore, we have always agreed to the activities carried on by the Senate Building Commission and they have likewise reciprocated in carrying out the wishes of the House with respect to its own housing needs.

Mr. GROSS. There can always come a day when good things come to an end.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Despite all the comity that we hear about, I should like to know and I am going to continue to ask the question as to what this is going to cost the taxpayers of the country. It seems to me we ought to have some estimate and some idea of how much this furnishing of the Senate Office Building is going to cost the people of this country. The Members of the other body are not going to pay for it; the taxpayers are going to pay for it, and I want to know.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I wish I had the facts and information that I could tell the gentleman from Iowa. However, the resolution is not drafted in such way that I think they would be readily ascertainable to indicate how

much the cost would be. I think there is a general agreement that the Senate Office Building is rather unique and it is going to require some considerable study by this Commission to make a selection of the various furnishings that go into the building.

I will say to my good friend from Iowa that he will have ample time in which to lodge his complaint for the selection of any article he finds objectionable when the appropriation items come before us in pursuance of this authorization.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. These three bills came before the Rules Committee and the same question was raised there that has just been raised by the gentleman from Iowa.

It is embarrassing to say anything about a bill that comes over here for the accommodation of the other body, but it seems to me that some things ought to be said at some time at whatever cost.

I objected there, and I object here to this provision:

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services—

And so forth. That strikes me as a very, very bad way for the Congress to legislate, because it is an open-end proposition; there is no estimate as to anything. The Architect of the Capitol appeared before the Rules Committee but could give us no estimate of what this would cost.

The same thing is true of the other bill which will follow this which deals with the remodeling of the old Senate Office Building. Nobody has the faintest idea what that is going to cost.

The gentleman from Alabama said this matter has been under consideration for 7 or 8 years. It seems to me that in that time somebody, somewhere, somehow, ought to have been able to make some estimates and at least take Congress into their confidence as to how much money they expect to spend for these purposes.

I think it is bad legislation, but I do not know what you can do about it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, this is another one of a series of bills, and this one, in my opinion, is especially bad.

I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama and in the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, Congressman SMITH of Virginia, that this is a blank check authorization.

I will agree that the record shows that we have in years gone by established somewhat of a precedent that each House should take care of its own needs, but I join with the gentleman from Virginia in stating that possibly the time

has come when we should call a halt to some of the things being done.

I would again like to call your attention to the minority report on this particular bill. It is found on page 4. It is signed by all the members of the minority side of the Committee on Public Works with one exception. I read the following:

We opposed this blank check authorization because we have no idea how much is to be spent. The only witness, the Architect of the Capitol, advised the committee he was not in a position to provide this information at this time. The Committee on Public Works of the House is without adequate information as to the coverage of this legislation and certainly we have no information upon which to base a reasonably accurate estimate of cost. We firmly believe that certainly the time has arrived when the policy of blank check authorizations should be stopped so that we may give the taxpayers some relief. How can we expect to balance our budget and bring relief to the taxpayers when we continue a policy of unlimited authorization?

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill that you have read a lot about in the papers. One of the items that was carried in the newspaper was in reference to a door costing \$8,000. I raised a question relative to this and asked the Architect of the Capitol, who was a witness before the committee: "Is \$8,000 correct for the price of the door, Mr. Stewart?"

Mr. Stewart said, "It is correct, that is right."

Then the question was raised, "Was competitive bidding asked for?"

He said, "We had no competitive bids. We just awarded the contract."

Then a question was brought up relative to some of the furnishings. Certain newspapers said that the price of the chairs was from \$400 to \$800 each. Then the report also was that some had vibrating appliances attached. The question was asked of the Architect and he said it had been the policy to allow each Member of the other body to choose the furniture for his office.

I take no exception to that, although to me it seems a rather ridiculous idea. I am sure that the Members of the other body are expendable the same as are the Members of this body. Maybe when a new Member of the other body comes in he might not like the vibrating chair his predecessor had and, such being the case, we might again have to pay another \$800 in order that the new Member of the other body may have the right vibration in the right spot.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement in opposition to this blank-check authorization. We in the Congress have, this year, adopted an economy position. It is encouraging to see the frankness of the minority views expressed here because unless we in the Congress take an economy position on our own activities here on the Hill, the executive departments will have every reason to neither justify nor curtail their activities.

I would like to ask the gentleman, is it proposed to ask for a recorded vote on this subject or on a motion to recommit so that the membership will have an opportunity to let their constituents know where they stand on this matter?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana has been here for a number of terms, he is always alert, he knows the rules of the House. If the question is raised and the proper number of Members stand, it would be mandatory on the part of the Speaker to have the roll called. That will be dependent entirely on the membership.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sorry to note the feelings that have developed over consideration of this bill. I want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that this is not originally a Democratic piece of legislation. It came out of the 80th Congress and was under the leadership of Mr. Taft at the time this resolution was included in the second deficiency appropriation bill. There has not been any disagreement either in a Democratic Congress or a Republican Congress since that time as to whether or not we were going to complete this building. Now, it is going to be ready for occupancy in January, and we are going to have to buy some furniture. You certainly do not want a \$23 million building standing idle so that the Senate of the United States cannot occupy it. So, it seems to me that these exaggerated propositions of somebody being in a rocking chair or something like that should not betray our ability to look at those things on their merits. I hope we will not be led astray into thinking that we will just have a few rocking chairs for a few Senators.

Mr. MCGREGOR. May I reply to my distinguished chairman? I assure him that this is not a partisan measure. There will probably be just as many Senators of one party using those chairs as Senators of another party, and I am not debating that. And, maybe it did originate back years ago, but we did not have the national debt years ago that we have had in the last few years. I am not going to insist on a roll call and insist on certain things being done, but I think the time has arrived where this Congress and the membership thereof should know exactly what is going on relative to some of these authorizations. My dear friend said something about some radical views or something. I will refer him to the hearings in which the Architect himself said that there were no specifications for any of this furniture; there was to be no competitive bidding; it would be at the pleasure of each of the Members of the other body. I say that this is not a partisan measure, but I think it is an issue between the membership of the House and possibly the other body so that we can let all the people know whether or not we favor one hundred and some million dollars additional for new offices and furniture when we seemingly cannot get enough money to take care of some of the other

needs of the people. That is the only reason I am trying to give the facts to the people.

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

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

Mr. SCHERER. Was not the chief objection of the minority not so much as to the furnishings and the type of equipment but the fact that this authorization bill contains no limitation whatsoever on expenditures?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct, and that was ably pointed out by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, a member of the other party, Congressman SMITH of Virginia and I believe he feels just as bad about it, and I feel in my own heart that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama does, too.

Let me read one section of this bill:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

That is a broad statement; a blank check. We must all recognize, of course, that the other body has a building under construction, and certainly they need equipment.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Was not the main objection by our committee due to the fact that we have been bypassed more or less in the past on some of these authorizations, and we have not been able to make a progress study so that we can justify our stand, and are we not now in that position today when we are asked to make an open-end authorization for the Senate?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think that is correct; and if I may continue on that subject, I think we are in a situation here with this furniture and these furnishings where we may have to go along with them, because someone I think was just a little negligent and did not take care of this before the project was started. But there is another bill coming up shortly along this same line, to remodel the existing Senate Office Building. There are no plans and specifications or any amounts stated in that bill. Certainly we have no reason for saying that we cannot insist in that bill on having plans and specifications drawn and contracts let under competitive bidding.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I simply want to make the record clear that I am not opposed to furnishing this building. What I am opposed to, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] has so well stated, is writing a blank check for perhaps colored television sets, and the Lord knows what. That is what

I am opposed to, the writing of a blank check to spend as much as you want to.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Was there any suggestion given as to what amount would be involved in this proposal; was there any estimate?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No; I tried to include in my remarks the testimony of the Architect. He did not know what it might cost. He did not know the unit price, because the membership of the other body had not made a selection of the type of desk they wanted, or the type of chair they wanted, and so forth.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So the Architect himself does not know how much it is going to cost and cannot even furnish an estimate?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. So he told our committee and told, I am sure, the Committee on Rules.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is not the bill we are presently considering in the same form, under the same procedure that is used in every authorization for furniture for the House and Senate Office Buildings and has been continuously since 1904?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not know, because I have not looked it up. But if my good friend from Alabama says it is I take his word. But I will say that if such is the case, it is time to change the procedure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The point is we are using the same procedure and the same method we always have used.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If the gentleman wishes to make that statement, that is acceptable to me. But I repeat, that started years ago when taking care of one's own house meant perhaps only \$1,000 or so but, if I remember correctly the Architect's statement before the Committee on Rules, he said the cost would possibly be over \$100 million.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. If I were to go buy the furniture that is in my office in the Old House Office Building, that must have been purchased under that same appropriation of 1904; that is, the couch and the overstuffed chair; but I must say that I like it very much and I think in that day they did a good job.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think this discussion is going to do some good. I think we are in a position where we have to recognize that we are operating under peculiar circumstances. But I am definitely of the opinion that the colloquy that has taken place in our committee and on the floor will make somebody think a couple of times before he starts such a procedure again.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. The distinguished gentleman will admit that in all of the prerogatives exercised by Members of the House, for example, the purchase of electrical equipment for our offices, our operating stationery allowances, and so forth, there is always a ceiling on the amount that may be spent by each Member. This furniture is to be purchased by the Senate under this authorization, with no ceiling on the amount, as this bill provides. I, too, want to agree that the new Senate building must be furnished, furnished quickly and furnished adequately—but if this expenditure is made, is it not natural to assume, under the somewhat secret system followed in the other body, that the taxpayers will never have any knowledge of which Senator spent \$5,000 to furnish his office and which Senator spent \$10,000?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That probably is true, but this is a part of the program of furnishing the building.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask the question as to whether there was any evidence whatsoever before our committee as to the total cost of furnishing the Senate Building?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the Architect said he could not give us such a figure?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Is not that the reason the minority oppose this legislation?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right, because the man who is in charge of making the purchase advised our committee that he could not give any figures as to costs.

Mr. SCHERER. That was the reason he said they recommended open-end legislation without any limitation whatsoever on the total expenditure.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It seems to me that most if not all of the criticisms that have been directed against the bill and some of the procedures here are justified, but may I ask the gentleman, what would he suggest the House do at this time under these circumstances? Do we pass it, recommit it to the committee, or what should we do under these circumstances?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am of the opinion this bill should be sent to the committee for estimates; but, if we cannot, certainly this colloquy will be of assistance in future programs and will help hold expenses down, because it is started and it will be finished. Possibly it can be amended to put a ceiling on the cost. I think by this procedure we are bringing out today we will serve warning we will not go along always in blank check procedures. As I mentioned a minute ago, when we come up with the other bill that is asking for another blank check for the remodeling of the present Senate Office Building, I think then we can insist that

we have plenty of time to develop the plans and specifications, and costs can be determined before we give a blank check.

Mr. SCHERER. Does not the gentleman think the proper action of the House should be, considering what has been said here, that this bill should be recommitted to the committee, and then after the committee obtains evidence from the Architect as to the approximate total cost it put that figure in this bill limiting it to that amount?

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. What committee would the gentleman like to have that sent to?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Our committee or the committee designated by the Speaker.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. We, the Committee on Public Works, did not start this legislation. It originated in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. This is not a House measure. These are Senate bills.

The gentleman from Ohio quoted some figures of \$8,000 for a door. What kind of door is it? Is it a revolving door of stainless steel, worth \$12,000 or \$14,000?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman was at the committee hearing when the Architect testified, and he said it was to cost \$8,000.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. But what kind of door is it, a revolving door, of stainless steel? There was a meeting of an association in my district last week that agreed to pay \$12,000 for a door. We are going to pay \$8,000. The gentleman knows the Architect will take bids on that. If it is a bad bill, I think we should have a rollcall on this and see where we all stand. I am not for this bill. I am sure the chairman of the committee is not anxious to handle the legislation. I am vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I am not for this bill. I think it is a bad bill, and we should not pass it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman is questioning the figure of \$8,000. I will refer him to page 13 of the hearings, in which we bring up the subject of chairs costing \$900. The Architect said, "I am afraid that that is a little too high." Then he was asked if it was \$200 or \$300. "Possibly a little more; I don't know the exact price, but I can find out for you, and I can put it in the record." He has not put it in the record.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Yes; but it is not in the record. The bids are not out on those chairs yet. I do not think they will spend \$400 or \$500 for chairs.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say to my friend all we have to go by is in these hearings and no definite prices are established.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. What the Architect has said.

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, not at all. The gentleman from Illinois was at the hearing.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I was at the hearing.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will give the gentleman the report and he can read it for himself.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. But the Architect told us the bids are not out yet.

Mr. MCGREGOR. He said he was not going to take competitive bids. I can read it to the gentleman. He can pay a thousand dollars for a chair if he wants to.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Well, I will ask for a roll call on it.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if the gentleman intends to offer an amendment limiting the authorization.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I certainly am in accord with offering a limited authorization. We honestly feel that it is unfair to ask this body to sign a blank check and let the other body spend whatever amount they want and certainly there is nothing wrong in asking a limit be placed. We have limits placed on the equipment in our offices. I am not the Architect of the Capitol. I do not write to the various furniture companies and ask them about these chairs. If the gentleman is in that business, I wish he would offer an amendment. Would the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON. I notice that the minority group are opposed to the bill, and I wonder if you intended to amend it in the Committee?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Please read the minority report. We are opposing it on one principle and that is because it is a blank-check authorization. Would the gentleman favor a blank-check authorization?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I would not.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am very happy to hear that, and I am sure he is honest and sincere in his desires to do that which is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would offer an amendment limiting the authorization.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have no idea what the limit might be. If it were within a certain range, we might be able to do that. But until I get that information I would not want to offer a limiting amendment because frankly we have no information whatsoever on what the costs might be. The Architect of the Capitol, the only witness, could not give us the information.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has been in this body a long time and he knows there is a great respect between the Houses for each other. This is a piece of business that concerns only the other body. It is a new building and must be furnished. That brings this matter before our body. We never interfere with the Senate because of the very reason that we must have amity between the two Houses. This would be a poor place for success in legislation if we were at odds with the body that we do business with all the time. I recall very well when we did this Chamber over. We were in the old Chamber of course at

that time and talking about the changes that were to take place here. There were such expressions as, "Would it not be glorious, all lit up with neon lights?" Well, we found out that we had more architects in the Congress of the United States at that time than we realized—and those who were not architects were engineers. We cannot be suspecting everybody who works here on the Hill and who has a certain position assigned to him. That is the situation that we have before us. Somebody, whoever he is, is to look after the purchase of this furniture, or a committee is going to be assigned to that task. Are we to be suspicious of everything that they are going to do? They could probably have brought this bill in here with a ceiling on it that it would not be more than a certain amount. I do not know why they did not do that. But I am not going to be suspicious of them. This is an outstanding building. It will be the top building on the Hill that people will come to visit next to the Capitol. We know that our own buildings are being estimated as to cost. Some people think that we should not have them. But people who have been studying this problem realize that we must have them. I am willing to go along with the suggestions that are made for the furnishing of the Senate building. I think there is much talk here—we are saying, "I am against this but I am going to vote for the bill." This bill will not be defeated here today, and everybody knows it will not be defeated. It is one of those things where somebody thinks, "I am going to stir this matter up." I do not think this is the right thing to do, to stir it up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. May I answer my distinguished colleague?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is going to ask me an embarrassing question, so I am going to sit down.

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, I was not going to do that.

Now you can see why we all love our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, so much. I am not suspicious of anyone, but the people who pay the taxes have a right to know how their money is being spent. Just in order to clear the record up, the gentleman raised the question about this Chamber and the furnishings here. The gentleman from Ohio was a member of that Commission that remodeled this Chamber. Plans were drawn—with the consent of this body—then estimates were received and an authorization including dollars and cents was submitted to the Congress and they were accepted and we had a limitation on cost of planning and construction from the very start. When we ran out of money we came back to the Congress and asked for another authorization and an additional appropriation. We did not come to the Congress or send the bill to the other body with a blank-check provision. We told them how much it was going to cost. We found ourselves in the position that we could not complete the project at the stated authorization, so we came back and asked for more money. We at no time asked for blank-check authorization as set forth in this bill. Why can't

the same procedure be followed in this legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), as amended, is hereby authorized and directed to provide furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate, authorized to be constructed and equipped by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029).

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Any appropriations made available under authority of this act may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, and section 1316 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 439).

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

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments? [After a pause.] There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1428) to authorize furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate, pursuant to House Resolution 298, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHERER. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHERER moves to recommit the bill S. 1428 to the House Committee on Public Works with instructions to the committee to report the bill back to the House with specific cost figures having been inserted covering the authorizations as provided in the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 87.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, the Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 232, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—135

Abbitt	George	Nimtz
Alger	Griffin	Norblad
Andersen,	Gross	O'Hara, Minn.
H. Carl	Haley	Ostertag
Ashmore	Harden	Pelly
Avery	Harrison, Nebr.	Pillion
Ayres	Harrison, Va.	Poff
Baldwin	Harvey	Ray
Bass, N. H.	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Baumhart	Heselon	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Riehlman
Bentley	Hill	St. George
Berry	Hoeven	Schenck
Betts	Hoffman	Scherer
Bolton	Holt	Schwengel
Bosch	Horan	Scott, Pa.
Bray	Hosmer	Scrivner
Broomfield	Hyde	Scudder
Brownson	Jennings	Seely-Brown
Budge	Jensen	Siler
Byrne, Ill.	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Carrigg	Johnson	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Chamberlain	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Chiperfield	Keating	Springer
Church	Keeney	Staufner
Collier	Kilburn	Taber
Corbett	Knox	Talle
Cramer	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Cretella	LeCompte	Tewes
Cunningham,	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wyo.
Nebr.	McCulloch	Tollefson
Curtin	McDonough	Tuck
Curtis, Mo.	McGregor	Utt
Dague	McIntosh	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McVey	Vursell
Dawson, Utah	Macdonald	Weaver
Dennison	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Devereux	Mason	Whidall
Dies	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Dooley	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Dowdy	Minshall	Withrow
Dwyer	Moore	Wolverton
Flynt	Mumma	Younger
Frelinghuysen	Neal	

NAYS—232

Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Doyle
Addonizio	Brown, Mo.	Eberharter
Albert	Brown, Ohio	Edmondson
Alexander	Broyhill	Elliott
Allen, Calif.	Burdick	Engle
Anderson,	Burleson	Ewins
Mont.	Bush	Fallon
Andrews	Byrd	Farbstein
Ashley	Byrne, Pa.	Fascell
Aspinall	Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan
Auchincloss	Cannon	Fenton
Baker	Carnahan	Fisher
Barden	Chelf	Flood
Baring	Chenoweth	Forand
Barrett	Chudoff	Ford
Bass, Tenn.	Clark	Forrester
Bates	Clevenger	Fountain
Beckworth	Coad	Frazier
Belcher	Coffin	Friedel
Bennett, Fla.	Cooley	Fulton
Blatnik	Cooper	Garmatz
Blicht	Cunningham,	Gary
Boggs	Iowa	Gathings
Boland	Curtis, Mass.	Gavin
Bolling	Davis, Tenn.	Gordon
Bonner	Delaney	Granahan
Bow	Dempsey	Gray
Boykin	Denton	Green, Ore.
Boyle	Dingell	Gregory
Breeding	Dixon	Griffiths
Brooks, La.	Dollinger	Gubser
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.	Hagen

Hale	Magnuson	Rogers, Colo.
Hardy	Mahon	Rogers, Fla.
Harris	Maillard	Rogers, Mass.
Haskell	Marshall	Rogers, Tex.
Hays, Ark.	Martin	Rooney
Hays, Ohio	May	Roosevelt
Healey	Merrow	Rutherford
Hemphill	Metcalf	Sadlak
Hess	Miller, Calif.	Santangelo
Hillings	Miller, Md.	Saund
Holland	Mills	Scott, N. C.
Holmes	Morgan	Selden
Huddleston	Morris	Sheehan
Hull	Morrison	Sheppard
Ikard	Moss	Shurford
Jackson	Moulder	Sieminski
Jarman	Multer	Sikes
Jenkins	Murray	Sisk
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Mo.	Nicholson	Smith, Miss.
Judd	Norrell	Spence
Karsten	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Kearney	O'Hara, Ill.	Steed
Kearns	O'Neill	Sullivan
Kee	Osmers	Teller
Kelley, Pa.	Passman	Thomas
Kelly, N. Y.	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Keogh	Patterson	Thornberry
Kilday	Perkins	Trimble
Kilgore	Pilcher	Udall
King	Poage	Ullman
Kitchin	Polk	Vanik
Kluczynski	Preston	Van Pelt
Lane	Price	Van Zandt
Lanham	Prouty	Vinson
Lankford	Rabaut	Walter
Lesinski	Radwan	Watts
Long	Rains	Whitten
McCarthy	Reuss	Wier
McCormack	Rhodes, Pa.	Wigglesworth
McFall	Riley	Williams, N. Y.
McGovern	Rivers	Willis
McIntire	Roberts	Wright
McMillan	Robeson, Va.	Yates
Mack, Ill.	Robson, Ky.	Young
Madden	Rodino	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—66

Adair	Fino	Morano
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andresen,	Grant	O'Konski
August H.	Green, Pa.	Pfost
Anfuso	Gwinn	Philbin
Arends	Halleck	Porter
Bailey	Hébert	Powell
Beamer	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Hollifield	Reed
Bowler	Holtzman	Saylor
Buckley	James	Shelley
Canfield	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Knutson	Taylor
Christopher	Krueger	Tengue, Tex.
Cole	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Latham	Thompson, N. J.
Coudert	Lennon	Wainwright
Dawson, Ill.	Loser	Westland
Dellay	McConnell	Whitener
Derounian	Machrowicz	Wilson, Calif.
Diggs	Meader	Zelenko
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	
Durham	Montoya	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Gwinn.
 Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Coudert.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Latham.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. James.
 Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Westland.
 Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. August H. Andresen.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Beamer.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Krueger.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Wainwright.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Dellay.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McConnell.
Mrs. Pfost with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Wilson of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution relating to the stockpile of extra long staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

The message also 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. 7599. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide an interim extension for the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1314) entitled "An act to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 6287) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 6, 23, 29, and 46 to the above-entitled bill.

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.

6070) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments No. 14, 27, and 41.

The message further announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 3 and 13 to the above-entitled bill.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1429), authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 1429, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JONES.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third in the series of bills relating to the housing situation of the Senate. The first bill we passed authorized an increase in appropriations for the completion of the Senate Office Building that is now under construction; the second authorized the Senate to acquire furniture and articles necessary to equip the building; the pending bill, the third, authorizes the same Commission, the Senate Office Building Commission, to enlarge and remodel the Senate suites and make other structural and mechanical changes and improvements in the present Senate Office Building.

The plans have not been drawn and there have not been any plans made as to how this is to be carried out. This bill simply places the Commission in authority whereby they can carry out the objectives set forth in the bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, 15 Republican members of the House Committee on Public Works have signed a report that opposes the 3 Senate Office Building bills which are before the House of Representatives today.

One of these bills would authorize spending \$2,800,000 in additional funds to complete the Senate Office Building that is now under construction and on which more than \$20 million already has been expended. We oppose these additional funds for the new buildings be-

cause the \$20 million already spent was not voted in accordance with the usual practices of the House of Representatives. It never was referred to the House Committee on Public Works. Our committee was bypassed when the first \$20 million to start this building was voted.

The second of the bills proposes to grant the Senate authority to furnish the new multimillion-dollar office building it is now building. The thing about this proposal to which we Republicans, who have signed the report against this bill, object is that it places no limit on what may be spent by the Senate to furnish this building. This bill is a blank check, an open-end authorization that permits the Senate to spend any sum it pleases on furniture. When other agencies of the Government—even the President—want money for any purpose limits are placed on what can be spent. There is no limitation in this bill as to what the Senate may spend for furniture. The Senate and House should abide by the same rules it imposes, and rightfully so, on all other agencies of Government.

The third bill, the one I now am discussing, authorizes the Senate to remodel its present office building. We object to this proposal because no limit is placed on what the Senate may spend on this remodeling job. We should not issue blank checks to anyone to spend taxpayers' money.

In 1947 the House passed a resolution through its Public Works Committee, while authorizing the expenditure of \$25,000 to look into the feasibility and the desirability of securing additional quarters and remodeling the office facilities. That \$25,000 has been increased by Congress without further consideration by the Public Works Committee of a building that will cost \$72 million.

In short, the committee authorized a \$25,000 survey to ascertain if enlarged quarters were needed and we wind up with \$72 million being spent for a new House Office Building.

In the bill that is now before us we are proposing to give the Senate Office Building Commission the authority to go ahead and expend unlimited sums of money for the remodeling of its present building. We are giving them a blank check. In no case should the Senate give a blank check. In the case of the White House at the present time the President desires additional quarters. It will be necessary for him to send his representatives to both the House and the Senate Public Works Committee to prove the building is needed. Limits will be placed on how much will be spent. No department is given a blank check by Congress. This being so Congress should not vote itself blank checks for its projects.

The bill before us now is particularly objectionable because it gives to the Senate a blank check to spend money without any limit in the remodeling of its present structure. That kind of a blank check should not, in my opinion, be given to any executive official or to any legislative branch of the Government.

There is no emergency for having the Senate Office Building remodeled at this time. This bill ought to be sent back

to the Senate and the Senate ought to provide some limitation upon the amount of money they propose or want to spend in the remodeling of this building.

If the President wanted to remodel the White House, if the Secretary of Commerce wanted to make repairs to a building, if the Secretary of Defense wanted to buy a new ship or a new plane, the appropriate committees of Congress would ask, How much money do you expect to expend? If we pass this bill we say to the Senate, you can spend all the money you wish without limitation. This issuing of blank checks to anybody, it seems to me, is an unsound and unwise policy for the Congress of the United States. That is the reason that 15 of the minority members of the House Public Works Committee signed the report in opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman described this bill as being a blank check operation. I would like to point out to the gentleman that none of the plans have been drawn. This merely authorizes them to obtain architects and to have designs made in order that they can determine the price. Of course, they will have to make proper accounting to the Appropriations Committee and every member of this committee will have an opportunity to scrutinize each item in it.

Let me say to the gentleman that this is the normal procedure that we have historically followed. The gentleman says we are issuing a blank check. A blank-check operation is not going to occur as the gentleman fears and as he has expressed his apprehensions, due to the fact that the Architect of the Capitol will make a proper accounting of the cost.

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the chairman of our committee that if the President of the United States asked for remodeling of the White House, there certainly would be questions asked of his representatives as to how much money was going to be spent on that repair job.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman recall how we authorized renovation of the White House? Let me say to the gentleman it is difficult to ascertain in connection with these very unique buildings, including the Capitol, what the cost will be. When we authorized the renovation of this structure back in the 81st Congress, we did not set a dollar limitation there because we said it was a unique undertaking. The gentleman from Ohio who served on that Commission well remembers the authorization contained in Public Law 71 of the 81st Congress. When we authorized the building of the House Office Building, when we authorized the Senate Office Building commencing in 1904 and

the old House Office Building in 1906, every one of these authorizations followed the same procedure. I would like to remind my good friend from Washington of the fact that the Architect of the Capitol is an appointee of the House and Senate, therefore he is answerable to this body and must make a thorough and complete accounting for all the activities carried on by the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, which is composed of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], our Speaker, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Let me reply. The 80th Republican Congress provided \$25,000 for looking into the feasibility and the desirability of a new House Office Building. On the floor of the House that was amended to provide for \$2 million to start construction of such a building. Plans for this new House Office Building were never discussed on the House floor. Those plans were never reviewed. I doubt whether any Members of the House outside of the members of the Commission knew that it was intended to spend \$72 million on the construction of a new House Office Building. I think if the Members of the House had known that the intention of the Architect was to spend \$72 million in constructing a new House Office Building, that the House would have disapproved that proposal.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It does seem that this is an open-end appropriation bill, because section 2 says:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

It is an unlimited right to spend the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is a member of the committee, I understand, that considered this legislation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the committee received information which would inform the committee as to whether the contracts for the work under these bills will be on a negotiated basis or whether they will be on the basis of competitive bidding, or just how will they be let?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not know about the proposed repairs to the building. I do know as to the furniture. The furniture will not be purchased by

competitive bidding. It will be bought by selection of the Senate committee, I think that is a proper procedure. It will be a very fine structure, and when they furnish it, they ought to furnish it in keeping with the building.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I was referring to the method of bidding.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama mentioned the renovation of this Chamber. A proper resolution was presented for the drawing of plans for this Chamber. The plans were drawn, and then estimates were submitted to this House for confirmation, and then we were authorized an exact amount of dollars that could be used for construction. The same applied to the White House. A commission was appointed to study and submit plans, and they came back to the House and asked for money for construction. The same way with the Supreme Court Building; the same way with the Federal court building. We have always followed the process of allowing money for plans and specifications and then coming back to the Congress and getting an authorization for construction—we never have used the procedure of blank checks—why do it now?

I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska when he read section 2 on page 2 and called it a blank check:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

This Mr. Chairman is an outright blank check, unlimited amount, and may I call to your attention, and I quote from the bill—"including expenditures for personal and other services as may be necessary"—that clause allows them to spend what they want and the sky is the limit, if they so desire, is that the proper way to operate this construction program—I say it is not. We have no objection to the other body having a new building. This bill is for remodeling the old Senate Office Building. Why can we not know how much it will cost—there should be no secret. But certainly in this case, this is not an emergency. They have plenty of time to draw their plans and to submit to this body an estimate of cost, and then your people and my people will know what we are doing for ourselves. It is their money we are spending.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the people who are doing everything within

their power to stop the private development at Hells Canyon should fully realize the responsibility which they will bear if they are successful. The Pacific Northwest States of Oregon, Washington and Idaho are facing an immediate and critical shortage of electric power. All of them, but particularly eastern Oregon and southern Idaho, will need substantial amounts of additional power in 1958 and increasingly greater amounts each year thereafter.

If the private development is brought to a halt, then it will be the responsibility of those who have stopped it to secure immediate appropriations from the Federal Government to the tune of \$100 millions per year for each of the next 5 years in order to build the Federal dam at Hells Canyon and its transmission lines in order that the area can receive electric power by 1964.

Congress has never before appropriated as much as \$100 million for one project in any one year. This year, for example, it is appropriating only \$25 million to start the entire upper Colorado River project. Only once since 1940—17 years ago—has Congress appropriated over \$50 million for a single project at any one session. That was \$63.5 million for construction of The Dalles. And only twice in the same period of time has it provided as much as \$60 million for area projects—as distinguished from single projects. This was for the Central Valley and Columbia Basin projects.

If the sponsors of the Federal dam at Hells Canyon are not successful in getting appropriations of \$100 million per year and should they receive appropriations of only \$25 million per year, no power would be produced from the project until 1978—more than 20 years hence. It should be remembered that the private development will be producing power in 1958.

I hope that these people who insist upon Federal development or nothing fully realize the responsibility which will be theirs in attempting to come up with this \$500 million. Also, they should make it patently clear to the people in the area that the Hells Canyon bill now before the Congress does not appropriate 5 cents, and that the passage of this bill does not mean that construction can start. There is no chance of receiving the first installment of \$100 million until at least 1958, and construction can commence only after sufficient money is appropriated.

Even if the Federal-Government-or-nothing advocates do produce to the tune of \$100 million per year, the area will suffer far more than mere inconvenience until the Federal power is brought on the line, which cannot possibly be before 1964 at the most optimistic earliest.

Delay in private development, which is the only means available for providing power to meet the immediate and expanding shortage, would not only mean a halt in progress for the area but economic chaos and retrogression from which it might not recover for decades.

The proponents of the Federal project must not leave the area in the position of forcing abandonment of one develop-

ment unless they can be absolutely certain that they can get the money to build their own project.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of our committee [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I felt constrained to vote against this measure in committee and feel constrained to do so here on the floor. As I said with respect to the 2 bills that preceded this 1 today, S. 1430 and S. 1428, it seems to me that although we recognize the fact that there is a historic background of traditional relationship to the other body, we also have certain obligations to our constituents. I do not believe that we can simply go back to our constituents and say that because of certain historic traditional relationships between the two bodies we never took the time to look into the cost of certain bills authorizing expenditures.

This bill is a bill to authorize a large expenditure or a small expenditure. We have no evidence from the hearings how much will be authorized. It seems to me, in order to be fair to our constituents, that we should say to the other body, "Would you please give us a maximum estimate of cost so that we may have something to go by before we pass this bill?" For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I cannot and will not vote for this bill in its present form.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from California that I concur emphatically and completely in the statement he has just made.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. There was some talk of remodeling our Old House Office Building during the period when we were constructing the new one. Were any estimates submitted of the cost of that, or was any authorization applied for to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. As far as the House Office Building is concerned, we have had no bill before the Committee on Public Works with regard to it. We had a bill many years ago authorizing a survey, but there has been no bill since that came to the House Committee on Public Works.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. I assume there was some justification for passing the two bills that preceded this. But does the gentleman not think that there is far less justification for approving this bill because there is plenty of time, plenty of opportunity for the other body to determine what the cost of this remodeling will be and to give the House an estimate without prejudicing the work of that body in remodeling the old building? There is no unusual exigency involved in this instance, is there?

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman has made a very accurate statement.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I voted for the bill that preceded this on the theory that the two Senate Office Buildings were an actuality, whether they were desired or not. But as I understand this is a matter of first impression; is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. Would the gentleman please restate that question?

Mr. FORRESTER. This is a matter of first impression with us. In other words, we are starting from scratch on the question whether or not we are going to authorize this work at this time?

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. That being true, I want to say to the gentleman that I expect to vote against this bill because I think at the present time we can operate as we have been operating, particularly with the new building. I do not think this is the time to undertake this extra expense.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Does the gentleman not think that the proper procedure would be to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions that a cost estimate should be provided the committee, and then the committee may report out a bill, so that we will know what we are voting for?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that would be true.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I made a brief statement on the last bill and I merely want to put myself on record in the same way on this one.

All of these bills were up before the Rules Committee for a rule, all three of them. The first bill we passed this afternoon was an authorization for an increased amount to complete the Senate Office Building. That was all right. It had the dollar amount in there that was needed. This bill is an open-end authorization with no limitation whatsoever, no guidepost, no instructions, but just saying that the Architect of the Capitol can spend such money as he finds necessary to remodel the Senate Office Building, without saying how it is to be remodeled and whether there are any plans.

In my humble judgment and with all due deference to everybody concerned, I do not think there is any sense in that kind of procedure. We have plenty of time to have plans made. They have to make plans, they have to get estimates, and they have plenty of time to have the plans and the estimates made and come back here with a dollar figure on what this thing is going to cost.

I just think it is an abdication of our duty to appropriate money, and that we just ought not to do it. I feel impelled to say this, although I regret very much

to differ with what the other body wants to do. I know it is not considered just exactly the polite thing to do. Nevertheless, there is a principle involved here of simply abdicating completely and leaving it to somebody else without any limitations whatsoever, and that is the breadth of this language here. I just do not think we ought to do it. We have been going along with the Senate's saying it is all right for us to do whatever we want to do for our housekeeping, and the House's saying it is all right for the Senate to do whatever they want to do. But do you know what that policy has gotten us into? We tried in the hearing before the Rules Committee to find out what all these new buildings up here were going to cost, and the best that the Architect of the Capitol could say was that we were being obligated on all these new buildings we are building up here and the land and buildings we are buying and all the furniture we are putting into them to somewhere between \$300 and \$400 million, at a time when we are telling our constituents how strong we are for economy.

I do not think we ought to do this thing. I do not think we are discommoding anybody, I do not think we are being discourteous to anybody, I do not think we are insulting anybody if we simply say, "Will you please tell us what these things are going to cost," and let us put it in the bill so we will know what we are doing.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] about the authorizations heretofore made, I call his attention to the fact that Public Law 71, Eighty-first Congress, First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, approved May 24, 1949, provided the requested supplemental appropriation of \$2,274,500 for the House roof and Chamber improvements and the authority to enter into cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for the House improvements, and vested the special House Roof and Chamber Committee with the authority to fix the limit of cost for the House project; also ratified any obligations incurred prior to May 24, 1949, under authority of Public Law 62, 81st Congress.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am very happy the gentleman has brought out that point. That concurs exactly with what we have been saying. There is a limit. Therefore, it is in the law. In what you are asking us to do this afternoon there is no limit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is no limit in the authorization because the Commission was given a task the same as is contained in this bill, and the same as contained in the White House renovation bill and similar acts. At no time since this Senate Office Building construction has been authorized has there been any question about the general authority for the Senate Commission to go about their task of furnishing the new building and to take into account the

reequipment and the rehabilitation of the old building. We have passed two bills here, so now let us go ahead and complete the job while we are at it.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think there is a little difference between this bill and the other two bills. The other two projects are underway and are practically completed. We know that they have to be furnished right away, and everything else has to be done. There you have a time element which is pretty significant. That is the reason I supported the gentleman as far as approving those bills is concerned. But here I think you have an entirely different situation.

I would like to ask the gentleman this: Is there present authority for the Architect of the Capitol to prepare plans and get estimates and do the preliminary detail work as for as the renovation and remodeling of the present building is concerned?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the very purpose of this bill, to authorize the Commission and the Architect to go about the business of drawing up plans and specifications for the proper renovation of the building.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Then would the gentleman have any objection, for instance, to striking out lines 6, 7, and 8 on page 1, which authorizes them and directs them to enlarge and remodel the office suits and to make structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements. That is a matter of actual construction. That is not a matter of authorizing them to prepare plans.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would object to that because I think we would ultimately face the problem anyway, and I think the present members of the Senate Office Building Commission, who are Senator CHAVEZ, Chairman; Senator GREEN, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator KEER, Senator BRIDGES, Senator MALONE, Senator PURTELL, and Senator MUNDT are going to do their job well. They are the members of the Senate Office Building Commission. They will do this job and do it just as frugally and just as economically as they possibly can, and at the same time uphold the dignity that the Senate Office Building should have. I cannot understand why this gets to be such a serious problem at this time when this job has been going on for years. The President in his budget has always included the item requested by the other body every year. The Senate Office Building, as the gentleman knows, was discontinued during the Korean War; that is, the construction of it was discontinued. Then we started back on it again in 1955 when we expended \$6 million, and then we spent \$8½ million in 1956 and \$5¼ million in 1957. So if we are in the situation that we can afford to build the Senate Office Building and equip it, then we certainly should go about the job of completing it and renovating the old building, and I hope the committee will be sustained in its action.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to

the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that while I mean no disrespect for the Senate, I am not in support of S. 1429 to authorize the enlargement and remodeling of the existing Senate Office Building.

Earlier this afternoon I voted against S. 1428, an act to authorize the purchase of furniture for the new Senate Office Building.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been a historic custom I realize for the House of Representatives to accept measures authorizing and appropriating funds for the other legislative body, just as its Members by practice have not questioned our spending. But my objective here is based on the point that the procedure in the past has been to show costs and set a limit on the amount which could be expended. But that is not the case here. Therefore, in order to register disapproval of a procedure of not specifying the figure which could be spent, I voted for recommitment of S. 1428. Senators must have furniture, but I have listened to talk here today of chairs costing from \$400 to \$600; and testimony from the committee hearing shows there is no limit on an amount any one Senator can spend, nor is there a purchasing agent to call for competitive bids.

As to the bill before us to enlarge and remodel the existing Senate Office Building, likewise, there are no plans or specifications. Section 2 of the bill includes expenditures for personal and other services. This is a blank check and I do not know what for.

I voted against the New House Office Building; so opposition from me is not inconsistent. However, let me say my vote against the House Office Building was an economy vote—I felt we could get by perfectly well without a new building to cost nearly \$100 million. My vote, when the time comes today, will be on a different principle. I do not wish to tell Senators not to spend. Rather I object here to an open-ended authority with no stated limit to the amount.

Perhaps the debate and action on this measure will serve toward establishing a new policy or relationship between the House and Senate. I hope so. I would not generate a feeling of rancor or lack of cooperation. Instead, an agreement could be made that in future there will be no open-ended authorizations.

Frankly, extravagance, at this time, by the legislative branch of the Federal Government to me is poor taste and poor politics, too. I want my people at home to know that I do not favor a double standard—economy for the taxpayers; extravagance for their elected representatives.

I stand for economy for both and that is the way I have been voting and I expect to continue on that course until a tax reduction is in order.

So, as I say, I do not support this legislation and shall vote accordingly.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago—May 13, 1955, to be exact—the District of Columbia, with

financial aid of the taxpayers all over the United States, completed construction of a \$677,400 elementary school building at East Capitol and 55th Streets NE. The property, including a well equipped playground, covers an entire block.

Known as the Marion P. Shadd school, it has 26 classrooms, auditoriums, cafeterias and all modern facilities. There are 32 teachers in addition to clerical and maintenance workers. Students total about 1,300, ranging from kindergarten through the 6th grade. It is an all-colored school in an all-colored community of modern, spacious apartments and homes.

This is one of the finest school plants in Washington or anywhere else. It is architectural and cultural landmark, an institution of which the residents of that Negro community should be very proud.

However, this beautiful edifice is being destroyed—literally ripped to bits by vandals and hoodlums—while people of the neighborhood stand by in apparent disinterest. The Marion P. Shadd school is rapidly becoming a landmark of shame to the very people it is intended to serve.

I inspected this school a few days ago, Mr. Chairman. I found hundreds of window panes broken. Mud and filth have been hurled against the building. Empty beer cans are scattered about the premises, piles of filth lie in the doorways, outdoor electrical equipment and entrance lights broken and destroyed. Three or four windows at the cafeteria end of the building have been boarded up by the school authorities because vandals break window glass as fast as it is replaced. Obscene words and crude drawings cover portions of the neat little frame annex used for kindergarten pupils.

This has been going on since the school was opened, I was informed by the distressed principal, Mrs. Lillian S. Glascoe, who has been a teacher in the District of Columbia school for 34 years. The cost of replacing broken windows and repairing other damage to the building already has run into thousands of dollars, she told me. She says she has vainly sought cooperation of adults in the area.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, because Washington, as the seat of government, is a congressional responsibility. Perhaps some of my colleagues may have suggestions as to how this shameful situation might be corrected.

My own background as a teacher and a school administrator convinces me that this is a shocking example of the lack of adult interest in the schools established for their children. The Negro people who live in this area are allowing their magnificent institution to be turned into a landmark of shame to them.

If we look more penetratingly into the problems of juvenile delinquency, we can see that parental delinquency and disinterest are prime factors.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further request for time the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), as amended, is authorized and directed to enlarge and remodel Senators' suites and to make structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to and approved by the Senate Office Building Commission.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. JONES of Alabama (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], what is meant by this language on page 2, line 10:

Expenditures for personal and other services.

What are "expenditures for personal services"?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that it is going to be necessary to employ architects to submit plans to the Commission. This would authorize the Commission to make expenditures to acquire expert advice with respect to the structural design of the building.

I will say further to the gentleman that this follows the same language generally employed in such authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. If I remember correctly most of the bills that provide for the employment of architects specify architects, they do not say "personal services."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me call the gentleman's attention to page 3 of the report, the second paragraph. That will inform the gentleman what is meant by that language.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

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

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

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama a question? Would he agree to a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] which would provide for the very basic thing he says he wants done,

namely to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications, and eliminate from this bill the authorization to proceed with the actual remodeling?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think I answered that question which was propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. In my answer to him I said I thought it was necessary for us to go ahead and to pass this bill because the architect plans to have the Senate start moving into the new building in January of next year. It is going to take some time to set up the plans and the proposals to renovate the existing Senate Office Building. For that reason I cannot agree to the delay and I do not think we should employ those dilatory tactics.

Mr. SCHERER. It is not a matter of being dilatory. This is giving us an opportunity to determine the cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have read the language on page 3 of the report. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the committee, would agree to an amendment to strike out the language providing expenditures for personal services and substitute "Architectural services"? Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman that he should not indulge in any fears on that point. I do not think the personal service part of it is going to develop into anything that will mean they are paying for something they will not get.

Mr. GROSS. I submit to the House that not only in the matter of expenditures for remodeling the present Senate Office Building but also in the matter of personal services and other provisions in the bill, this is a blank check, a complete blank check.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is more rigid than language we have written into previous bills which provided that the Commission shall have authority to make any and all expenditures in carrying out the act. I think this language on a comparative basis with the existing legislation on the subject is rather restrictive.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, as I said before, and I want to reemphasize it, this is a complete and outrageous blank check spending bill. I am opposed to it and I want the RECORD to show that I am unqualifiedly opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed and continue to oppose the spending of some \$9½ million to remodel each of the House Office Buildings to provide each House Member with a three-room suite. It is my understanding that this bill would provide each Senator with at least a 5-room suite of offices. I have no need for a 3-room office and I can think of no good reason why a Member of the other body should need a minimum of 5 rooms.

This is no time to saddle upon the taxpayers such a bill of expense, and if wanting some facts and figures regarding costs is disturbing to the Members of the other body then it is time that there be a disturbance.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 1, line 3, insert "That the

Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), as amended, is authorized and directed to prepare plans to enlarge and remodel Senators' suites and to make structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate.

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there has been considerable controversy that has arisen concerning this particular project. Personally I feel that unless some compromise is reached there is the possibility that this bill may be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works.

The purpose of offering this substitute is to provide a method whereby the Senate can go ahead with the preparation through its Architect and engineers of the plans and specifications for renovation of the existing building, thereby not hampering in anyway the work they can do during the present and near future period of time. It will also facilitate the presentation to the Public Works Committee in the future of facts and figures upon which an authorization for the actual construction at a maximum cost figure can take place for the remodeling. Of course, the objective of the committee, so far as the minority members are concerned, who signed the minority report, is that there should be some limit on the amount of money authorized to be spent for this purpose. This amendment will not hamper, as I see it, the other body from going ahead with the work that needs to be done in the way of architectural planning, and it will also provide facts and circumstances that will be presented upon which a reasonable limitation can be placed sometime in the future through an authorization bill coming out of the Public Works Committee. Now, that is what it does. The amendment is rather simple, and I feel that it is a fair compromise in this admittedly difficult problem.

I am fully cognizant of the comity that of necessity exists between the House and the other body, and this amendment is offered in a constructive sense in order to guarantee that the project will not be in any way stalled or hampered.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for many, many years the Senate of the United States, or the other body, as some people call it, and this body have been working in perfect harmony as far as their specific business functions were concerned. It has worked fine. There has never been a time in my experience in this House when the House of Representatives voted something for itself that the Senate has ever changed one word in it.

Now, the other day we made a large appropriation. We did not specify exactly what it was all going to be used for in the legislative appropriation bill. The Senate accepted every word of our language; accepted the amount that we put in the bill, and I just want to call your attention to the fact that if we are going to have a real working legislature in the Congress of the United States, these two bodies must cooperate with each other; that they must know that the Senate of the United States knows more about what they need and what they want than we do, and that we know more about what we need and must have than they do. They have never changed any of the laws that we have passed with reference to buildings on this side of the Capitol, and I do not think we should change any of theirs if we want this comity to keep existing, and it must exist, if we are to have an effective legislature in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 47, noes 83.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1429) authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate, had directed him to report the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on third reading.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CRAMER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMER moves to recommit the bill, S. 1429, to the House Committee on Public Works, with instructions that the committee report the bill back to the House with specific figures as to the cost of the projects set forth in the title of said bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CRAMER. 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 148, nays 216, not voing 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—148

Abbutt	Baumhart	Blitch
Andrews	Bennett, Fla.	Boiton
Ashmore	Bennett, Mich.	Bosch
Avery	Bentley	Bray
Baldwin	Berry	Broomfield
Bass, N. H.	Betts	Brownson

Budge	Henderson	Ostertag
Burdick	Heselton	Pelly
Byrne, Ill.	Hiestand	Pillion
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Poff
Cederberg	Hoffman	Ray
Chamberlain	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Chipperfield	Holt	Rhodes, Ariz.
Church	Horan	Riehman
Cole	Jennings	Sadlak
Collier	Jensen	St. George
Corbett	Johansen	Schenck
Cramer	Johnson	Scherer
Cretella	Jonas	Schwengel
Cunningham,	Judd	Scott, Pa.
Iowa	Kean	Scrivner
Cunningham,	Keating	Scudder
Nebr.	Keeney	Seely-Brown
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Slier
Curtis, Mo.	Kitchin	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Krueger	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Laird	Smith, Wis.
Dennison	LeCompte	Springer
Devereux	Lispcomb	Staufner
Dies	McCulloch	Taber
Dixon	McDonough	Talle
Dooley	McGregor	Teague, Calif.
Dorn, S. C.	McIntire	Tewes
Dowdy	McIntosh	Thomson, Wyo.
Dwyer	McMillan	Tollefson
Flynt	McVey	Tuck
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Utt
Forrester	Mason	Vorys
Fountain	Mathews	Vursell
Gary	May	Weaver
George	Michel	Whitten
Griffin	Miller, Nebr.	Widnall
Gross	Minshall	Wigglesworth
Haley	Moore	Williams, Miss.
Harden	Mumma	Williams, N. Y.
Harrison, Nebr.	Murray	Wilson, Ind.
Harrison, Va.	Nimtz	Winstead
Harvey	Norblad	Withrow
Hemphill	O'Hara, Minn.	Younger

NAYS—216

Abernathy	Engle	Lankford
Addonizio	Evins	Lesinski
Albert	Fallon	Long
Alexander	Farbstain	McCormack
Allen, Calif.	Fascell	McFall
Andersen,	Feighan	McGovern
H. Carl	Fenton	Macdonald
Anderson,	Fisher	Mack, Ill.
Mont.	Flood	Madden
Ashley	Forand	Magnuson
Aspinall	Frazier	Mahon
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Maillard
Ayres	Friedel	Marshall
Baker	Fulton	Martin
Baring	Garmatz	Meador
Bass, Tenn.	Gathings	Morrow
Beckworth	Gavin	Metcalfe
Belcher	Gordon	Miller, Calif.
Blatnik	Granahan	Miller, Md.
Boggs	Gray	Mills
Boland	Green, Oreg.	Montoya
Bolling	Gregory	Morgan
Bonner	Griffiths	Morris
Bow	Gubser	Morrison
Boykin	Hagen	Moss
Boyle	Hale	Moulder
Brooks, La.	Hardy	Multer
Brooks, Tex.	Harris	Natcher
Brown, Ga.	Haskell	Neal
Brown, Mo.	Hays, Ark.	Nicholson
Brown, Ohio	Hays, Ohio	Norrell
Broyhill	Healey	O'Brien, Ill.
Burleson	Hébert	O'Hara, Ill.
Bush	Hess	O'Neill
Byrd	Hill	Osmers
Byrne, Pa.	Hillings	Passman
Cannon	Holifield	Patman
Carnahan	Holland	Patterson
Carrigg	Hosmer	Perkins
Chelf	Huddleston	Pfost
Chenoweth	Hull	Plicher
Chudoff	Hyde	Poage
Clark	Ikard	Polk
Clevenger	Jackson	Preston
Coad	Jarman	Price
Coffin	Jenkins	Prouty
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Cooper	Karsten	Eadwan
Curtin	Kearns	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Reuss
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	Riley
Denton	Keogh	Roberts
Dingell	Kilday	Robeson, Va.
Dollinger	Kilgore	Robson, Ky.
Dorn, N. Y.	King	Rodino
Doyle	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Durham	Kluczyński	Rogers, Fla.
Edmondson	Lane	Rogers, Miss.
Elliott	Lanham	Rogers, Tex.

Rooney	Smith, Kans.	Vanik
Roosevelt	Smith, Miss.	Van Pelt
Rutherford	Spence	Van Zandt
Rutangelo	Stagers	Vinson
Saund	Steed	Watts
Scott, N. C.	Sullivan	Wier
Seiden	Teller	Willis
Sheehan	Thomas	Wolverton
Shuford	Thompson, La.	Wright
Sieminski	Thompson, Tex.	Yates
Sikes	Thornberry	Young
Simpson, Pa.	Trimble	Zablocki
Sisk	Udall	

NOT VOTING—69

Adair	Diggs	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alger	Donohue	O'Konski
Allen, III.	Eberharter	Philbin
Andresen,	Fino	Porter
August H.	Fogarty	Powell
Anfuso	Grant	Reece, Tenn.
Arends	Green, Pa.	Reed
Bailey	Gwinn	Rivers
Barden	Halleck	Saylor
Barrett	Herlong	Shelley
Bates	Holtzman	Sheppard
Beamer	James	Taylor
Becker	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Bowler	Kearney	Thompson, N. J.
Breeding	Knutson	Ullman
Buckley	Landrum	Wainwright
Canfield	Latham	Walter
Celler	Lennon	Westland
Christopher	Loser	Wharton
Colmer	McCarthy	Whitener
Coudert	McConnell	Wilson, Calif.
Dawson, III.	Machrowicz	Zelenko
Dellay	Miller, N. Y.	
Derounian	Morano	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Gwinn.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Dellay.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Bates.
 Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Wainwright.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Becker.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Beamer.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Westland.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Coudert.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Latham.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Grant with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Wilson of California.
 Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Derounian.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Morano.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. James.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wharton.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. August H. Andresen.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Alger.
 Mr. Bowler with Mr. McConnell.
 Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Breeding with Mr. O'Konski.

Messrs. BOYKIN, HASKELL, BONNER, and ASHLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMITTING HUNGARIAN ESCAPEES INTO THE UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, within our shores we have 33,000 people without a country. It is true they reside in our United States. They work on our farms and in our factories and live just about like the average American citizen.

These 33,000 persons are those young and old who have escaped Communist Hungary after the revolts there last fall. Over 130,000 escaped over the border into Austria. Most of them now live in other free countries.

We have partially lived up to the expectations of our humane conscience by the admission of these Hungarian escapees into the United States on a parole basis. The emergency Hungarian refugee operation, as initiated by our Immigration and Naturalization Service, with able assistance from the Department of State and the consular services, was marvelously successful, as far as it went.

The program probably would not have been a reality if it were not for the countless religious and charitable non-profit organizations which set up machinery in Austria and the center at Camp Kilmer, N. J., to assist in sponsorship, transportation and countless other problems.

We have acted with deliberate haste in rescuing these brave persons who fled their beloved nation at risk of life and limb rather than live in their once free country now under the yoke of Communist tyranny and cruelty.

Section 212 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that the Attorney General may, in his discretion, parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he prescribes for emergency reasons, or reasons in the public interest, any alien making application for admission. This is the provision by which the 33,000 Hungarians were admitted.

However, the section goes on further to state that when the purposes of such parole have been met, the alien shall forthwith be returned to the custody from which he was paroled, Hungary, in this case, and dealt with in the same manner as any ordinary applicant for admission to the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances facing those Hungarians admitted, this provision of law is unrealistic, impractical and, in fact, has no meaning. It is also unfair and inconsistent with our initial endeavors to provide asylum for these escapees from the Iron Curtain.

No one can say with any degree of certainty what is in store for the Hungarian Nation. Whether there will be more revolts leading to Communist evacuation, whether such revolts will only tend to strengthen Moscow's hold on the area, or whether the Communists will sud-

denly decide to bequeath independence, we do not really know.

Our Government certainly will not revoke parole privileges to any Hungarian citizen wishing to remain here. The point is, under the existing law, the status of permanent residence cannot be conferred upon these people. They remain here indefinitely in an atmosphere of uncertainty, confusion, and lukewarm acceptance into our society.

Early this session of Congress, President Eisenhower urged special legislation to grant these persons and others, who flee from totalitarian governments, the status of permanent residence. This would enable them to apply for United States citizenship, which no doubt many would do. Some may elect to return to Hungary when it is once again free, but regardless, each alien should be given the freedom of choice.

Since February 6, 1957, my bill H. R. 4505, has been pending in the Immigration subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. There are probably many other similar bills. Mine would simply admit for permanent residence aliens who flee, or who have fled the persecution and tyranny of any totalitarian government.

It also includes relief for Korean orphans, adopted children and others here on parole basis, and there is a reasonable limitation of the number who can be admitted under the bill, namely, no more than the average number of aliens who, in the past 8 years, have entered by special acts of Congress.

It is intolerable that Congress has to this date ignored the plea of the President on the need for this legislation, and equally as appalling is our failure to see that this, or similar legislation, would give a semblance of permanency, order, and happiness to the lives of the 33,000 Hungarians involved.

In the minds of many persons throughout the world, it might very well appear that the United States felt it had to uphold her position as the leader of the free world by admitting a portion of the 130,000 Hungarians, who escaped over into Austria, but that our actions were more automatic, in attempts to protect our position, rather than genuine and heartwarming.

This is the kind of poison from which the Communist propaganda creature feeds, and the result could be a lessening of our prestige as the forerunner of anti-communism.

An editorial appeared on June 26 in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the subject I discuss and I should like to include it at this point.

REFUGEES IN LIMBO

Refugees from last autumn's revolt in Hungary continue to enter the United States under the parole provision of the immigration laws. There are now some 33,000 of them here, settled in jobs or in university work and seeking to put together a new life. But because Congress has refused to move on the package of immigration law changes recommended by President Eisenhower, the Hungarian parolees live in a sort of political limbo, uncertain whether they really have a future here or anywhere.

They may not apply for citizenship and thus are foreclosed from some job opportu-

nities. They are uncertain whether to sink their roots too deeply in anything, such as homeownership, careers, and educational programs. Thus their potential contributions to American life are limited, and their personal lives are blighted. No doubt many greatly prefer this situation to life under communism, but it is not the best that America can offer, and it is a poor reward for their valiant defiance of the Russian suppression.

If it is too late in this session for action on the many revisions that are needed in the basic immigration statutes, it is not too late to authorize paroled refugees to seek citizenship. This is a step that cannot be indefinitely postponed by Congress without great harm to America's reputation and to many deserving would-be Americans.

Up to now our efforts in behalf of Hungary and her refugees have been well directed but pitifully insufficient. Why, for example, did we close down the emergency program when, as pointed out in the New York Times on Wednesday, there are still thousands of Hungarian teen-agers still stuck in Austrian camps?

Hundreds of these persons have seen no hope and returned to Hungary. Will official indifference—not on the part of some remote European bureaucrat but of our own American Government—kill all hopes for those who remain, asks the Times?

To my understanding, there was never a numerical limitation imposed on the Hungarians admitted under this program, and I will be very curious indeed about the explanation I intend to get from the Immigration and Naturalization Service as to why the program has, for all intents and purposes, been terminated.

I do not think the United States is in a position to pat itself on the back for maximum effort in relieving the plight of escaped Hungarians, because, in plain words, we have not done as much as we should or could.

It is encouraging to note, however, that Congress has expressed its official sentiment on the Communist treachery in Hungary by passing a resolution affirming the United Nations 24 Free World nations report on the revolt and urging a special session. According to the latest information, it was agreed the report will be brought up in a special session early in September, much to the dismay of Russia and her satellite servants.

This represents a tremendous victory by the Free World over suppression and murder by the Communists. It should be followed up by a forceful and imaginative program of our own by which our genuine concern is expressed and positive action taken for the people remaining in Hungary, those in Austria wishing desperately to seek a home in the United States, and those who are already here but as yet are unable to exercise the privilege of gaining permanent residence and future citizenship.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber when my name was reached on the rollcall which has just been completed, although I was here during a part of the debate and also before the rollcall was completed. How-

ever, I cannot qualify to be recorded. If I had the opportunity to vote I would have voted "no." During practically all of this day I have been in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, hearing witnesses testifying on various bills affecting cotton. On one quorum call, and on the other rollcall today I left the committee in time to be present when my name was called. When the bells rang on this last rollcall, I misjudged the time necessary to get to the Chamber before the Clerk reached my name. The only reason I make this explanation is to indicate that I was not absent and have been engaged in official work in the interest of my constituents during the entire day.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the Speaker will permit a parliamentary inquiry, there have been an increasing number of announcements in the last few weeks by Members on how they would have voted if present when the roll was called. May I ask the Speaker, as to the practice?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri raised that question with the Chair the other day and stated that it was unparliamentary for a Member who could not qualify to announce later on that had he been here he would have voted yea or nay. Now, the Chair does not know of any way that we could keep a Member from asking unanimous consent to proceed for a minute or an hour and announce before a bill was brought up how he was going to vote if he was present or how he would have voted when the matter came up. So the Chair cannot see any reason for not allowing Members to express themselves how they would have voted or how they are going to vote. If there is any rule of the House that that violates, the Chair does not know anything about it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the Speaker's inquiry, may I quote from section 3151 of the Precedents of the House.

3151. It is not in order after a record vote on which he failed to vote for a Member to announce how he would have voted if present.

On February 6, 1915, Mr. John E. Raker, of California, rising in his place, said:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to make a statement for a minute. I was here yesterday afternoon, but on account of sickness in my family I was called out and could not get back in time to vote on the motion to recommit the naval appropriation bill. I returned, but too late to have my vote recorded. If I had been here, I would have voted against the motion to recommit.

Mr. James R. Mann of Illinois made the point of order that the statement was wholly improper.

The Speaker sustained the point of order and said:

The statement is out of order.

As a matter of fact, Speaker RAYBURN, in the first session of the 73d Congress, in passing on a similar point of order, read the first section of rule XV, including:

After the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote.

The rule is founded on sound policy. Such announcements may be cited in contrast with others who failed to vote, as an inference of less interest in the proceedings and less attention to the question at issue.

If one Member makes the announcement, critics may make it the occasion of inquiry as to why other absent Members did not announce a position on the vote.

The pair clerks pair all members who do not vote. Subsequent announcement of how a Member would have voted if present automatically places the Member, with whom he is paired, on the other side of the question.

Such practice renders Members less responsive to inconvenient rollcalls, when their position can later be announced at a more convenient time.

No Speaker has ever held such announcements in order.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I was detained when the vote was taken. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was called from the floor yesterday afternoon to a meeting. Had I been here on rollcall No. 124, I would have voted "nay."

VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 115) to provide an interim extension for the voluntary home mortgage credit program.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 610 (a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 15, 1957."

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

DISCLOSURE OF CHARITABLE, BENEVOLENT, PATRIOTIC, OR OTHER SOLICITATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3400) to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 1, after "the" insert "financial."

Page 4, strike out lines 16 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

(7) to prescribe by regulation the form of and the information to be contained in the solicitor information cards required by this act, and to prescribe the manner of reproduction and authentication of such cards; and

Page 4, line 24, after "act", insert "The Commissioners shall, in publishing the results of any such investigation, have power to publish information concerning the officers and members of the governing board of any organization coming within the purview of this act: *Provided*, That such information shall not include membership and contribution lists of any such organization."

Page 5, strike out all after line 15 over to and including line 5 on page 6 and insert:

"(b) The provisions of this act shall not apply to any person making solicitations, including solicitations for educational purposes, solely for a church or a religious corporation or a corporation or an unincorporated association under the supervision and control of any such church or religious corporation: *Provided*, That such church, religious corporation, corporation or unincorporated association is an organization which has been granted exemption from taxation under the provisions of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954: *Provided further*, That such exemption from the provisions of this act shall be in effect only so long as such church, religious corporation, corporation or unincorporated association shall be exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section and sections 5, 6, 7, and 9 shall not apply to any person making solicitations (1) solely for the American National Red Cross or (2) exclusively among the membership of the soliciting agency.

"(d) The Commissioners may by regulation prescribe the terms and conditions under which solicitations in addition to those enumerated in subsection (b) of this section may be exempted from the provisions of subsection (a) of this section and sections 6 and 7: *Provided*, That no exemption granted under authority of this subsection (d) shall exceed for any calendar year \$1,500 in money or property."

Page 6, line 12, strike out "Commission" and insert "Commissioners."

Page 9, after line 12, insert:

"Sec. 12. (a) No person who is required to obtain a certificate of registration under this act shall, for the purpose of soliciting contributions, use the name of any other person, except that of an officer, director, or trustee of the organization for which contributions are solicited, without the written consent of such other person.

"(b) A person shall be deemed to have used the name of another person for the purpose of soliciting contributions if such latter person's name is listed on any sta-

tionary, advertisement, brochure, or correspondence in or by which a contribution is solicited by or on behalf of a charitable organization or his name is listed or referred to in connection with a request for a contribution as one who has contributed to, sponsored, or endorsed the charitable organization or its activities.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the publication of names of contributors without their written consents, in an annual or other periodic report issued by a charitable organization for the purpose of reporting on its operations and affairs to its membership or for the purpose of reporting contributions to contributors."

Page 9, line 13, strike out "12" and insert "13 (a)."

Page 9, after line 19, insert:

"(b) Prosecutions for violations of this act, or the regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

"(c) The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants is hereby empowered to maintain an action or actions in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia to enjoin any person from soliciting in violation of this act or in violation of any regulation made pursuant to this act."

Page 9, after line 19, insert:

"Sec. 14. Where any provision of this act refers to an office or agency abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824), such reference shall be deemed to be the office, agency, or officer now or hereafter exercising the functions of the office or agency so abolished. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as a limitation on the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952."

Page 9, line 20, strike out "13" and insert "15."

Page 9, line 25, strike out "14" and insert "16."

Page 10, line 2, strike out "15" and insert "17."

Page 10, line 2, strike out "14" and insert "16."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the charter of the House Un-American Activities Committee will have to be modernized in order to operate efficiently within the limits imposed by the recent Supreme Court decisions. I regard this as a purely legal procedures problem which can be simply and clearly resolved so I am today introducing a House resolution to amend the rules of the House. The changes which I propose will enable the committee to perform its functions

within the framework established by the Court decisions and keep its charter up to date by submitting an authorizing resolution to each new Congress. If my resolution is accepted by the House, I expect that the committee would submit a resolution that it feels will enable it to carry its work forward effectively.

The Supreme Court ruling requires vagueness in the committee authorization to investigate be cleared up. The difficulty is that if the resolution is made definite and specific it will not be sufficiently broad and general to cover the changing situations which develop over the years. It seems to me that the only practicable solution is to come in with a resolution at each new Congress which will meet the requirements that may exist at that particular time. That is what the proposed change in the rules provides.

The decision in the current Watkins Supreme Court case does not in any way strip Congress of its power to investigate. It does require the House, when it delegates investigative power to a committee, to define quite accurately the area of investigation. It also requires the committee to act within the boundary of that area. It seems to me that the delegation of authority can best be made timely and appropriate if it is brought up to date by each new Congress.

I am a westerner, and in the early days in Montana the big cattle spreads staked out their claims to ranges. If an outfit staked out, let us say, Willow Creek and the rangeland within grazing distance of it, he was in business, and his claim was generally respected. If on the other hand he laid claim to 20,000 square miles or to all the grass between the Rockies and the Little Snowies, and from Cascade to Canada then his claim was so big, so broad, so general that he would end up with a firm claim on nothing. The Un-American Activities Committee, by staking out the whole countryside has much less in hand than if they staked out a clear claim to a legitimate area of investigation related to its legislative responsibility, and appropriate to the time and circumstances of the investigation. Under my resolution every 2 years the committee would stake out whatever claim it felt was necessary to do the job then facing it.

Congressional investigations have proven themselves capable of fine accomplishments. The investigation of Teapot Dome by a senatorial committee headed by the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh of my State of Montana, President Truman's investigation of wartime profiteering, Senator McClellan's exposure of Dave Beck's activities and the need for corrective legislation, Senator Kefauver's investigations of crime and of Dixon-Yates, and accelerated depreciation in nondefense industries all served a valuable legislative purpose. Each was set up by resolution tailored and designed to accomplish its particular job.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the power to investigate is a limited power, subject to the same limitations which the Constitution imposes on the power to legislate, of which it is

an adjunct. To quote from the major opinion in the Watkins case:

An essential premise in this situation is that the House or Senate shall have instructed the committee members on what they are to do with the power delegated to them. It is the responsibility of the Congress, in the first instance, to insure that compulsory process is used only in furtherance of a legislative purpose. That requires that the instructions to an investigating committee spell out that group's jurisdiction and purpose with sufficient particularity. Those instructions are embodied in the authorizing resolution. That document is the committee's charter.

And further in the decision:

Combining the language of the resolution with the construction it has been given, it is evident that the preliminary control of the committee exercised by the House of Representatives is slight or nonexistent. No one could reasonably deduce from the charter the kind of investigation that the committee was directed to make.

In the opinion of the Court:

Protected freedoms should not be placed in danger in the absence of a clear determination by the House or the Senate that a particular inquiry is justified by a specific legislative need.

But, says the Court:

An excessively broad charter, like that of the House Un-American Activities Committee, places the courts in an untenable position if they are to strike a balance between the public need for a particular interrogation and the right of citizens to carry on their affairs free from unnecessary governmental interference. It is impossible in such a situation to ascertain whether any legislative purpose justifies the disclosures sought and, if so, the importance of that information to the Congress in furtherance of its legislative function. The reason no court can make this critical judgment is that the House of Representatives itself has never made it.

And the opinion summarizes:

Plainly these committees are restricted to the missions delegated to them, i. e., to acquire certain data to be used by the House or the Senate in coping with a problem that falls within its legislative sphere. No witness can be compelled to make disclosures on matters outside that area. This is a jurisdictional concept of pertinency drawn from the nature of a Congressional committee's source of authority.

The Court recognizes the importance of Congressional investigations, saying:

We are mindful of the complexities of modern government and the ample scope that must be left to the Congress as the sole constitutional depository of legislative power. Equally mindful are we of the indispensable function, in the exercise of that power, of Congressional investigations. The conclusions we have reached in this case will not prevent the Congress, through its committees, from obtaining any information it needs for the proper fulfillment of its role in our scheme of Government. The legislature is free to determine the kinds of data that should be collected.

Essentially, then, the Court reversed the Watkins conviction because the present rule under which the committee operates is so vague that witnesses called before it have no means of determining whether the questions put to them have any relevancy to a legitimate legislative purpose. In order to carry out adequately the indispensable func-

tion of Congressional investigations the resolution under which the Un-American Activities Committee would operate must be more explicit than its present rule. The only satisfactory way to have an adequate and up-to-date charter for this committee through the changing years is to bring in a resolution of authorization at each new Congress, as contemplated under my proposed resolution.

SECOND ANNUAL UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE FAIR—GREATEST MARKET PLACE IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today with pride introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair, to be held at the New York City Coliseum from May 7 to 17, 1958.

It is with great satisfaction and pleasure that I offer this resolution. I am honored to play whatever part I can to further the aims and objectives of the United States World Trade Fair because of its immeasurable value in creating better international understanding, economic advancement, and good will.

Last spring 43 nations participated officially in the First Annual United States World Trade Fair. Its 3,000 displays included products and raw materials from 60 countries.

The Fair attracted over 700,000 visitors, including approximately 125,000 buyers from all parts of the world. It is estimated that over \$1 billion in business, as well as invaluable contacts will result directly from the Fair.

These, indeed, are the statistics of success. They proved that the United States World Trade Fair is the only established, large-scale international exposition in the Americas. They demonstrate that the Fair is, in fact, the greatest market place in the Western Hemisphere for the efficient and effective exhibition, promotion, and volume sale of foreign products and services to buyers and the public.

Perhaps the most important reason why the United States World Trade Fair will be even more successful in May of 1958 is that it is a completely recognized, tested, and proven economic tool—a truly potent machine—for paving the highway to world peace and prosperity through world trade.

We have long since come to recognize the fact that world trade is not an economic condition which can exist in a partial vacuum; not something that is only good for the other nations as a premise for their purchasing exports from the United States. World trade is an economic common denominator among all nations. The sale of foreign

goods and commodities to this country provides the purchasing power necessary for building good customers for American-made products.

The people of the United States, as well as citizens of other nations throughout the world, realize that the well-being of all of us depends upon the ability of each to produce products, goods, and services which others need, want and will buy.

The United States World Trade Fair is a practical demonstration of this economic interrelationship of nations, through the facility it provides for the exchange of goods and services. It is a truly American answer to the need for improving political and economic conditions throughout the world, a means whereby the people of other nations can stabilize their domestic economies and raise their living standards with the pride, self-respect, and personal satisfaction of achievements derived from their own productivity and ingenuity.

The inherent values of world trade are woven into the fabric of our American tradition. As a colony, whose rights to free trade were throttled by the mother-country, we fought for and won our independence.

We created a new nation based on the economic idea of free enterprise, a man's right to take a chance, his right to sell his goods and services openly in the open market place without any interference and undue restrictions. As our Nation grew and expanded, new laws were added to the statute books to prevent monopolistic practices, to prohibit restrictions of trade in our own country.

In the course of our own growth and prosperity, through the devastating paths of two world wars to the new era of jet propulsion and atomic energy, we have seen the nations of the world drawn closer together. Today we find ourselves giving more thought, and more time, to the practicalities of an integrated international economy. We know that we must.

Just as once we accepted the fact that no man is an island to himself, we now accept the fact that no nation, however mighty or meek, can endure as an isolated entity.

A faltering economy in any nation is a sociological and political virus. It is a threat to the health and well-being of other nations. It has proven itself, time and time again, to be the germ of wars.

The United States, today, stands out as the leading nation in the struggle for world peace and prosperity. We have placed great premiums on accomplishing these aims over the last decade. We have directed our economic resources to restoring devastated lands. We have sought to strengthen nations by continuing investment, by providing materiel for protection, by military alliances. But economic and military aid are, at best, the pump-primers for world peace and prosperity. To generate lasting international harmony we must continue to foster and build a healthy world trade condition, in the best interests of all nations as well as ourselves.

That is why I urge that we join together, here and with our neighbors throughout the world, in a mutual determination, through such efforts as the

United States World Trade Fair, to accelerate a continuing, morally forceful, and responsible program of international trade.

As partners, neighbors, and freemen, we can achieve our common goals—peace, prosperity, and freedom on earth.

PROGRAM TO DECREASE THE SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS, AND TECHNICIANS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, June, the traditional graduation month, turns our attention toward education and the shortage of scientists, engineers, and top-level technicians.

National security and national progress require an ever-increasing number of people trained in the scientific disciplines.

It is idle to compare the enrollment in high-school science courses in 1900 with the enrollment today. The courses in 1900 were rudimentary; even science itself was elemental compared with the body of knowledge that has been discovered and verified since then.

The disturbing fact is the present and acute shortage of scientifically trained manpower; a shortage that fails to meet the needs of our expanding, industrialized society.

I propose a two-point program to alleviate this shortage:

One. To amend the immigration law by establishing a special annual quota to permit 25,000 qualified scientists and engineers from Communist or satellite countries to enter the United States each year. They would be refugees or escapees who would be carefully screened, both as to their competence, and their opposition to communism. In this manner, we would attract a number of "ready-made" scientists to meet our own needs, and at the same time we would be draining skilled personnel from the Communist countries, thereby weakening their capacity for aggression.

Two. Beyond our immediate needs, and to promote our own self-sufficiency in this respect, I offer a separate bill to provide tuition loans for needy and qualified high-school graduates who want to continue their education in the scientific fields. A revolving fund to finance such loans, would accomplish our purpose, and on a self-sustaining basis. The actual cost would be a small appropriation for administrative expenses. While it is true that many businesses, and institutions of higher learning, as well as many social and fraternal organizations, and private individuals, are providing scholarships; and a modest start has been made in financing tuition loans by traditional banking methods; these forms of assistance are unable to cope with the demand.

By the two approaches I suggest, we will be able to reduce the shortage of

scientifically trained manpower today and eliminate that shortage tomorrow.

The Science Teacher of April 1957 relays the following information. We are told that, in the United States today, we need 50,000 more scientists, 100,000 more engineers, X thousand more technicians, and X thousand more qualified science teachers.

The National Science Teachers Association, in covering all the problems involved in high school science teaching, brings out many facts. And among certain questions that need to be answered I mention these two:

First. Why do 50 percent of the high-school graduates of superior ability fail to go to college?

Second. Why do many high-school graduates with special scientific interests reveal little or no interest in college science courses?

The answer may be found in one of the association's proposals, namely:

The offering of more scholarships, awards, and recognition for students who show special capacity or outstanding achievement in scientific and other intellectual efforts.

It is clear however, that voluntary benevolence, is not sufficient to meet the need.

How many thousands of bright, young, scientific minds, never realize their own potentialities, and are lost to the Nation that needs them, because help was not available to them in time? How many of this June's graduating class will be unable to further their education, because the means are not present to give their minds the opportunity they deserve?

In a sense, we have established a precedent for this bill. After World War II, and the Korean war, the Federal Government helped millions of veterans to secure an education they could not otherwise afford.

The education allowance for each qualifying veteran not only included tuition, but expenses for subsistence, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. These allowances were outright payments, and not loans.

This was a subsidized educational program by outright grants.

The plan I propose would apply to all needy and qualified students, who take up scientific studies beyond the high-school level. And it would be confined to loans for tuition exclusively. In this manner, we would also be helping to build up our educational plant.

Under my bill, high-school graduates and students in the colleges and universities who meet the qualifications as established by the United States Office of Education in consultation with scientists, engineers, and the officials of our technical schools, would be eligible for tuition loans. These loans would be advanced by private lenders, and would be guaranteed by the Government.

Repayment would be scheduled over a reasonable period after graduation and/or subsequent employment.

The purpose of this bill is to insure maximum scientific educational opportunities for needy, qualified students, who are being priced out of a higher education. I want to emphasize that

this is a tuition loan program that would more than pay for itself in solving the problem of the scientific-manpower shortage. It would help to develop the brainpower that is needed even more than horsepower to insure our security and our progress in a changing world.

EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO ANSWER ROLL CALL NO. 124 ON THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT, H. R. 6287, APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the conference report on H. R. 6287, making appropriations for fiscal year 1958 for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I was called to the Senate side of the Capitol on important legislative business. While there, roll call No. 124 was directed on a motion made to recommit that conference report to the Committee of Conference. The adoption of the motion would have had the effect of delaying beyond the commencement of the new fiscal year, the appropriations for those departments and might have been interpreted as a vote to eliminate from the appropriations bill funds for the Department of Labor to enforce the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act as it applies to Federal aid to highways.

I returned to the House floor from the Senate side too late to answer my name and therefore could not qualify to be recorded on that roll call.

If present during the roll call I would have voted "no."

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader what the program is for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy to respond to the question. The only thing that might be called up tomorrow is the conference report on the Department of Interior appropriation bill. They have until midnight to file a report and that may be brought up. I understand that the conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill will not be brought up. I shall announce on tomorrow the program for next week. Of course, I like to take Members into my confidence as much as I can and in order to give them a bird's-eye view of the program for next

week I will say that there will be no business from Wednesday on. On Monday we take up the Consent Calendar and certain insurance features in connection with an atomic energy bill. There will be several suspensions which I shall announce tomorrow. Suspensions are screened by the leadership on both sides.

I do not know of any controversial legislation that might be up on Tuesday or Wednesday if we dispose of the atomic energy bill on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill may well come in tomorrow. I understand there is no controversy over that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mentioned the Interior Department appropriation bill. The gentleman refreshes my memory on the legislative appropriation bill, but usually that is adjusted so quickly, I overlooked it for the moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that the bill H. R. 72 will not be brought up next week; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. It will not be brought up next week.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very deeply troubled about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The lady need not be troubled about it next week.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I mean for the future.

ASSUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS BY SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States is slowly putting the Congress of the United States out of business.

In restricting the investigative committees of the House and Senate in the exercise of the obligations laid upon them by their respective bodies, the Court is assuming functions which are clearly legislative. From a position coequal with the executive and the judicial, the legislative branch is losing ground and will, unless remedial steps are taken by the Congress, find itself completely subordinated to the other two branches of Government.

There are two reasons why I am reluctant to criticize the Court or its decisions. The first and the most important of these goes to the respect which should be accorded the high tribunal by every citizen familiar with the Constitution and with the glorious tradition of the Supreme Court in our national history. In the second place, I am not a lawyer and cannot, with authority, go to the legal points involved in recent decisions. Therefore, I shall confine myself to the apparent effects of the Court's actions.

Any citizen of the United States is privileged, by virtue of his citizenship, to criticize constructively whomsoever

he will, always provided that his criticisms are contained within the framework of common decency and restraint. This course I presume to follow in what I shall have to say during my remarks today. I shall not engage in personalities, but confine myself to a discussion of general philosophical trends evidenced by the majority of the members of the Supreme Court during recent months, weeks, and days. As the members of the Court have the duty laid upon them to study and to pass upon matters of legal concern to the Nation and its people, so I consider it to be a solemn duty for me to speak my mind as a representative of the people whenever I sense that a threat to the Nation stems from the actions of either the executive or the judicial branches. While those learned in the law may attack the logic of my position, none can gainsay the sincerity with which my remarks are put on the RECORD.

While there have been decisions of the Court over the years with which I found myself in disagreement, I think that few of them lent aid, comfort, and assistance to our national enemies, nor enhanced a threat to the security of our people. In my opinion, several recent ones do, and it is with these that I propose today to deal. First, however, it is necessary to place the controversy in its proper context, historically, and to refresh the memories of some by a brief recital of circumstances which have led us into the present area of controversy and bitter dissension.

There have been different definitions of international communism, but, in essence, all have agreed, including those of the Supreme Court, upon several fundamental facts and premises. Today only the Communists themselves deny the substantial and proved arguments that:

First. Communism is an international conspiracy designed to insure the conquest, by force and violence if necessary, of governments and of men who oppose its tenets, precepts, and philosophy.

Second. The most effective instruments of Soviet conquest are deceit, intransigence, and political infiltration of governments and national institutions marked as targets for destruction.

Third. The proletariat revolution is best furthered in any country by the recruitment into the international Communist movement of nationals of countries which are targets of Soviet design.

Fourth. The agents of the international Communist movement forswear allegiance to their own governments on affiliation with the Communist apparatus, and become dedicated advocates of Communist aggression.

Fifth. Espionage, sabotage, and violence are standard operating procedures for Communist agents in all countries, and must be guarded against at all times where such agents are engaged in activities on behalf of the Soviet Union.

Sixth. The Communist apparatus at all levels operates in secrecy; that it bears no relationship to a political organization; that its adherents in all lands recognize and obey instructions and directives originating abroad and transmitted through a rigid and monolithic

chain of command, the top echelon of which is located in the Soviet Union.

Since 1848, communism has been on the march worldwide. The progenitors of the faith, for such it is, laid down the guidelines for world conquest in the Communist manifesto, and the doctrines enunciated in the manifesto have served as a rallying point for millions during the past century. In the hands of Lenin, Stalin, and more recently, Khrushchev, Communist philosophy has remained ever constant to the original precepts of the founders of the movement, although the exigencies of time and changing circumstances have required a reevaluation of tactics and techniques on many occasions. In our own time we have witnessed detours and the tangential deviations of Communist policy, the most recent of which saw the downgrading of Stalin and his subsequent reconsecration. But for all of what might appear aimless meanderings of Communist parties throughout the world, the thread of the manifesto has remained the taut guideline to which the Marxists have always returned when the immediate roadblock was cleared, or the need for diplomatic delay dissipated. The manifesto remains today the Koran, the Talmud, and the Bible of the Communists, refined and extended as its provisions and injunctions have been by the prophets who followed Marx and Engels.

The greatest single problem created in free lands by world communism has been the threat posed in any country by the recruitment into the Communist apparatus of nationals of those countries selected by the Reds for political, economic, or social attack. Historically, language difficulties, color, distinguishing racial characteristics, and other unmistakable traits, have rendered security against espionage, sabotage, and propaganda relatively simple. But, the Communist success in recruiting its agents from the streets, the universities, the laboratories, and the government services of the country selected as a victim, superimposed upon the old problems of counterespionage new and vexatious considerations. The theft of military and diplomatic secrets under the Communist plan of conquest, is preceded by the theft of minds, and a voluntary renunciation of previous allegiances, a process later to become known as "brainwashing." Having conquered a man's love of God, country, and his own national institutions, it was no task at all for Communist functionaries to convince a new recruit that his greater duty to mankind lay in treason to, and renunciation of, all of his previous moral, ethical, and patriotic values. Thus, every Communist, having pledged a new and terrible allegiance, became a willing agent dedicated to the destruction of his own homeland, so long as it remained free and outside the orbit of Communist domination. Even the death of thousands of free men on the battlefields of Korea and in the streets of Budapest was as nothing compared to the new crusade upon which the Communist found himself embarked. Law became a mockery, and justice, unless it be the fearful and immediate "justice" meted out to non-conformists by the Soviet secret police and "people's courts," became a thing to

be rebuked and scorned by every comrade. How ironic that American justice has spread its cloak around the chortling advocates of world disorder, insurrection, brutality, and conspiracy. How many supreme court justices of how many conquered lands, today lie in the earth with bullet holes in their skulls because they proffered justice to those who know neither justice nor mercy.

Differentiate, if you can, Mr. Speaker, between the Communists in their tanks on the streets of Budapest, and the Communists in the United States of America. The only significant difference is represented by the armor plate and the machine guns possessed by those who slaughtered unarmed men and women who dared rise up in revolt against their oppressors. If there is any difference between the brutal Communists in the Poznan and East German riots and those in Los Angeles who hailed the Supreme Court decision of June 17 as "our greatest victory," it is purely a geographic difference. There is certainly no philosophical distinction. The decisions of the High Court foreclosing Congressional inquiry and opening security case files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, whatever their legal merits, represent a victory greater than any achieved by the Soviet on any battlefield since the conclusion of World War II. What bitter mirth and what stunned unbelief the decisions must have occasioned in the concentration camps, cellars, sewers, the attics and the secret places where victims and the intended victims of Soviet "justice" plot their very survival under the guns of Red occupying forces.

I have a deep and lasting regard for the provisions of the American Constitution. It has been said, and I agree, that it must have been in some measure divinely inspired. I would protect every one of its amendments, including the battered provisions of the fifth, but I deplore what appears to be a continuing tendency to permit its living phrases to be distorted and twisted to meet the immediate needs of those whose dedicated and avowed purpose it is to destroy it and replace it with the constitution of the Soviet Union. For example, it is not the proper use of the fifth amendment to which millions of Americans object, but the premeditated and obscene distortion of its provisions. This misuse has served to bring the amendment into national disrepute and drape it with the regard and affection generally accorded a municipal ordinance regulating the keeping of goats within the city limits.

As of this moment the decisions of the Supreme Court have nullified and vitiated the attempts of the Congress to inquire into matters related to the national security of the United States and the safety of our people against the greatest aggression since that of Adolph Hitler. While tying the hands of the Congress, the Court has made it impossible for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to do the job expected of this Government agency by the Congress and the people. The Court has preempted the police powers of the sovereign States in the area of subversive activities and labor disputes, although the Congress

has never implied that this power should be exercised solely by the Federal Government. I do not know what fine points of law are involved, but I do contend that the present course of action is lending aid, comfort, and assistance to an enemy—an enemy with whom we are presently engaged in a struggle to the death. The Communists freed by the Supreme Court in the Los Angeles case and others, are now back in their secret meetings, plotting the destruction of the American system—gloating over their new-found liberty, and waving with unrestrained glee, their renewed licenses to drive through other men's liberty while drunk.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that two wrongs do not make a right, and that we should not, as a nation, emulate the conscionable injustices perpetrated by the Soviet on its own citizens in the name of national concern or national emotion. However, in the Los Angeles case, five defendants were acquitted by the Supreme Court, an act without precedent in the history of the Court, according to Justice Clark. These defendants, in the best American tradition, had been tried by a jury of their peers and had been adjudged guilty of conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. Justice Clark said, and for what a layman's opinion is worth, I agree, "This Court should not acquit anyone here. In its long history I find no case in which an acquittal has been ordered by the Court solely on the facts. It is somewhat late to start in now usurping the functions of the jury, especially where new trials are to be held covering the same charges." These words may not make sense to the distinguished jurists who comprised the majority in the case in question, but they make considerable sense to many Americans, including, I might add, many eminent jurists with considerable trial experience.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was not only hamstrung, and its capacity to act effectively in the future destroyed, but it was chastised by the Court for some of its past activities. It might be well at this point to discuss with the House some of the problems confronting any committee of the House and Senate engaged in investigations which enter the area of subversive activities. Several days ago I pointed out here on the floor that service on the House committee is no sinecure and that the only reward is the personal sense of an unpleasant duty accomplished to the best of one's ability. Perhaps it is that we who serve on such a committee come to realize better than others the true nature of communism. At times it is our grim privilege to peer behind the mask of gentle persuasion adopted by American Communists, to witness the fury and the hatred which is the true expression of Communist philosophy. For behind the papier-mache facade of the Communist structure, here and abroad, is violence, terrorism and the lash, and no protestations of judicial injury by those summoned by the committees can blot out the true picture of communism in

action, nor stifle the moans of its victims.

It is unfortunate that the Congress has not moved to outlaw the Communist conspiracy and place the same penalty upon membership in it as that provided for other and less well-organized treason. The myth of genteel political activity by the Communists has been so completely demolished in court trials and hearings before Government agencies that no thoughtful person of any political persuasion today believes it. Conspiracy to burn down a house for the insurance is a criminal offense, but conspiracy to destroy a constitutional government by force and violence remains in the same legal category as running through a red light. So long as the Communist is privileged to thumb his nose at the Congress and the courts, and so long as his precocity is to be sanctioned by the Supreme Court, there is nothing to be done until such time as he is caught with a torch in hand. At that time he can probably get off with a suspended sentence on the plea that it was dark and he did not want to run into the powder magazine on his way home. Farfetched? Yes; I suppose that it is to Americans, apathetic and bewildered as they are by controversy and turmoil. For bewildered they are, and they have company here in the Congress, including myself, and the recent decisions of the Supreme Court have done nothing to dissipate the fog.

Who were the five Communist functionaries acquitted by the Supreme Court in the Los Angeles case? To most readers of the newspapers they are only names. To some Americans they may have been well-meaning humanitarians who drifted innocently into the Communist conspiracy. But to those who have followed the course of Communist Party activities on the west coast, these individuals are of the hard core of the conspiracy—the men and women who make it go—not simple folk who didn't know what they were doing at all, and who simply made a mistake. I hesitate to take the space necessary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to detail their activities on behalf of the conspiracy and its related organizations, but I feel that it is essential to give their complete dossiers in order that Members of Congress may better understand the extent to which these "guiltless" souls have, individually and collectively, furthered the ends of the Soviet design in this country. Each and all of them are agents of the Communist apparatus. Each of them is a part of, and a party to, the Soviet plan to destroy the institutions of free men and to subordinate the world to Communist domination. These are functionaries of the new order which measures its justice by the length of a bayonet. The records follow, and I include at this point in the RECORD, the documentation referred to:

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 21, 1957.

For: Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON.

Subject: Philip M. Connolly.

The symbols inserted in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication listed herein indicate the name of each

Federal authority which has cited or designated that organization or publication, and the year in which each agency's first citation, or listing, of the subject appeared. Capital letters denote agency names, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and S—Subversive Activities Control Board. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.)

A number of witnesses have testified concerning Philip M. Connelly before the Committee on Un-American Activities. On March 29, 1944, the committee released a report (H. Rept. No. 1311) in which a chapter is devoted to Mr. Connelly. Attached is a reproduction of excerpts from that report (pp. 98, 99, 130, and 131), containing references to testimony given prior to 1944 concerning Mr. Connelly.

In an appearance before the committee on October 24, 1947, Mr. Oliver Carlson said:

"So far as the Los Angeles picture is concerned, I should say the greatest strength in the labor movement lies within the CIO. Mr. Philip Connelly, the secretary of the CIO Council, has I think, at least to my satisfaction, been proved to be a Communist, and works with them and has for years" (Communist Infiltration of the Motion Picture Industry, p. 250).

Mr. Roy M. Brewer made the following statement to the committee on October 28, 1947:

"And I want to say here that the official CIO movement in Los Angeles, as well as in the State of California, is recognized by all experts in the field of labor as being completely under the domination of the Communist Party. It is led by a man by the name of Phil Connolly (sic) who is generally recognized as being a Communist" (ibid., p. 349; see also testimony given by Mr. Brewer on May 17 and 18, 1951, Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry, pp. 479 and 503).

Mr. Charles W. Judson testified before this committee on January 26, 1952, and stated that he had been a member of newspaper unit 140 of the Communist Party. He was asked to identify fellow members of that unit, and Phil Connolly was one of those he named. Mr. Judson said: "He was extremely active in the newspaper guild and I attended numerous meetings with him" (Communist Activities Among Professional Groups in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 1, p. 2639).

Mrs. Alice K. Bennett, formerly the wife of Mr. Judson, testified before the committee on May 22, 1952. She stated that she had been a member of the Communist Party, assigned first to a unit of social workers. While married to Mr. Judson, she was transferred to the newspaper unit, and she identified Philip Connolly as one of the members of that group (Communist Activities Among Professional Groups in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 2, p. 3563).

On July 8, 1952, Miss Urcel Daniel appeared as a witness before the committee. She stated that she had been a member of a newspaper unit in the Communist Party, and she identified Philip Connolly as one of the members of the group (ibid., p. 3581).

Mr. Stephen A. Wereb appeared before the committee on July 1, 1955. He testified that he had belonged to the Communist Party in connection with his work as an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He told of a meeting held in 1945, which was attended only by functionaries of the Communist Party, who were required to present an official pass. Those lacking a pass had to be identified by the credentials committee, and Mr. Wereb stated that he had been fortunate enough to be elected to that committee. He named

Philip Connelly as one of the functionaries who attended the meeting. He testified further concerning Mr. Connelly, as follows:

Mr. WEREb. In the fall—rather, the early part of the winter of 1946 * * * we were given instruction by the chairmen of our groups to attend a meeting held at the Templar Hall * * * a man walked in whom I knew to be a Communist for a long time, Carl Brant * * *. He now was addressing this meeting. He said, "Comrades, there has been by the Superior Court in the county of Los Angeles an order issued limiting the pickets * * * and we are going to break that order."

The following morning I was on the picket line with the manpower we mobilized. The police department had a hundred or more policemen out there in the morning, and at 7 o'clock the parade started. In spite of the police, loudspeaker warnings, the parade started down Lawson Avenue going west; I would say 1,500 people. This was led by two people. They spearheaded this. One was Philip Connelly * * * and this man Carl Brant. They came at the head of this and defied the police . . . and they were going to have violence, and they did have violence.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, here were two known Communists leading a group of American workmen and women, most of whom probably had no idea that the Communist Party was leading them down the road.

Mr. WEREb. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Philip Connelly you referred to as being one of the two leaders of this group, do you recall whether or not he served a jail sentence on the charge of inciting a riot?

Mr. WEREb. Yes, he did. (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., Area—pt. 4, pp. 1812, 1819-1822).

Philip M. Connelly was arrested in 1951 and indicted in 1952, charged with conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence (see Daily Worker, July 31, 1951, p. 3; Daily People's World, Aug. 1, 1951, p. 8; Transcript of proceedings, July 18, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif., *United States of America, Plaintiff v. William Schneiderman, et al., Defendants*, p. 12,593). On August 5, 1952, Mr. Connelly and 13 other defendants, including the State chairman of the Communist Party, were convicted of violation of the Smith Act, in the court of Federal Judge William C. Mathes, Los Angeles (Daily People's World, Aug. 6, 1952, pp. 1 and 8). The 14 received maximum sentences of 5 years in prison and \$10,000 fine. The Ninth United States Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the conviction. A petition for reconsideration was filed, but the Court of Appeals refused to reconsider its decision (Daily People's World, June 16, 1955, p. 8). The cases were taken to the United States Supreme Court, and it was reported on June 17, 1957, that the Supreme Court had that day "ordered the freeing of 5 California Communist Party leaders and new trials for 9 others who were convicted of teaching and advocating violent overthrow of the Government" (Washington Evening Star, June 17, 1957, pp. A1 and 6). Philip M. Connelly was named as one of those for whom acquittals had been ordered on the basis of insufficient evidence. Thermo-Fax reproductions of the Evening Star article and an article from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of June 18, 1957 (p. A21) accompany this report.

Mr. Connelly was the subject of an article by Jack Young which appeared in the magazine section of the Daily People's World, August 17, 1951. A reproduction of the article is attached hereto.

During the trial of Harry Bridges in California, in 1950, Mr. Lewis Michener testi-

fied concerning a Communist meeting which he attended in San Francisco, in 1940. He stated that Philip Connelly also attended the meeting (Daily People's World, Jan. 12, 1950, p. 10). It is noted that in 1941 Mr. Jay Edward Bolling testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that Mrs. Lew Michener had told him "Slim" Connelly was a Communist (see printed hearings, vol. 14, p. 8589; also report No. 1311, attached hereto).

An advertisement in the Daily People's World of October 26, 1950, page 4, announced a rally to be held under auspices of the election campaign committee, Communist Party of Los Angeles, on October 29, in Embassy Auditorium. Philip "Slim" Connelly was named as one of the speakers.

The Sunday Worker of January 25, 1942 (sec. 2, p. 4), named Mr. Connelly as one of the CIO leaders who were affiliated with the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (A-1942; C-1944). Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party, was in prison serving a sentence involving fraudulent passports. An advertisement in behalf of Mr. Browder appeared in the Washington Post of March 12, 1942, and Mr. Connelly was listed as a signer.

The Daily People's World of February 3, 1948, page 2, announced the arrest of "Claudia Jones, Negro official of the Communist Party * * * charged by the FBI and immigration authorities with being an alien who desires forcible overthrow of the Government. * * * Signing a statement that Miss Jones' arrest was a 'most unfortunate and dangerous action' and urging that the charges against her be dismissed were Philip M. Connelly, secretary Los Angeles CIO Council (and others)."

Philip M. Connelly, Los Angeles editor of the Daily People's World, was named as one of the "prominent guests at the speaker's table" at a dinner protesting the trial of 12 Communist leaders, in an article which appeared in the Daily People's World of September 6, 1949, page 3. The article stated that the dinner audience of 500 "contributed \$25 each to the Foley Square defense."

The following appeared in the Daily Worker, July 2, 1956, page 6:

"LOS ANGELES.—Over 350 people attended the party at the Robertson Rendezvous in Los Angeles last Saturday to honor Dalton Trumbo and to celebrate and introduce his pamphlet 'The Devil in the Book'. This is the 50-page tract concerning the Smith Act in general with special emphasis on the California trial.

"One by one the author called up Smith Act defendants * * * Slim Connelly."

It was reported in the Daily People's World of July 31, 1956, page 6, that Philip M. Connelly had chaired a meeting held under auspices of that newspaper, "to greet Steve Nelson, western Pennsylvania Communist party chairman and a Smith Act defendant," on July 29.

The Daily People's World of February 19, 1952, page 3, reported that Mr. Connelly had been a speaker at a mass meeting of trade unionists to plan a fight on the Smith Act. An advertisement in the issue of October 5, 1955, page 7, announced that he would speak on the Smith Act case at a forum on October 9.

As reported in the foregoing, Mr. Connelly has served as Los Angeles editor of the Daily People's World, which is the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast. Our files also contain references to numerous articles contributed by him to that newspaper during the period of 1949-1954, and to the Daily Worker in 1949, 1953, and 1954.

An advertisement in the Daily People's World of November 17, 1949, page 3, announced that Mr. Connelly would be a featured guest at a banquet under the auspices of the California Labor School (A-1948; I-1956).

A letterhead, dated August 24, 1939, of the Harry Bridges Defense Committee (C-1944) named Mr. Connelly as a member of the southern division, California sponsoring committee. It is noted that Mr. Connelly, as a representative of the CIO, was associated with Harry Bridges in a libel suit against William Randolph Hearst and his publishing houses, as reported in the Daily People's World, January 9, 1942, page 1.

The Daily Worker of December 19, 1940, page 5, named Mr. Connelly as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (C-1942; A-1942), on behalf of Sam Darcy, a Communist. An advertisement in the Daily People's World of May 2, 1947, page 8, named Mr. Connelly as a sponsor of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress (C-1947; A-1947; I-1956). The following sources name him as a speaker for the organization: a handbill, "Keyes Freed To Kill Again"; Daily People's World, February 24, 1948, page 3; March 29, 1948, page 3; July 19, 1948, page 3.

New Masses (C-1939; A-1942) for August 6, 1940, page 22, named Mr. Connelly as a speaker for a mass meeting of the American Peace Crusade (C-1939).

Mr. Connelly was a member of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization (C-1942; A-1942; I-1956), according to a pamphlet, "What Is APM?", page 11, the Daily Worker, September 3, 1940, page 4, and November 9, 1940, page 5.

A letterhead of the Committee To Defend America by Keeping Out of War (C-1944), dated August 10, 1940, named Mr. Connelly as a sponsor. A leaflet entitled "Committee To Defend America by Keeping Out of War" (p. 2) named him as a sponsor of the Emergency Peace Mobilization (A-1942; C-1944).

The Daily People's World of December 18, 1951, page 3, reported that Mr. Connelly was a speaker at a party given by the California Emergency Defense Committee (A-1953) for Communist leaders who had been released from jail after arrest under the Smith Act.

Letterheads dated 1946, 1947, and 1948 list Mr. Connelly as a sponsor of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (A-1949; J-1952; I-1956).

An advertisement in the Daily People's World of June 23, 1948, page 5, urged that "the imprisonment of the executive board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee" (C-1944; A-1947; I-1956) be stopped, and announced a protest meeting to be held on June 28, under auspices of the Spanish Refugee Appeal (C-1946; I-1956). Mr. Connelly was named as chairman of the meeting.

An article entitled "Smith Act Stirs Rank and File" appeared in March of Labor (C-1954), March 1952, page 18. It was accompanied by a photograph of Mr. Connelly, and he was referred to as one of the "victims" of the Smith Act.

It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 21, 1952, page 8, that Mr. Connelly was a speaker at a meeting on January 17, under auspices of the National Committee for Freedom of the Press (A-1953).

The Daily People's World, October 3, 1946, page 2, announced that in his capacity as secretary of the Los Angeles CIO Council Mr. Connelly had sent a letter to all affiliated locals, urging them to send two delegates to the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East (A-1949).

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 20, 1957.

For: Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON.

Subject: Frank Spector.

The public records, files, and publications of this Committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or

by findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The symbols, inserted in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication below, indicate the name of each Federal authority which has cited, or designated, that organization or publication and the year in which each agency's first citation, or listing, of the subject appeared. Capital letters denote agency names, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and S—Subversive Activities Control Board. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.)

Following is an excerpt from the testimony of Harper L. Knowles, chairman of the radical research committee of the American Legion, Department of California, at a public hearing of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, October 24, 1938:

"Mr. KNOWLES. On December 8, 1936, a mass meeting was held in San Francisco Auditorium * * * Those seated on the platform with Harry Bridges were * * *; Frank Spector, party organizer for the Communist Party" (p. 1789).

Mr. Knowles then read excerpts from articles in the Western Worker "Communist Party newspaper" (1937) entitled "Preconvention discussion of the Lessons of the Maritime Strike by Frank Spector":

"The Communists in the maritime union, both before and during the strike," Spector wrote, "participated in every phase of the struggle, whether on the picket lines, in the various committees for organizing relief, publicity, finances, picketing, and in the leading strike committees, * * *"

"One of the major factors in the success of the strike was the correct policy of the Communists * * * in laying the basis before last September 30 for joint action in all maritime unions."

"The role and influence of the party reflected especially in the recruiting of over 300 new members to the party from the strikers' ranks. The party organization as a whole reacted well to its tasks during the strike" (pp. 1791, 1792). (Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States, vol. 3, 1938 hearings).

The following excerpts are from a sworn affidavit of Arthur James Kent, Los Angeles, Calif., November 2, 1938:

"Mr. KENT. In the years 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936 and until September 1937, I was a member of the Communist Party; and in the years 1936 and 1937 I was a membership director for the Communist Party at San Francisco and in charge of political activity of the party.

"The Communist Party had a political strategy committee * * * and the members of that committee were * * * Frank Spector.

"I was also in 1936 and 1937, fraction secretary of the Conference for Progressive Political Action, the fraction being all Communist Party members in Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, or elsewhere, or who were leaders in political action. As such secretary I was instructed by the leaders of the Communist Party—Schneiderman, Spector, or Gannett—what legislative bills were to be pushed and by whom." (Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States, Special Committee Hearings, 1938, vol. 3, pp. 2083 and 2084.)

Mrs. Malda B. McLaughlin, witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on August 20, 1940 (Executive hearings, made public), made the following references to Frank Spector:

"Mr. STEDMAN. And in your position on the county finance committee of the Communist Party did you collect funds from other members of the Federal writers' project for the Communist Party?

"Mrs. McLAUGHLIN. The members of the party on the project? Yes.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Who did you turn this money over to that you collected from the Government workers?

"Mrs. McLAUGHLIN. * * * and Frank Spector. They were both always there.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Frank Spector is an official of the Communist Party here in San Francisco?

"Mrs. McLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Is it your understanding that Frank Spector has already been ordered deported from the United States?

"Mrs. McLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STEDMAN. And he is still operating here in San Francisco and throughout California as a paid organizer for the Communist Party?

"Mrs. McLAUGHLIN. He is." (Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States, pp. 1491 and 1492.)

Following are excerpts from the testimony of Roy M. Brewer at a public hearing of the Committee on Un-American Activities on May 18, 1951:

"Mr. BREWER. There is an individual in Mr. Sorrell's organization, Frank Spector, who testified before the California committee that he had been a Communist since 1919, had never denied it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where is he now?

"Mr. BREWER. As far as I know he is in Los Angeles. He was in this union during the entire period, but he was expelled later on, I think." (Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry—pt. 2, p. 527.)

On January 24, 1952, A. Marburg Yerkes, former member of the Communist Party, was a witness at a public hearing of the Committee on Un-American Activities and made the following reference to Frank Spector:

"Mr. YERKES. I went to a meeting, a Communist Party meeting, which was held in Los Angeles in the summer of 1948, at a place called the Park Manor. * * * There was endless speechmaking and milling about.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the names of any of the speakers?

"Mr. YERKES. I do remember a few people. Dorothy — was there and a chap whom I have never met, but whom I have seen, and identified as Frank Spector (sic)." (Communist Activities Among Professional Groups in the Los Angeles Area—pt. 1, pp. 2560 and 2561.)

Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider, who joined the Communist Party as an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation had this to say about Frank Spector when she testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 27, 1955:

"Mr. MOULDER. Did you have any contact with any of the Communist Party leaders in the Los Angeles area while you were working in the San Diego area?

"Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I had contact with some of them.

"I met Frank Spector. Frank Spector I knew as a Communist Party member.

"Mr. MOULDER. Did you know him here among the Los Angeles cells?

"Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No. I met him when he came to San Diego to speak for the Civil Rights Congress." (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., Area—pt. 1, p. 1517.)

Stephen A. Werek, who worked within the Communist Party for the Federal Bureau of Investigation from October 1943 until January 1948, was a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on July 1, 1955. Among those he said he knew to be members

of the Communist Party was Frank Spector whom he referred to as "an oldtimer; made the papers a lot of times." (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., Area, pt. 4, p. 1817.)

Following is an excerpt from the testimony of William Don Waddilove, Communist Party member in 1947 and 1948, who appeared as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 16, 1956:

"Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall at this time the names of any of the Communist Party functionaries who attended the meetings of your group?"

"Mr. WADDILOVE. The only one I could possibly recall would be Frank Spector. That is the only one I was aware of." (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., Area, pt. 7, p. 3663.)

Frank Spector was shown as a member of the Secretariat of the Los Angeles Subdistrict, Communist Party of United States on a document issued by the Los Angeles Subdistrict, August 15, 1929, which was reprinted as exhibit No. 10-A, with the testimony of Capt. William F. Hynes of the Los Angeles police department in hearings of the Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, House of Representatives, part 5, volume No. 4, October 9, 1930, pages 631-632.

The Daily Worker of January 9, 1937, named Frank Spector as a county organizer of the Communist Party in San Francisco in a page 1 story; and, the same paper on June 23, 1937 (p. 1), listed him as a representative of the Communist Party in California. The Young Communist League yearbook issued by the California YCL in 1937 (p. 39), showed Frank Spector among those who sent greetings; and the booklet, "For Security, Democracy, Jobs, Peace" (page 3), revealed that Frank Spector, secretary of the San Francisco county committee, sent a telegram of greetings to the third annual convention of the Los Angeles, Calif., Communist Party held on April 29, 30, and May 1, 1938.

According to the proceedings of the California convention of the Communist Party, May 14 and 15, 1938, pages 2, 3, 5, and 8, Frank Spector was a member of the presiding committee on elections; was elected chairman of the nominations committee at the second session; extended remarks at the same session; gave a pledge in the Anita Whitney party building drive at the third session; and made the report of the nominations committee at the fourth session.

The Daily Worker of May 30, 1938, page 8, reported that Frank Spector of San Francisco was a member of the peace commission of the 10th national convention of the Communist Party held in New York and that he suggested regional conferences on the Spain embargo issue.

Frank Spector was county secretary of the Communist Party in San Francisco, according to Equal Justice, February 1939, page 4, was named as a member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles by the Daily People's World, May 5, 1948, page 3, and was shown as chairman, southern division, Communist Party, Los Angeles, in the Daily People's World, September 8, 1949, page 3.

The Daily Worker of January 8, 1930, page 1, reported that Frank Spector, one of the workers arrested in the San Bernardino demonstration at the city hall in December, was convicted in court in San Bernardino and sentenced to 125 days in jail. The paper said: "The sentence is part of the intimidation campaign against militant workers here, but it will not halt future demonstrations by militant workers, according to the Communist Party." On the same page, another article stated that Frank Spector, district organizer of the International Labor Defense (A-1942; C-1939) in southern California "today telegraphed the national office of the ILLD that workers arrested in the strike of Mexican and Filipino plantation laborers

have already been released through the efforts of the ILLD."

As reported in the Daily Worker, March 19, 1930, page 2, Frank Spector, secretary of International Labor Defense in Los Angeles was being held for inciting to riot and was being defended by the ILLD; and, according to an article datelined Los Angeles, April 30, in the Daily Worker of May 1, 1930, page 1, "Frank Spector, district organizer, International Labor Defense, was arrested in court today on a criminal syndicalist charge for his activity among the workers of the Imperial Valley while he was attending a hearing on deportation charges against him. No ball has as yet been set."

The Daily Worker, February 7, 1933, page 4, contained an article by Frank Spector entitled, "The Daily Worker in the San Quentin Prison," and noted that: "Frank Spector was 1 of the 8 Imperial Valley prisoners sentenced in 1930 to from 3 to 42 years for organizing the agricultural slaves of Imperial Valley, Calif. Mass protests forced Spector's release after he had served a year. He is now assistant national secretary of the International Labor Defense." The New Masses (A-1942; C-1939) of April 8, 1941, page 15, contained an article, "Hero in Stripes," written by Frank Spector about J. B. McNamara, a fellow prison mate in 1930.

The Daily Worker of June 10, 1936, page 3, reported that the (New York) State executive committee of International Labor Defense announced that the week of June 15 would be set aside as Brazil week and that Frank Spector, State secretary of ILLD said: "All working class organizations, particularly trade unions, should support this campaign against the fascist terror in Brazil."

The ILLD publication, Equal Justice, for February 1939, page 4, showed that Frank Spector was arrested in San Francisco on October 2, 1938, for anti-Nazi demonstration.

It was reported in the Daily People's World, December 7, 1950, page 2, that Five Los Angeles residents, including Frank Spector, veteran of many historic labor battles in California and widely known Communist, were informed today that, under the McCarran Act, they are expected to deport themselves" and that failure to do so will subject them to criminal prosecution.

The daily People's World for June 13, 1951, page 1, showed Frank Spector, Communist Party leader, as facing deportation, and in the July 10, 1951, issue, pages 3 and 6 showed him as being out on bail and as speaking at a reception held by the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (C-1956) in his honor on July 8 at Parkview Manor. According to the same paper, July 11, 1951, page 3, the case was continued until July 19 when the defense motion will be argued and that "Spector continued at liberty on \$15,000 bail raised by the Los Angeles civil rights bail fund." The Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was defending Spector in his deportation fight, according to the Lamp, December 1951-January 1952, page 1, and he was listed in the organization's booklet containing the program and greetings for its conference on February 7, 1953 (p. 17) as one of the "80 deportees of the Los Angeles committee * * *" who sent greetings. The proceedings of this conference, February 7, 1953, page 4, showed Frank Spector as being elected to the resolutions committee for the conference, and he was still listed as one of the "victims of deportation" in the souvenir journal issued by the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born for its fourth annual conference in Los Angeles, February 28, 1954, page 4.

On November 19, 1953, page 6, the Daily Worker contained an article datelined, "Los Angeles, November 8," which noted that, after a final Immigration Department order, the Frank Spector trial had been set by

Judge William Mathes to begin February 15, and added:

"Spector, who came to the United States as a youth, has been active ever since in trade union and progressive struggles, first in New York, then around Chicago, and since the 1920's in Los Angeles.

"He was first ordered deported in 1930. But the Government took no steps to carry out the order until after passage of the 1950 McCarran law.

"He was indicted on 4 counts, but Judge Mathes dismissed 2 of them as faulty. The Government carried the Mathes dismissal to the United States Supreme Court and won reinstatement of the counts.

"Meanwhile, Spector's lawyers, headed by Attorney John Porter, of foreign born legal panel, challenged validity of the 1930 deportation order.

"This challenge is now pending an appeal before the ninth circuit court at San Francisco. Should there be a circuit court ruling, the February 15 trial date in the McCarran case may be postponed, Judge Mathes indicated."

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, in her column in the Daily Worker, July 15, 1949, page 8, wrote about the pamphlet, It's You They're After, published by the Civil Rights Congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956) of Los Angeles. She described this as the "story of the Los Angeles witch hunt," and revealed that Frank Spector was among the "21 people which have been sentenced for contempt for refusing to answer these questions to a grand jury." The questions to which she referred concerned the officers and organization of the Los Angeles Communist Party.

References to the arrest of Frank Spector under the Smith Act on charges of conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence and subsequent developments of the case appear, as follows, in the separate sources indicated:

The Daily Worker of September 3, 1951, page 3, noted that Frank Spector, of Los Angeles, was arrested under the Smith Act, as did the Daily People's World, September 4, 1951, page 1. He was released on bail, set at \$5,000 by the circuit court of appeals in California, according to the Daily People's World, December 19, 1951, page 1, and the Daily Worker, December 19, 1951, page 1; and, in celebration of this, he, Frank Carlson and Ben Dobbs were superhonored guests at the Christmas-Chunukah party of the Civil Rights Congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956) at Park View Manor (Daily People's World, Dec. 20, 1951, p. 6).

The transcript of proceedings of the United States District Court, Southern District of California, July 13, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif., *United States of America, plaintiff v. William Schneiderman et al., defendants*, pages 12 and 593, showed Frank Efraim Spector as 1 of 14 defendants charged in an indictment with conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence. He was convicted of violation of the Smith Act in Los Angeles on August 5, 1952 (Daily People's World, Aug. 6, 1952, p. 1, and the Worker, Aug. 10, 1952, p. 3); appeals were filed in his behalf on June 14, 1953, in San Francisco (Daily People's World, June 16, 1953, p. 3); and, the case was shown as being on appeal to the court of appeals in a Justice Department letter dated September 8, 1954. The Daily People's World reported on June 16, 1955 (p. 8) that the Ninth United States Circuit Court of Appeals had refused to reconsider its earlier decision upholding conviction under the Smith Act and that Frank Spector was free on bond. The same paper showed in its August 21, 1956, issue, page 3, that the case of the California Smith Act defendants, Frank Spector among them, would be reviewed by the Supreme Court on October 8, 1956. It was reported on June 17, 1957, in the Evening Star, pages A-1 and 6 (and in the Washington Post and Times

Herald, June 18, 1957, p. A-21) that Frank Efraim Spector, Communist Party organizer of Los Angeles, was 1 of the 5 California Communists freed by the Supreme Court in a 4 to 3 majority opinion on June 17. (Thermofax copies of these 2 clippings are being enclosed for use in connection with this report and the 4 others requested.)

In 1954, the Daily People's World reported that Frank Spector would be leader of classes on the "history of civil-rights struggles in the United States" at a school to be held by the Civil Rights Congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956) in Los Angeles beginning in October (issue of September 8, 1954, p. 7), and would lead the opening session of the school on November 6 at CRC headquarters, room 709, 326 West Third Street, Los Angeles (issue of November 1, 1954, p. 6).

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 20, 1957.

For: Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON.

Subject: Mrs. Rose Chernin Kunitz.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The symbols, inserted in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication below, indicate the name of each Federal authority which has cited or designated that organization or publication and the year in which each agency's first citation or listing of the subject appeared. Capital letters denote agency names, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and, S—Subversive Activities Control Board. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.)

On July 16, 1940, in testimony before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. John L. Leech, former member of the State committee of the Communist Party of California, referred to Rose Chernin, as follows:

"Mr. STEDMAN. Do you recall the approximate date when he joined the party?"

"Mr. LEECH. It was some time prior to the Criminal Syndicalism Congress held in California in the early part of 1936. He took an active part in the preparation and organization of that congress, but I didn't personally bring him into the Communist Party, and I would just have to state the date as being in the very early part of 1936.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Have you ever met in strictly Communist Party meetings with Mr. —?"

"Mr. LEECH. Yes; in connection with the Criminal Syndicalism Congress which I have just mentioned. Rose Chernin, secretary of International Labor Defense in Los Angeles, district 14, called the fraction to intensify the practical work for this congress preparatory to its being held; and, as the county organizer of the party in Los Angeles, my responsibility was to meet with this fraction, and in this meeting of the party, which excluded all others than Communists, Mr. — took a part." (Executive hearings, later released, vol. 2, March–July 1940, p. 930.)

Miss Rena Vale of Los Angeles, Calif., on July 22, 1940, identified Rose Chernin as a Communist Party functionary, as shown in the following excerpt from her testimony before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Mr. STEDMAN. Before you joined the party did you do some work for the International Labor Defense?"

"Miss VALE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Recite the details concerning that work, Miss Vale.

"Miss VALE. Well, there were two instances in which I did work for the International Labor Defense. The first was at the time the Young Communist League organizer, Angelo Herndon, a Negro, had just been released from a Georgia prison and came to the coast, and I did publicity work for his tour under the instructions of Rose Chernin.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Did Miss Chernin tell you that all officials of the International Labor Defense were Communist Party members?"

"Miss VALE. Yes, sir; she did.

"Mr. STEDMAN. What did she tell you?"

"Miss VALE. She told me the party had organized, and did control the International Labor Defense.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Is she a well known Communist Party member in the State of California?"

"Miss VALE. Yes, sir; although she isn't in the State of California now.

"Mr. STEDMAN. Where is she?"

"Miss VALE. The last I heard of her she was in New York.

"Mr. STEDMAN. At the time you knew her was she a functionary in the party?"

"Miss VALE. Yes, sir; she said she was." (Executive hearings, later released, vol. 3, July and August, 1940, pp. 1211–1212.)

The following references to Rose Chernin are taken from public testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities by Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider and Mr. Stephen A. Werek, on June 27, 1955, and July 1, 1955, respectively:

"Mr. MOULDER. Did you have any contact with any of the Communist Party leaders in the Los Angeles area while you were working in the San Diego area?"

"Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I had contact with some of them. I met in closed Communist Party meetings.

"Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I met Rose Chernin." (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., Area, part 1, June 27, and 28, 1955, page 1517.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed now with giving of the names of the functionaries of the Communist Party who attended the meeting regarding the Duclos letter?"

"Mr. WEREK. We had * * * Rose Chernin, convicted in the Smith Act.

"Mr. WEREK. There are more names I have but these are names of those people who were at the southern section of the California Communist Party." (Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles, Calif., area, pt. 4, July 1 and 2, 1955, pp. 1822–23.)

The annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1956, page 5, made reference to Rose Chernin Kunitz in connection with the hearings on Communist political subversion, as follows:

"The evidence during these hearings disclosed the control exercised over these organizations by the Communist Party. In California, there was created the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Its executive secretary is Rose Chernin Kunitz, who was convicted under the Smith Act. When she appeared before the committee on December 8, 1956, she was still executive secretary of the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, and received her total income through this organization, even though more than 2 years had elapsed since her conviction for advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence."

Rose Chernin Kunitz was the subject of a full-page article by Philip M. Connelly in the Daily People's World, January 18, 1952, page 8, magazine section. In this biographical

sketch, she was reported to have been active in the unemployed council (C-1939) in New York City about 1929 and in the workers alliance (A-1942; C-1929) in Los Angeles in 1932, and then to have gone to Russia when her husband, Paul, an engineer, signed a 3-year contract for work on the Moscow subway system. She was further reported as working in a publishing house in Moscow, and after a year and a half, returned to California because of her daughter's illness. In California, the article stated that she helped lead a fight against the State criminal syndicalism law, but, when her husband returned from Russia, she joined him in New York where she was active in the American Labor Party (C-1944). In 1946, after the daughter's death, according to this article, she and her husband returned to Los Angeles, and Rose Chernin returned to full-time work in the civil rights congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956) but "was drafted from CRC to take charge of the Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born (C-1956)." (A Thermo-fax copy of this article is attached.)

The Daily Worker of August 27, 1926, page 4, listed one Rose Chernin of New York City as a winner of a contest for selling subscriptions to the Daily Worker (C-1939).

Rose Chernin was shown as a Communist Party section organizer for the upper eighth A. D., New York City, by the Daily Worker, November 17, 1942, page 5.

The Daily People's World, August 31, 1950, page 10, named Mrs. Rose Chernin as membership drive director for the civil rights congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956); and, according to the same paper, October 24, 1950, page 12, Rose Chernin of the civil rights congress was a member of a delegation protesting the McCarran law.

The Daily Worker of June 17, 1951, page 8, listed Rose Chernin among the members of an All Nations Salute honoring Ferdinand Smith and others which was held by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (A-1948; C-1942; I-1956) in Chicago, June 9 and 10.

Rose Chernin Kunitz was listed in an advertisement in the Daily People's World of December 26, 1951, page 3, as one of those who would participate in a celebration to be held by the Jewish People's Fraternal Order (A-1950) on December 29 at North Star Auditorium, Los Angeles.

The Daily People's World of December 18, 1951, page 3, reported Mrs. Rose Chernin to be among the guests of honor at a party and dance given by the California Emergency Defense Committee (A-1953) in Los Angeles on their release from jail after arrest under the Smith Act; and the same paper, on March 4, 1952, page 3, showed Rose Chernin Kunitz as honor guest at the organization's International Women's Day celebration to be held on March 8 at Forum Starlite Roof, Los Angeles.

Mrs. Rose Chernin was shown as a member of the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (C-1956) in the Daily People's World, March 5, 1951, page 3, and as the executive director, or executive secretary, of the organization in the following sources: Daily People's World, July 10, 1951, page 3, and July 16, 1951, page 3; a booklet, "Greet the New Year with the Los Angeles Committee * * * December 31, 1951, * * *," page 2; proceedings of the organization's conference, February 7, 1953, page 13, where she was shown as being re-elected executive director; a paid advertisement of the Los Angeles Committee * * * in Community News Service, April 23, 1953, page 8; official letterheads of the organization, date April 27, 1953, April 30, 1953, May 7, 1953, and May 13, 1953; the Daily People's World, March 3, 1954, page 6 and a press release of March 4, 1954, which show her as re-elected as executive director at the fourth annual conference held February 27 and 28, 1954; letterheads of June 29, 1954 and Feb-

ruary 9, 1955; the Daily People's World, March 22, 1955, page 3, reporting her unanimous reelection as executive director; and, a letterhead, May 28, 1957.

Identified as executive secretary, or executive director, Mrs. Rose Chernin has been shown in the various sources, indicated below in each case, as taking part in activities of the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as follows: Speaker at a meeting (Daily People's World, March 6, 1951, p. 10); speaker at a reception for "The Terminal Island Four" in Los Angeles on May 6, 1951 (Daily People's World, May 10, 1951, page 9) (The Terminal Island Four were listed in a circular, "Urgent," issued by the Los Angeles Committee * * * in March 1952, as being Miriam Stevenson, David Hyun, Harry Carlisle, and Frank Carlson, "foreign-born Americans denied bail in deportation proceedings."); speaker at a reception to welcome Frank Spector on July 8 at Parkview Manor (Daily People's World, July 10, 1951, page 3); as protesting the jailing of Mrs. Charlotte Galalian by the Immigration Department (Daily People's World, July 16, 1951, page 3); as urging support of a dinner on September 16 to honor the attorneys and research workers of the Los Angeles Committee * * * (Daily People's World, August 30, 1951, page 6); speaker at a victory rally on December 21 at Park Manor, Los Angeles to celebrate her release from jail (Daily People's World, December 17, 1951, page 6); speaker at a testimonial dinner to be held in honor of Abner Green of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at Park Manor in Los Angeles on March 9 (Daily People's World, March 4, 1952, page 3); as co-signer of the organization's appeal for aid in its fight to deprive the right to bail, and to halt the deportation drive (mimeographed appeal concerning the Supreme Court decision of March 10, 1952, in the case of the Terminal Island Four); speaker at meeting at Parkview Manor auditorium, Los Angeles (Daily People's World, October 21, 1952, page 6); as welcoming the delegates and observers and as being the keynote speaker at the Southern California Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, at Park Manor, Los Angeles, Calif., February 7, 1953 (booklet containing the program and greetings, February 7, 1953, pages 2 and 3, and Daily People's World, February 10, 1953, pages 2 and 6); speaker at informal dinner arranged in honor of Stanley Nowak at the Festival of Nationalities in Los Angeles in June 1953 (mimeographed press release of the Los Angeles Committee * * *, June 1, 1953); as extending greetings to those attending the Festival of Nationalities, June 7, 1953 (mimeographed program); speaker at meeting on July 6 at Park Manor to support David Hyun and Mrs. Miriam Stevenson who must surrender July 6 in deportation proceedings (Daily People's World, July 6, 1953, page 3); speaker at the Los Angeles Committee's annual banquet honoring their panel of defense attorneys on November 11 in Los Angeles (Daily People's World, November 12, 1953, page 6); as scheduled to speak and bring greetings at the group's Fourth Annual Conference at Park Manor, Los Angeles, February 27-28, 1954 (Souvenir Journal and the Summary of Proceedings); speaker at the Festival of Nationalities, June 6 at the Croatian picnic grounds, Los Angeles (Daily People's World, June 8, 1954, page 3); and, as scheduled to speak at a dinner-dance to be given by the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on October 29 at Park Manor in Los Angeles (Daily People's World, October 25, 1955, p. 6, advertisement).

The Daily People's World, July 27, 1951, page 8 and the Times Herald of Washington, D. C., same date, page 5, reported that Rose Chernin, executive secretary of the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born had been arrested under the Smith

Act for conspiracy and was being held for \$75,000 bail. According to the Daily People's World and the Washington Post, both of August 1, 1951, pages 8 and 9, respectively, Rose Chernin was indicted under the Smith Act and bail was fixed at \$75,000. Her photograph appeared in this connection in the Daily Worker of August 19, 1951, page 3. On December 10, 1951, the Daily People's World reported, page 1, that Mrs. Rose Chernin had been freed from county jail in Los Angeles on \$5,000 bail.

The transcript of proceedings of the United States District Court, southern district of California, July 18, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif., *United States of America, plaintiff, v. William Schneiderman et al., defendants*, pages 12 and 593, showed Rose Chernin Kusnitz as 1 of 14 defendants charged in an indictment with conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence. Mrs. Rose Chernin Kusnitz was reported as being convicted on August 5 in Los Angeles and as being sentenced on August 7, 1952 to 5 years imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine (see: Daily People's World, Aug. 6, 1952, p. 1; Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1952, p. 1; Washington Times Herald, Aug. 6, 1952, p. 1; Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1952, p. 10; Times Herald, Aug. 8, 1952; Evening Star, Aug. 8, 1952; New York Times, Aug. 8, 1952, pp. 1 and 5; and the Worker, Aug. 10, 1952, p. 3, with photo).

Appeals were filed on behalf of Mrs. Rose Chernin Kusnitz on June 14, 1953, in San Francisco, according to the Daily People's World, June 16, 1953, page 3; and her name was listed in a Justice Department letter of September 8, 1954 among the defendants in Smith Act case V, shown then as on appeal to the court of appeals. The Daily People's World reported on June 16, 1955, page 8, that the Ninth United States Circuit Court of Appeals had refused to reconsider its earlier decision in the California Smith Act case and that Rose Chernin Kusnitz, one of the defendants, was free on bond.

It was announced in the Daily People's World of August 21, 1956, page 3, that the case of Rose Chernin Kusnitz, California Smith Act defendant, would be reviewed by the Supreme Court in October 1956; and, as reported in the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 18, 1957, page A-21, and the Evening Star, June 17, 1957, pages A-1 and 6, Rose Chernin Kusnitz was 1 of 5 California Communists freed by the Supreme Court in a 4-3 majority opinion on June 17, 1957. (A Thermo-fax copy of each of the 2 latter clippings is being enclosed for use with this report and the 4 others requested.)

On October 23, 1952, the Washington (D. C.) Times Herald reported, page 9, that the Attorney General had directed that denaturalization and deportation proceedings be instituted against Rose Chernin of Los Angeles at once; and, the Daily People's World of May 4, 1953, page 6, reported that the Justice Department was seeking to denaturalize Mrs. Rose Chernin, director of the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, and that she had 60 days in which to file answer to the charges. Reference was made to Rose Chernin's case in the souvenir journal, fourth annual conference, Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, February 28, 1954, page 9, in an article captioned, "Victims of Denaturalization." It was noted in the Daily People's World of June 11, 1956, page 2, that the denaturalization trial of Rose Chernin Kusnitz would begin on June 12. However, an INS article datelined, Los Angeles, August 23, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, August 29, 1956, page 17, reported:

"Rose Chernin Kusnitz * * * has won her fight to retain her American citizenship.

"United States Judge Harry C. Westover ruled yesterday that she keep the citizenship she acquired by naturalization in 1929. He attacked the Government's case as 'based

primarily upon the philosophy of guilt by association.'

"Judge Westover explained:

"Such philosophy has never been recognized as a principle of law.'

"He held that no evidence was produced to sustain charges that Mrs. Kusnitz was 'an officer of the Communist Party since 1927,' and that evidence was insufficient regarding possible 'statements, speeches, or acts of violence prior' to naturalization.

"The Government had contended she made false statements regarding her loyalty when she swore allegiance 27 years ago."

The Daily Worker of December 13, 1956, page 7, commented that the United States attorney's office had announced it was dropping all plans to appeal a ruling by a Federal judge that there was no evidence to justify revocation of Rose Chernin's naturalization.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 21, 1957.

For: Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON.

Subject: Henry Steinberg.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The symbols, inserted in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication below, indicate the name of each Federal authority which has cited, or designated, that organization or publication and the year in which each agency's first citation, or listing, of the subject appeared. Capital letters denote agency names, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and, S—Subversive Activities Control Board. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.)

The Daily People's World of November 12, 1948 (p. 5), contained a photograph of Henry Steinberg, who served in the Army on Okinawa and then served as chairman of the Communist Party in the 19th Congressional District, Los Angeles. The photograph showed him being served with a subpoena to appear before the grand jury as he was leaving the county jail cell where he spent 9 days for refusing to answer questions he considered beyond the province of the grand jury. The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (p. 2), reported that Henry Steinberg was Communist Party candidate for the Board of Education Office No. 4 in Los Angeles. The Daily People's World of April 7, 1950 (p. 9), identified Henry Steinberg, Communist Party candidate for assessor in the June 6 primary in Los Angeles, as 37 years old, born in St. Louis, Mo., but a resident of Los Angeles since about 1935. The news article stated further that he was Communist Party county legislative director, one of "the Los Angeles 21" who refused to stoolpigeon for the Federal grand jury a year and a half ago, and Communist Party candidate for the board of education in 1949 whose grand total of 35,000 votes was the highest ever received [sic] by a Communist candidate for citywide office locally.

The Daily People's World of April 27, 1950 (p. 10), reported that Henry Steinberg was Communist Party candidate for tax assessor in Los Angeles. Reference to this was found also in the Daily People's World of April 28,

1950 (p. 6). The Daily People's World of January 30, 1951 (pp. 2 and 3) reported that Henry Steinberg, Communist Party county legislative director was candidate for the Board of Education in Los Angeles. He was named as county legislative director of the Communist Party in Los Angeles as shown by the Daily People's World of March 1, 1951 (p. 3). According to the Daily People's World of March 30, 1951 (p. 7), Henry Steinberg, legislative director of the Los Angeles Communist Party, was endorsed as candidate for the board of education on the Communist Party ticket. He was defeated in the campaign for city councilman according to the Daily People's World of April 5, 1951 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of April 10, 1951 (p. 4), reported that Henry Steinberg, legislative director of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, was candidate for the Los Angeles school board. He polled 39,707 votes but was defeated. The Daily Worker of July 31, 1951 (p. 3), reported that Henry Steinberg, Communist Party leader, was jailed under the Smith Act for conspiracy and held for \$75,000 bail. This same information was found in the Daily Worker of August 19, 1951 (p. 3). Henry Steinberg, Los Angeles, participated in a meeting in behalf of the Communist cases according to the Daily People's World of September 6, 1949 (p. 3). He was one of a group of war veterans who protested against President Eisenhower's proposal to deprive Communists convicted under the Smith Act of their citizenship according to the Daily People's World of January 18, 1954 (p. 2).

Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings of this committee on July 21, 1947 (p. 13), that Henry Steinberg was on a list of officers of the Communist Party as Communist Party candidate for councilman, Ninth District, Los Angeles County.

The following quotation is from the testimony of Stephen A. Werek who testified in public hearings of this committee on July 1, 1955:

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Werek * * * will you proceed now with giving of the names of the functionaries of the Communist Party who attended the meeting regarding the Duclos letter?"

"Mr. WEREK. Henry Steinberg, convicted in the Smith Act. ("p. 1822.")

The Daily Worker of October 2, 1948 (p. 2) reported that Henry Steinberg was sentenced to jail for civil contempt of court in Los Angeles. He was photographed with other defendants in the Daily People's World of November 5, 1948 (p. 1). The April 24, 1950, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 12) reported that the United States circuit court of appeals ruled in his favor. He was indicted under the Smith Act by a Federal grand jury in Los Angeles, July 31, according to the Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 8). The Daily People's World of December 11, 1951 (p. 1), reported that Henry Steinberg, arrested under the Smith Act, was freed on bail after 4 months in jail. Henry Steinberg was 1 of 14 defendants charged in an indictment with conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence in the southern district of California. United States district court, as shown by the transcript of the proceedings, July 18, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif., *United States of America, plaintiff v. William Schneiderman et al., defendants*. Henry Steinberg was convicted of violation of the Smith Act in Los Angeles on August 5, according to the Daily People's World of August 6, 1952 (p. 1). He was given the maximum penalty of 5 years in prison and \$10,000 fine for conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, as reported in the New York Times, August 8, 1952 (pp. 1 and 5), the Washington Post, August 8, 1952 (p. 10), the Times Herald, August 8, 1952, and the Evening Star, August 8, 1952. The Worker of August 10, 1952 (p. 3), reported

that Henry Steinberg was 1 of 14 convicted in Los Angeles, Calif., of violation of the Smith Act. Appeals were filed in his behalf on June 14 in San Francisco according to the Daily People's World of June 16, 1953 (p. 3).

A Justice Department letter, dated September 8, 1954, with a list of Smith Act cases involving the Communist Party leaders, listed Henry Steinberg, a defendant in the Smith Act case V, *United States v. Schneiderman, et al.*, February 1, 1952, to August 5, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif.; convicted; on appeal to the Court of Appeals. The Daily People's World of June 16, 1955 (p. 8), reported that the Ninth United States Circuit Court of Appeals had refused to reconsider its earlier decision upholding Henry Steinberg's conviction under the Smith Act. At the time Mr. Steinberg was free on bond. The Daily People's World of August 21, 1956 (p. 3), announced that Henry Steinberg's case would be reviewed by the Supreme Court on October 8, 1956. The Evening Star of June 17, 1957 (pp. A-1 and 6), and the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 18, 1957 (p. A-21), reported that Henry Steinberg, legislative director of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County, was 1 of 5 California Communists freed by the Supreme Court in a 4-to-3 majority opinion of June 17. All were convicted in 1952 under the Smith Act. The basis for the Court's decision was given in the article.

Henry Steinberg was the subject of an article by Phillip M. Connelly from the Los Angeles County jail (Daily People's World, November 9, 1951, pp. M3 and 7).¹

He was scheduled as a speaker for a meeting on the Smith Act to be held April 3 in Los Angeles (Daily People's World, April 2, 1952, p. 8). The Daily People's World of June 6, 1952 (p. 3), reported that he was to participate in an anti-Smith Act motorcade and rally.

Henry Steinberg was a speaker at a Communist Party May Day celebration in San Pedro, according to the Daily People's World of May 4, 1950 (p. 2).

His photograph and biography are found in the pamphlet, *It's You They're After* (p. 15).

The Daily People's World of September 15, 1950 (p. 5),¹ contained Henry Steinberg's statement on why he refused to register as a Communist Party member. An article, *Why I Refused to Register*, by Henry Steinberg, is found in the September 24, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 3).

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 20, 1957.

For: Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON.

Subject: Al Richmond.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The symbols, inserted in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication below, indicate the name of each Federal authority which has cited, or designated, that organization or publication and the year in which each agency's first citation, or listing, of the subject appeared. Capital letters denote agency names, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and S—Subversive Activities Control Board. (For more complete information on citations, see this commit-

¹ Thermo-fax copies attached.

tee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.)

Charles David Blodgett testified in public hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 8, 1953. The following quotations are from his testimony.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, who constituted the staff of the Daily People's World during the period you were employed by it?"

"Mr. BLODGETT. Mr. Al Richmond, of course, was the executive editor of the Daily People's World.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you a moment. In identifying those employed by the Daily People's World, will you state whether or not you knew them to be members of the Communist Party, and if you name those that you did not know to be members of the Communist Party, will you also so state that fact? In other words, give us all the information you can about those who were members of that staff and the extent of their participation, if any existed, in Communist Party activities.

"Mr. BLODGETT. To the best of my knowledge, all members of the editorial department of Daily People's World and the business office were members of the Communist Party. That was a prerequisite for employment."

"Mr. BLODGETT. I can further substantiate that by the fact that we did hold regular meetings of the staff, both editorial and business, which were conducted as Community Party educational meetings, and members of the State executive board of the party were often in attendance [sic], giving the staff the line, strategy, and tactics of the party to be applied by the party * * * " (p. 3237).

Stanley B. Hancock testified in executive hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, March 1, 1954. These hearings were later made public. References to Al Richmond in Mr. Hancock's testimony follow:

"Mr. TAVENNER. In your association with the Newspaper Guild in San Francisco did you learn to know any of its members as members of the Communist Party?"

"Mr. HANCOCK. Only my fellow employees from the People's World.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?"

"Mr. HANCOCK. Al Richmond.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Daily People's World in San Francisco an official organ of the Communist Party?"

"Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir; not so designated in contrast to its predecessor, the Western Worker, which carried on its masthead the title 'Official organ of the Communist Party.' The Daily People's World ostensibly was the product of leftwingers. In actuality it was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist Party, but it never stated these facts in its columns.

"Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base the statement that this paper was dominated and controlled by the Communist Party?"

"Mr. HANCOCK. The many meetings I attended with the State committee of the party at which details of the circulation problems and financial problems of the People's World were reported on, and the solution was discussed. Certainly all the key people on the paper were party members, including the editor, city editor.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was his name?"

"Mr. HANCOCK. Al Richmond was the city editor" (pp. 4584-4585).

Stephen A. Werek testified in public hearings of this committee on July 1, 1955. The following reference to Al Richmond is from that testimony.

"Mr. WEREK. One of the functions I would like to call your attention to was in the month of June, I believe, 1945. I was given credentials by the club chairman, John Houston. This was printed by the Los Angeles County Communist Board, and it was

signed. With these credentials I attended what was known as the southwest section, southern section of the State of California Convention of the Communist Party. That was held in the Danish Hall around 24th or 25th Street, a few doors east of Vermont Avenue. This was approximately the month of June in 1945.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you record the names of the persons present that you could identify?"

"Mr. WERE. I did.

"Mr. TAVENNER. As members of the Communist Party?"

"Mr. WERE. I did, sir. Did you wish to hear them now?"

"Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. I would like for to proceed (sic).

"Mr. WERE. Al Richmond, R-i-c-h-m-o-o-n-d. He is a Smith Act conviction from the Peoples World" (pp. 1812, 1814, 1817).

Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 16, 1938. During the course of his testimony Mr. Steele read a list of Leading State Officials of Communist Party, U. S. A. * * * Al Richmond was shown on this list as propaganda director in California. (See p. 314 of the hearings.)

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1957 (pp. 1 and 2), and the New York Times of February 13, 1957 (pp. 1 and 20), reported that Al Richmond, San Francisco, Calif., was elected to the national committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the closing session of the 16th national convention held February 9-12, New York City. Al Richmond, California, wrote an article entitled "Strike Struggles and Some Key Conclusions" which was printed in the 1951 issue of "Our Party," Pre-Convention Discussion Bulletin, No. 5, issued by the Communist Party, U. S. A. The Daily Worker of August 29, 1936 (p. 3) contained an article entitled "2 Communists to Speak at Labor Press Outing" in which it was reported that Al Richmond, Washington correspondent for the Daily Worker, was to speak at a Labor Press outing arranged by the Communist Party in Washington, D. C. According to the Daily People's World of January 18, 1954 (p. 2), Al Richmond was one of a group of war veterans who protested against President Eisenhower's proposal to deprive Communists convicted under the Smith Act of their citizenship. He was identified in this instance as T/Sgt., Medical Dept. ETO, from San Francisco.

According to the Daily Worker of July 27, 1951 (p. 1), Al Richmond, executive editor of the Daily People's World, was arrested under the Smith Act for conspiracy, with bail set at \$75,000. The same information is found in the Daily People's World of that date in which he was described as a "working class" leader. Al Richmond was indicted under the Smith Act by a Federal grand jury in Los Angeles, July 31, as shown by the Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 8), and the Washington Post of August 1, 1951 (p. 9). He was freed on bail after 4 months in jail (Daily People's World, December 11, 1951, p. 1). The transcript of proceedings, July 18, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif., United States of America, Plaintiff vs. William Schneiderman et al., Defendants, listed Al Richmond, 1 of 14 defendants, charged in an indictment with conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence, in the Southern District of California, United States District Court.

The Daily People's World of August 6, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Al Richmond was convicted of violation of the Smith Act in Los Angeles on August 5. He was given the maximum penalty of 5 years in prison and

\$10,000 fine for conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence according to the New York Times of August 8, 1952 (pp. 1 and 5). The Daily Worker of November 9, 1952 (p. 8) reported that the United States Government moved to have Al Richmond's citizenship revoked. The Daily Worker of May 13, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Al Richmond, Daily People's World editor convicted under the Smith Act, obtained his citizenship in 1943 at San Antonio, Tex., while in the United States Army. The article stated further that he won postponement of the Government's suit to cancel his citizenship until his appeal of a Smith Act conviction was adjudged. Appeals were filed in his behalf on June 14 in San Francisco according to the Daily People's World of June 16, 1953 (p. 3). A Justice Department letter, September 8, 1954, with a list of Smith Act cases involving Communist Party leaders listed Al Richmond as a defendant in the Smith Act Case V, *United States v. Schneiderman et al.*, February 1, 1952, to August 5, 1952, Los Angeles, Calif.; convicted, on appeal to Court of Appeals. The Washington Evening Star of June 17, 1957 (pp. A-1 and 6) and the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 16, 1957 (p. A-21), reported that Al Richmond was 1 of 5 California Communists freed by the Supreme Court in a 4-3 majority opinion on June 17.

Al Richmond, editor-in-chief, Daily People's World, was shown as a member of the faculty or lecturer at the California Labor School (A-1948; I-1956) in the spring 1947 catalog of the school (p. 47), the testimony of Walter S. Steele in public hearings of this committee, July 21, 1947 (p. 54), and in the yearbook and catalog of the school for 1948 (pp. 16, 38). He was chairman of the forum on labor developments in Australia, Panama and South Africa at the California Labor School (Daily People's World, July 7, 1948, p. 1). The Daily People's World of April 2, 1951 (p. 8) reported that Mr. Richmond would speak at a discussion series held by the school. The Daily People's World of May 8, 1951 (p. 8) announced that Al Richmond would speak at the California Labor School on problems of Mexican-Americans on May 9. He was announced as a member of a panel discussion at the school on September 18 (Daily People's World, September 18, 1952, p. 7); at a forum on November 26 (Daily People's World, November 21, 1952, p. 2); as a speaker on "the truth behind the current charges of Soviet antisemitism" in San Francisco, February 18 (Daily People's World, February 11, 1953, p. 7); and as a lecturer in a series on Economic Problems of Capitalism and Socialism, beginning February 25, 1953 (Daily People's World, February 19, 1953, p. 7).

The Daily People's World of March 20, 1953 (p. 3) reported that Al Richmond was to conduct a class on "Economic Problems of Capitalism and Socialism" in a series of the California Labor School beginning April 1 in Oakland. It was announced in the Daily People's World of April 27, 1953 (p. 7), that Al Richmond would be a guest speaker at the California Labor School at a lecture course on United States Imperialism—As It Affects Us at Home and Colonial Peoples Abroad, beginning April 28. The Daily People's World of September 15, 1953 (p. 7) reported that Al Richmond was to lecture on China trade in a regular lecture series entitled "Our Changing World Today" at the California Labor School. The Daily People's World of November 13, 1953 (p. 6) and November 24, 1953 (p. 2) reported that Al Richmond would support the 11th annual Christmas market to be held December 11-13 in San Francisco, to benefit the California Labor School.

The circular, Winter Term 1954, January 18-March 26, named Al Richmond as instructor of a session at the California Labor School on California Masters of Literature.

The Daily People's World of April 26, 1954 (p. 7), announced that Al Richmond would speak at the California Labor School on Puerto Rico—United States Colony, in a series of lectures. The Daily People's World of May 14, 1954 (p. 3), announced that Al Richmond would deliver the last in a series of lectures on the History of the Negro People in the United States on May 17. The Daily People's World of July 8, 1954 (p. 7), announced that Al Richmond was scheduled to lecture on the history and problems of the Negro people at the California Labor School during the summer lecture discussion series beginning July 28.

Al Richmond was guest of honor at a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress (A-1947; C-1947; I-1956) held December 14 welcoming home working class leaders arrested under the Smith Act according to the Daily Worker of December 19, 1951 (p. 3). It was announced in the Daily People's World of January 17, 1952 (p. 3), that Al Richmond was to be guest of honor at a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress to be held January 25, San Francisco.

Al Richmond was shown as executive editor of the Daily People's World (C-1941) in the following sources: Daily People's World, August 8, 1947, page 2; January 6, 1948, page 5; March 4, 1947, page 2; May 20, 1948, page 3 and April 6 1953, page 3. Al Richmond was shown as a member of the editorial board of the Daily People's World in the January 27, 1938, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), and as editor in the October 2, 1947 (p. 3), October 6, 1952 (p. 6) and October 5, 1953 (p. 6) issues of the Daily People's World. In testimony in public hearings of this committee on July 21, 1947, Walter S. Steele named Al Richmond as executive editor of the Daily People's World (p. 34), and a staff writer for the paper (p. 43).

Articles written by Al Richmond are found in the following issues of the Daily People's World: December 14, 1942, page 1; August 15, 1947, page 1; August 5, 1948, page 1; October 7, 1948, page 2; January 20, 1950, page 1, section 2; June 9, 1950, page 1, section 2; January 19, 1951, page 3, section 2; February 23, 1951, page 1, section 2; March 26, 1951, page 5; April 5, 1951, page 1; April 20, 1951, section 2, page 1; May 11, 1951, page 8M; December 21, 1951, page M4; December 28, 1951, page M1; January 11, 1952, page M3; February 15, 1952, page M4; March 7, 1952, page M4; June 20, 1952, page 6; December 5, 1952, page 6M; July 3, 1953, page 4M; December 31, 1953, page 5M; July 2, 1954, page 1M; December 10, 1954, page M5; and February 4, 1955, page M1.

Al Richmond spoke at gatherings of the Daily People's World as shown by the following issues of the publication: Daily People's World, April 14, 1952, page 8; July 7, 1952, page 2; July 9, 1952, page 1; December 26, 1952, page 3; February 16, 1953, page 7; March 9, 1953, page 8; March 12, 1953, page 2; January 21, 1954, page 2; May 7, 1954, page 2; and June 22, 1956, page 3.

The Daily People's World of January 7, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Al Richmond would participate in the Daily People's World 15th anniversary celebration on January 9 in San Francisco. The January 13, 1953, issue of the newspaper (p. 3) reported that he did participate in the celebration. He signed an open letter urging full support to the newspaper's drive for new readers (Daily People's World, March 18, 1953, p. 8). It was announced in the Daily People's World of May 26, 1953 (p. 2), that Al Richmond would participate in a welcome home celebration for Nat Yanish, freed on bail in deportation proceedings to be held May 29 in San Francisco. Al Richmond, staff member of the Daily People's World, pledged a day's pay to its annual fund drive according to the June 19, 1953, issue of the newspaper. Al Richmond was the subject of an article by

Adam Lapin in the August 10, 1951, issue of the *Daily People's World* (sec. 2, p. 1).

Al Richmond was Washington correspondent for the *Daily Worker* (C-1939) according to the August 29, 1936, issue of the publication (p. 3). He was California correspondent according to the January 4, 1939, issue (p. 1). Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings of this committee on August 16, 1938. In the course of his testimony Mr. Steele identified Al Richmond as a columnist for the *Daily Worker* (p. 321).

Al Richmond contributed articles to the following issues of the *Daily Worker*: May 16, 1935, page 5; November 2, 1935, page 5; May 24, 1936, page 3; June 25, 1936, page 1; July 18, 1936, page 1; August 15, 1936, page 1; January 27, 1938, page 1; March 1, 1942, section 2, page 4; April 13, 1952, page M3; May 10, 1953, page 3; April 26, 1954, page 4; and February 19, 1956, page 9.

Articles written by Al Richmond are found in the following issues of *New Masses* (A-1942; C-1939): October 4, 1938, page 13; November 22, 1938, page 8; January 17, 1939, page 15; and May 21, 1940, page 9. He contributed to the September 1952 issue of *Masses and Mainstream* (C-1949).

Al Richmond spoke in behalf of the Communist cases as shown by the *Daily People's World* of October 24, 1949 (p. 3). He spoke at a mass meeting for the California Smith Act defendants according to the *Daily People's World* of January 24, 1952 (p. 3).

Al Richmond, editorial staff, *Western Worker*, sent greetings to the Young Communist League (A-1948; C-1940) as shown by the California Young Communist League Yearbook, 1937 (p. 45).

Nine other Los Angeles Communists, convicted of Smith Act violations at the same time as the 5, were granted a new trial. Their records are very much like those of the 5 foregoing and no purpose could be served by taking additional space in the record to detail their many activities for and on behalf of the Red conspiracy. Suffice it to say that these Communists and their Communist attorneys are now at liberty to resume a normal life of revolutionary plotting—a course but temporarily slowed, if at all, by their convictions.

Nothing in recent years has given greater impetus or encouragement to the resurgence of the American Communist apparatus than have recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Joyous disbelief must have greeted the news of the acquittal of the five, as well as the intelligence of new trials for the other Smith Act defendants in the Los Angeles case. Following as it did the earlier action of the Court in requiring the FBI to open its files in court actions against subversives. Monday, June 17, 1957, might well be added to the Communist calendar as a "Red letter" day to be celebrated throughout the enslaved world.

Nor is the Congress itself blameless in the matter. The duty of the Congress is to write the laws; that of the Supreme Court to interpret them. For many months Members of the Congress, and a sizable section of the Nation's press, have voiced criticism of some of the recent interpretations and decisions of the Court. Yet the Congress has not taken action to this time to clarify its intent nor to rewrite the law in certain instances where it was clearly evident that the interpretation put upon an act by the Court was not that intended by the Congress in passing the legislation. Pending bills deal with this aspect of

the matter, and the respective Committees on the Judiciary should act before the public demand forces recognition of a worsening situation and a growing protest.

Mr. Speaker, I have just received from a great American jurist, former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Lloyd Wright, the following telegram:

Although I speak for myself alone, I am sure that many members of the legal profession and thoughtful citizens throughout the country are gravely concerned by the trend evident in recent decisions of the Court. In the structures of American Government we have entrusted the ultimate power to the judiciary in the faith that ours may be a government of laws and not of men. Only through the disciplines and processes of law can the Nation and its traditional liberties be held secure, and only if these disciplines and processes are respected can the Court abide by its solemn duties.

Certain well-known decisions fail to respect these limits of the judicial function. The boundaries of the concrete case have been transcended, in disregard of the Court's own rules, and in an apparent campaign of ideological preaching. Personal views of individual judges have supplanted precedent, the cornerstone of Anglo-American jurisprudence. Rightful prerogatives of the political branches of the Federal Government have sometimes been usurped, and the rights of the American people to control their local affairs through State governments have been ignored.

The final solution is not chastisement of the transient occupants of the bench or curtailment of essential judicial powers. The Court as an institution must be preserved. It can be restored to its proper station by limiting the honor of its office to seasoned trial judges or men who have in other pursuits proved their qualification. Every citizen shares the responsibility forthrightly to assure that those chosen for the Bench are fit to discharge its solemn obligations.

The following is another telegram I received from Mr. Louis C. Wyman:

SUN VALLEY, IDAHO, June 26, 1957.
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON,
Members of Congress
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Copy of my address of June 24 airmailed special to you this morning as requested. The National Association of Attorneys General one hour ago passed the following resolution 31 to 11 calling for cooperation with Federal agencies in preparation of legislation designed to regain as much ground for national and State security as is possible from the recent decisions of the Supreme Court: "Be it resolved by the 51st annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General at Sun Valley, Idaho, June 26, 1957, That the president of this association is authorized to appoint a committee on internal security, such committee to be instructed to confer immediately with interested Federal agencies and other national groups, including the American Bar Association, with a view to preparation of legislation for introduction at the current session of Congress designed to reaffirm and reactivate Federal and State internal security controls, and be it further

"Resolved, That the committee shall present its recommendations to the executive committee of this association, and with the approval and authority of the executive committee, the committee on internal security is authorized to appear before the Congress in support of its recommendations."

Needless to say, this matter is of literally urgent importance. I sincerely hope Con-

gress will not let these decisions go by without acting to cure as much as possible by legislation and by proposal of adequate constitutional amendments. If the first amendment is to be applied as it has by the Court in the *Watkins v. United States* to security cases the limitation will apply with even greater force to Congressional investigations in fields in which no justification for limitation of freedom of speech has yet been pronounced. Not only will the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice be severely handicapped by it; it is almost certain that Congressional and State legislative fact-finding investigations cannot function at all when opposed by hostile witnesses in the future under these decisions.

Best wishes.

LOUIS C. WYMAN, President.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security have been rendered as innocuous as two kittens in a cage full of rabid dogs, and if the intent of the decisions was to destroy the utility of these committees, that goal has been achieved. It might be added that the Court has accomplished what all of the Communists, the fellow travelers, and apologists have been unable to do since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was first named chairman of the Select Committee on Un-American Activities many years ago. If the Congress does not intend to rectify the present situation by appropriate legislation to protect its own committees, it should then abolish them by appropriate resolutions, and leave the field of battle completely in control of those who would destroy not only the authority of the two committees in question, but the inherent power of the Congress to investigate in any area it deems proper and necessary. Furthermore, if the powers delegated to the States by the Constitution are to be preserved against the further and alarming encroachments of Federal sovereignty, the Congress should meet the present challenge and emphatically.

Although the impact of recent decisions has been felt principally in the area of Communist investigation, no member of any committee of the Congress can today afford the luxury of complacency. The Court has demonstrated its ability to so restrict and nullify the effective activity of a Congressional committee that no committee of the Congress, nor any member of any committee, can assume that his particular area of Congressional activity is beyond the reach of the Court.

The present Court is demonstrating a libertarian view that is, in the opinion of many, tortured and strained. In an effort to demonstrate something that escapes the understanding of the average layman, the Court is returning scot-free to the bosom of the conspiracy, known Communists who may be expected to resume immediately their former positions as functionaries of the Communist apparatus. Whether the safety of the American people and their right to be secure against treason in their midst, is more important than possible injury to a few known and proven Communists, is a question fraught with concern at the present time. No one

questions the right nor the duty of the Court to scrutinize closely the acts of the Congress and the decisions of subordinate courts. Any concerned citizen, however, has the right and the clear duty to protest decisions which appear to constitute infringements of authority constitutionally delegated to the legislative branch, and outright acquittals of Communist defendants determined guilty of subversion by legally constituted juries.

During last week a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in San Francisco, Calif., inquiring into matters clearly within the purview of the charge laid upon the committee by the House of Representatives in Public Law 601. During the hearings the most recent decisions of the Supreme Court were handed down, and it is my understanding that the arrogance and intransigence of unfriendly witnesses appearing in response to subpoenas issued by the subcommittee, exceeded anything before witnessed in the history of the committee. In this connection it should be pointed out to the membership of the House that for several years past it has been the policy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities not to subpoena before it any person not previously identified, under oath, as a past or present member of the Communist conspiracy. It is my understanding that all who were subpoenaed to appear before the subcommittee in San Francisco had been so identified. It is clear that the heart and soul of any conspiracy are those individuals who comprise its secret councils, and participate in its secret operations. It is impossible to disclose the machinations of a conspiracy, whatever its nature, without bringing before proper authorities those individuals who constitute the conspiratorial core. Without the authority to subpoena witnesses and to direct to those witnesses questions relating to sworn information in the possession of the committee, there is removed from the hands of the Congress of the United States the only effective instrument it possesses for the initiation and recommendation of remedial legislation. During the many years in which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has served as the instrument of the House for the investigation of subversive propaganda activities, a considerable number of legislative recommendations have been made by the committee to the legislative committees of this body. The charge is frequently made, and evidently the Supreme Court believes that the primary purpose of the committee is exposure of the role played by witnesses, and not the implementation of its findings by appropriate recommendations for remedial legislation. The most effective answer to this charge is to insert into the RECORD a documented list of committee recommendations for legislative action by the Congress, together with a list of substantive legislative actions taken by the Congress and by the executive branch on the recommendations submitted by the committee. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this

point a list of such recommendations and actions:

PART I

1947

Citizenship of Federal employees

Committee recommendation: The enactment of legislation requiring that all employees and officials of our Federal Government be American citizens (January 3, 1941).

Action: Although no such legislation has been enacted, the appropriation acts carry citizenship requirements, of which the following is an example:

"General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1958 (Public Law 85-48, sec. 202). Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States; (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date; (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States; or (4) is an alien from the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed 60 days) as a result of emergencies."

Deportation and exclusion of alien subversives

Committee recommendation: That legislation be enacted requiring that all alien Communists and other subversive aliens be promptly deported and that the Immigration Service maintain a stringent screening process to restrain the present influx of aliens into the United States and to determine whether their political background is inimical to the best interests of the United States (January 2, 1947).

Action: I. Section 22 "Sec. 4" of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1008) as repealed (66 Stat. 279, sec. 403 (a) (16)) and superseded by section 241 (a) (6) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 205), provides for deportation of aliens affiliated with the Communist Party and other subversive aliens.

II. Section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1006) as repealed (66 Stat. 279, sec. 403 (a) (16)) and superseded by section 212 (a) (28) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 184), provides for the exclusion of aliens with political backgrounds which are inimical to the welfare of the United States.

III. Chapter 4 of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 195-

204), provides for a stringent screening process.

Restriction of tax-exemption privileges of Communist educational and charitable organizations

Committee recommendation: Legislation should be enacted to restrict the benefits of certain tax-exemption privileges now extended to a number of Communist fronts posing as educational, charitable, and relief organizations (January 2, 1947).

Action: Section 11 (b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 997) denies income-tax exemptions under section 502 of the Internal Revenue Code, to Communist organizations required to register under section 7 of the Internal Security Act.

Secret membership in organizations

Committee recommendation: Legislation designed to prohibit membership in any organization using the United States mails or subject to Federal laws, by persons using an alias or assumed name. Such legislation should also include a provision which would clearly ban concealed or secret memberships in any such organizations (January 2, 1947).

Action: Section 8 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 995) provides for registration with the Attorney General of individuals who are members of Communist-action organizations, and seeking or holding employment in a defense facility.

1948

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE, 80TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mundt-Nixon bill

Committee recommendation: Legislation modeled substantially after the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill (December 31, 1948).

Action: The provisions of the Mundt-Nixon bill (H. R. 5852, 80th Cong.) have been incorporated in the Internal Security Act of 1950 in the following sections, given in the order in which a similar provision appeared in the Mundt-Nixon bill: Sections 7-10 (64 Stat. 993-996), section 5 (64 Stat. 992), section 6 (64 Stat. 993), sections 12-13 (64 Stat. 997-1001), section 14 (64 Stat. 1001), section 11 (64 Stat. 996-997).

Deportation of aliens upon conviction of crimes against United States

Committee recommendation: That the espionage laws of the United States be substantially strengthened with special attention to means for returning aliens to other countries upon conviction for crimes against the United States (December 31, 1948).

Action: Section 241 (a) (17) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 207), substantially strengthens the laws concerning deportation of aliens on conviction for crimes against the United States by listing specific acts, the violation of which shall be grounds for deportation. Among these acts are: The Espionage Act of 1917 (40 Stat. 217) as amended (40 Stat. 553), the espionage provisions of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 791, 792, 793, 794, 2388, 3241), the sabotage provisions of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 2151-2156), the Selective Service Act of 1948 (61 Stat. 604), the Universal Military Training and Service Act (65 Stat. 75), and several others.

Study of immigration laws

Committee recommendation: That our immigration laws and passport visa regulations be carefully studied to determine what changes are necessary to prevent disloyal elements from entering this country and remaining here (December 31, 1948).

Action: Section 401 (a) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 274), provides for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, which is to conduct a continuing study of the administration of the act and

its effect on the national security, etc., of the United States. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General are required to submit all regulations, etc., requested by the committee pertaining to administration of the act, and the Secretary of State shall consult with the committee from time to time.

1949

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE, 81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Statute of limitations in espionage cases

Committee recommendation: That the statute of limitations in espionage cases be amended (March 15, 1950).

Action: Sections 4 (e) and 19 of the Internal Security Act (64 Stat. 992, 1005) provide for a 10-year statute of limitations for a violation of certain provisions of law concerning espionage, other than violations constituting a capital offense. This replaces the 3-year statute of limitations (18 U. S. C. 3232) which would otherwise prevail.

Legal definition of treason

Committee recommendation: That legal definition of treason and the penalties attached thereto be broadened to cover a period like the present cold war.

Action: There are 2 bills now pending (H. J. Res. 1 and H. J. Res. 53) which provide for a constitutional amendment, broadening the definition of treason so as to include adherence to any group which advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Employment of subversives in defense plants—safeguards

Committee recommendation: Adoption of H. R. 3903 (81st Cong.) providing for safeguards against employment of subversive individuals in defense plants (March 15, 1950).

Action: Section 5 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 992) provides that members of a Communist-action organization shall not hold employment in a defense facility, and that members of a Communist-front organization must disclose such membership when seeking or holding employment in a defense facility.

Detention of deportable alien Communists

Committee recommendation: H. R. 10 (81st Cong.), providing for the supervision and detention of deportable aliens, should be enacted into law in order to deal with thousands of alien Communists refused acceptance by the country of their birth (March 15, 1950).

Action: Section 23 "Sec. 20 (b)" of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1011) and the act of June 18, 1952 (66 Stat. 138, c. 442), as (both) repealed and superseded by section 242 (c)-(h) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act (66 Stat. 210-212) provides for detention and supervision of such aliens.

1950

Technical surveillance

Committee recommendation: That Congress authorize the use of technical evidence secured during the course of investigations involving espionage, treason, or other crimes involving the security of the United States, to intercept and use as evidence in any criminal proceeding information obtained as the result of technical surveillance (January 2, 1951).

Action: There are 2 bills now pending (H. R. 269, 1010) which would authorize the admission into evidence of information intercepted in national security investigations in any criminal proceeding, in any court established by Congress in criminal cases involving interference with national security or defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, etc., if such information is obtained after the issuance of an ex parte order by a Federal judge, authorizing the interception.

Amendment of Taft-Hartley Act—non-Communist affidavits

Committee recommendation: Amendment of Taft-Hartley Act to make impossible a situation where a union official formally resigns from the Communist Party and then signs a non-Communist affidavit (January 2, 1951).

Action: The Communist Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 777, sec. 6) has made it lawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold office in any labor union (50 U. S. C. 784 (1) (E)); the act of July 26, 1955 (69 Stat. 375, c381), in amending section 13A (e) (1) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, now provides that a labor union which has an officer who has been affiliated with a Communist organization for the past 3 years, shall be considered a "Communist-infiltrated organization" and shall be ineligible to act as representative of any employees.

1951

Single espionage statute for peace and war

Committee recommendation: A single, comprehensive espionage statute applicable both to peacetime and wartime, carrying a capital-punishment sentence (February 17, 1952).

Action: The act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1219 sec. 201) amended section 794 of the criminal code so that gathering or delivering defense information to aid a foreign government now carries a penalty of "death or imprisonment for any term of years, or for life" in peacetime as well as in wartime (18 U. S. C. 794).

Immunity for Congressional witnesses

Committee recommendation: Legislation to effect a greater latitude in granting immunity from prosecution to witnesses appearing before Congressional, executive, or judicial hearings (February 17, 1951).

Action: The act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 745 sec. 1) provides that a witness in any Congressional investigation involving interference with or endangering of the national security or defense, by specific crimes involving subversive activity, may be granted immunity against self-incrimination (if he has claimed such privilege) and thereby be compelled to testify and produce evidence. The act requires, prior to the immunity grant, an order of a United States District Court compelling the testimony or the production of evidence. No testimony so compelled shall be used in any subsequent criminal proceeding against the witness in any court. But no immunity shall exist against perjury or contempt committed while testifying or producing evidence under compulsion (18 U. S. C. 3486).

1952

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE, 82D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Emergency powers of executive branch in present period

Committee recommendation: In matters dealing with internal security, that emergency powers of the executive branch of the Government be placed on a wartime basis in periods such as now exist (December 28, 1952).

Action: Act of June 30, 1953 (67 Stat. 133 ch. 175), extend until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, certain wartime provisions relating to sabotage of war materials, espionage, and subversive activities affecting the Armed Forces.

1953

B. ON RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN ANNUAL REPORT OF FEBRUARY 6, 1954

Foreign agents—Registration

Committee recommendation: Reexamination of the Foreign Agents Registration Act

of 1938 to determine its effectiveness in controlling and exposing subversive activities (February 6, 1954).

Action: This was done, with the resulting enactment of the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 899 c849) which provides for the registration of every person who has knowledge of or who has received training in foreign espionage systems (50 U. S. C. 851).

Communist infiltration of labor unions

Committee recommendation: The study of the anti-Communist oath provision of the Taft-Hartley Act with a view to strengthening that provision to prevent Communist infiltration of labor unions (February 6, 1954).

Action: The act of July 26, 1955 (69 Stat. 375 c381) amends section 13A (e) (1) of the Subversive Activities Control Act so that the management of an organization may be considered Communist-infiltrated if one of its officers has been a member of a Communist organization within the past 3 (previously 2) years (50 U. S. C. 792a).

Membership clause of the Smith Act

Committee recommendation: The Smith Act be amended to "provide that proof of membership in the Communist Party shall constitute prima facie evidence of violation of the Smith Act."

Action: Although no legislation has been enacted to so amend the Smith Act, section 4 of the Communist Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 775) provides that whoever knowingly and wilfully becomes or remains a member of the Communist Party shall be subject to all the provisions and penalties of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The court has convicted Claude Lightfoot for violating "the membership clause of the Smith Act," on the theory that he continued to be a member of the Communist Party, knowing what the party stood for. *United States v. Lightfoot* (January 12, 1956, CA 7, 24 L. W. 2319).

1954

Recommendations made in 1954 either (a) were also made in previous years and are reported above or (b) are recommendations on which no legislative action has been taken.

1955

Streamlining contempt of Congress procedures

Committee recommendations: H. R. 780, 84th Congress, be enacted by the Senate. This bill provides that a committee may refer a defiant witness directly to the courts, where, if the court finds the witness to have been in contempt of Congress, and the witness so continues, the witness may be adjudged in contempt of court, itself.

Action: H. R. 259, now pending in the 85th Congress is a similar measure.

Registration of persons trained in espionage

Committee recommendation: All persons with a knowledge or training in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage tactics of a foreign government be required to register.

Action: Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 900, ch. 849) so provided (50 U. S. C. secs. 851-857).

1956

E. ON RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1956

Perjury statute

Committee recommendation: Presently the Government must prove perjury by the testimony of 2 witnesses or 1 witness and corroborative evidence. Legislation is needed (bills were introduced in both Houses, 84th Congress) requiring that the Government need prove only that the statements of the witness are contradictory—provided that they are willful, concern material matters, and are made within 3 years of each other.

Action: H. R. 282, now pending, extends the United States criminal law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath.

Passports: Use by members of the Communist Party

Committee recommendation: Secretary of State should have his discretionary power in the matter of the issuance of passports reinforced by positive legislative declaration: statutory recognition should be given the presently existing regulations governing passport matters.

Action: H. R. 5612, now pending, would prohibit the issuance of passports to persons under Communist discipline under the Communist Control Act.

Penalties—Increase

Committee recommendation: More realistic penalties for such crimes as those involving seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of the Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the Government.

Title 18, United States Code, section 2384 should be amended to provide penalties up to \$20,000 and 10 years; title 18, United States Code, section 2385 should be amended likewise:

Action: The act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 623 c678) increased the penalty for seditious conspiracy, and for willfully advocating the overthrow of government by force, to a fine of \$20,000, or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both (18 U. S. C. 2384, 2385).

Social Security—Fraud

Committee recommendation: Legislation making it a crime for any member of the Communist Party to acquire a social security card under a false name. Recommends a 10 year statute of limitations for such a crime.

Action: The Social Security Act has been amended by act of August 1, 1956, to provide that service in the employ of a Communist or Communist-infiltrated organization shall not count toward social security coverage (42 U. S. C. 410 (a) (17)).

The Social Security Act provides a penalty for fraud in connection with any false representation concerning the requirements of the act (42 U. S. C. 1307 (a)).

Summary suspension of Federal employees

Committee recommendation: Legislation to overrule the Supreme Court in *Cole v. Young* (351 U. S. 536) where it held that "national security" as used in the National Security Act (August 26, 1950) referred only to employees "directly concerned with the protection of the Nation from internal subversion or foreign aggression. * * * The legislation recommended would state that all employees of any Government department or agency were engaged in "national security."

Action: H. R. 981, now pending, would authorize the summary dismissal of Federal employees in the interest of national security in the absolute discretion of the head of the department or agency. All employees of any department or agency are deemed to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security.

PART II

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION ON FEDERAL LOYALTY

Committee recommendations: That Congress create an independent commission with authority to investigate and to order the discharge of any employee or official of the Federal Government whose loyalty to the United States is found to be in doubt (January 2, 1947).

Action: Although no legislation was enacted, several steps in that direction have been made under Executive Order 10450 (18 F. R. 2489), issued on April 27, 1953, which establishes a security program for the

Federal departments and agencies. Sections 1 and 6 of this order provide for summary suspension by agency heads, of employees considered to be poor security risks, followed by termination of their employment if found to be advisable in the interest of national security upon the results of proper investigation. Section 9 of this order provides for a central clearance by means of a security-investigation index to be maintained in the Civil Service Commission, covering all persons as to whom security investigations have been conducted by any agency, and to contain all identifying information which the heads of agencies shall immediately furnish to the Civil Service Commission.

SUBVERSIVE MATTERS DIVISION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Committee recommendation: That the Department of Justice be required by law to establish within the Department a special division devoted to the prosecution of subversive elements now operating in the United States (January 2, 1947).

Action: On July 9, 1954, the Attorney General established the Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice (Order No. 51-54) (19 F. R. 4429).

SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES OF FOREIGN EMBASSIES

Committee recommendation: That the House request, by proper resolution, a report from the Postmaster General of the United States, setting forth the number of embassies or foreign agencies now enjoying second-class mailing privileges and also specifically identifying such agencies where the respective foreign governments do not accord to our embassies, ministers, and other United States officials equal mailing privileges in those countries, and that proper legislation be enacted by Congress limiting the use of second-class mailing privileges to such embassies and agencies of those foreign governments which extend reciprocal privileges to the United States Government (January 2, 1947).

Action: No legislation, but reciprocity is being enforced by the State Department. An illustration appears in Department of State Press Release No. 680, issued December 31, 1953, containing the text of a note delivered to the Rumanian Legation, in which the Secretary of State notified the Legation to cease the publication in the United States of the Rumanian News and other similar pamphlets published at the expense of the Rumanian Government. This step was taken because the Rumanian Government had on December 29, 1953, banned the distribution in Rumania of a publication issued by our Legation in Bucharest entitled "News From America."

ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST COUNTRY EMBASSIES

Committee recommendation: That activities of embassies of Communist-dominated countries be limited to proper safeguards sternly enforced (March 15, 1950).

Action: This now being enforced by the State Department and restrictions on diplomatic personnel are generally a matter of reciprocity with the various foreign countries. On March 10, 1952, the State Department issued a press release (No. 181) which contains the text of a note from the Secretary of State to the Ambassador of the U. S. S. R., restricting the travel of Soviet officials in the United States to a 25-mile radius from their base office, without prior permission from the State Department. This action was retaliatory for restrictions placed upon travel of American diplomatic and consular officials in the Soviet Union.

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL BY SOVIET AND SATELLITE DIPLOMATS

Committee recommendation: That reciprocal restrictions be enforced by this country

on the travel of Soviet and satellite diplomats (February 17, 1952).

Action: Such restrictions are now being enforced by the State Department, an example being the note of March 10, 1952, from the Secretary of State to the Soviet Ambassador, restricting the travel of Soviet officials in the United States to a 25-mile radius from their base office, without prior permission from the State Department. This was in retaliation for similar restrictions placed upon the travel of American diplomatic and consular officials in the Soviet Union.

CANCELLATION OF PASSPORT OF PERSON UNDER SUBPENA

Committee recommendation: Legislation to provide for the cancellation of the passport in the possession of any United States citizen in a foreign country for whom a subpoena has been outstanding for 6 months (February 17, 1952).

Action: Although no such legislation has been introduced, a step in that direction may have been taken by the issuance by the Secretary of State (on January 10, 1956), of Department Regulation 108.276, which amends section 51.136 of the passport regulations, to provide that passport facilities, except for direct and immediate return to the United States, will be refused to a person when it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the person's activities abroad would: (a) violate the laws of the United States; (b) be prejudicial to the orderly conduct of foreign relations; or (c) otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States (21 F. R. 336).

REVOCAION OF COMMISSION IN ARMED FORCES

Committee recommendation: That in any instance where a person holding a commission in the armed services chooses to refuse to answer questions concerning his present or past membership in the Communist Party, such commission shall be immediately revoked (February 17, 1952).

Action: No legislative action, but the Army Department has issued AR 604-10 (15 May 1957), Criterion No. 6, section 13, which includes a provision that the refusal of military personnel to testify before a duly authorized body regarding subversive activities, may result in a discharge other than honorable.

If the American people are aware of the nature and of the ultimate goals of the Soviet Union, it is the contention of many that the knowledge acquired has stemmed from the conscientious pursuit of their assigned duties by the Members of the House and Senate who have undertaken the onerous duty of service upon one or another of the committees investigating subversive propaganda activities. Again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that recent decisions in the Supreme Court have rendered the committees' effectiveness null and void, and that unless the Senate and the House move, by legislation, to restore authority to their committees and spell out the authority intended to be exercised, these instruments might as well be abolished by appropriate resolution.

Now to the question, Mr. Speaker, of public information mediums and the role they should play in bringing the story of the American Congress at work to the American people. It has long been accepted as desirable and proper that newspaper, periodical, and radio representatives should enjoy every facility here on Capitol Hill, necessary to the important work of the gathering and dissemination of news originating in the Capitol. However, new problems, unique

in the history of the Congress, have been created in recent years, following the development of television and its rapid acceptance by the American people as a news medium. Many resolutions have been introduced in recent years which would have written into the rules of the House of Representatives either a prohibition upon the use of television in the House and in committee hearings, or, conversely, a rule which would have made possible the broadcasting of committee hearings by television, radio, or moving pictures, subject to the decision of a committee chairman, or upon a vote of a majority of the members of the committee. The original ban on television, radio, and moving pictures in a hearing room was issued by our distinguished Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, in 1952, when a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was conducting a series of hearings in Detroit, Mich. At that time the committee subpoenaed as witnesses, a number of officials of the Ford local union, all of whom had been identified in previous testimony, under oath, as past or present members of the Communist Party. In the midst of those hearings, an order was issued by the Speaker, prohibiting the further televising or broadcasting of the testimony. Since that time the question of television, moving pictures, and radio broadcasts from committee hearing rooms has been the center of a continuing controversy; one which was pointed up dramatically during the recent hearings of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that television and other visual mediums are here to stay, and that their wide acceptance by the American people indicates that they, too, believe all to have become coequal partners. Today millions depend upon their newspapers, their radios, and their television sets for information on events transpiring throughout the world, and in giving coverage to news events, each medium supplements the other. Nor should the reluctance of a witness to face a camera of any kind influence in any way the decision of the Congress, which should be made upon this important subject in the immediate future. No defendant, and very few witnesses, appearing in response to an official court order or subpoena, desire to have their countenances seen by their fellow citizens. In almost every issue of every newspaper there appears a picture of a defendant, a witness, or one subject to some form of inquiry, attempting to shield his face from the probing eye of the press camera. Yet, no protest is made that photographing a reluctant individual under those circumstances infringes upon his constitutional rights. To the contrary, such photographs have become a part of our contemporary journalistic scene. In another body, the recent hearings into practices in some trade unions were televised throughout the Nation and served to bring to the American people—our employers if you please—the shocking story of what may transpire where secrecy instead of publicity is the order of the day. It should not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that we

who represent the people of the United States in the Halls of Congress are here as their agents and upon the public business. The people have a complete and absolute right to know what goes on, and under what circumstances. Those whom we represent are footing the bill for the activities of the Congress, and for any and all of its committees and subcommittees. Hearings before the committees of the Congress are in no manner trials, in spite of what the Communists and their sympathizers, and the critics of Congressional investigations, claim. They are hearings, based in all instances upon what the committee considers to be factual information and evidence upon which it proceeds. If a witness does not choose to answer the question propounded to him by committee members or counsel, he has the unquestioned right to avail himself of whatever protection he desires.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, his declination to speak openly and frankly is news, as evidenced by the recent hearings in another body a few days ago. The question, then, resolves itself into one involving an interpretation of what constitutes news media and to what extent one news medium shall be militated against, and which shall be shown preferential treatment. It is my contention that all facilities and media, properly accredited, which serve the function of giving news service to the American people, must be considered by this Congress on an equal basis. All of them have certain advantages in relation to the other, and all have certain disadvantages by the same yardstick. But, Mr. Speaker, to rule that it is quite all right to photograph a reluctant witness with a speed graphic, but that it is improper to record visually his testimony or his arrogance when questioned by a committee of the Congress, is to draw a tenuous line of distinction and to assume a position which the very force of moving events is certain to destroy. Piling sand against the tide is no answer to the question here involved. The argument has been advanced against television, moving pictures and radio, that the presence of facilities required for the operation of the media create a situation in a hearing room where the witness under interrogation is unable to coordinate his thoughts, and is thus placed at a disadvantage in presenting his case. Having been a member of a committee which has, on many occasions, utilized every means of information to bring the facts of a hearing to the public, I can say, sir, that in no instance of which I have any knowledge, has the presence of television done anything more than to increase the arrogance of unfriendly witnesses, amplify their snarling contempt of the Congress, and in general offer them what they believe to be an excellent vehicle for further exploitation of the individual and collective Communist propaganda effort.

I should feel remiss in my duty as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities if I did not, during the course of these remarks, pay personal tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the House committee. It has been my privilege to serve under several com-

mittee chairmen, Democrat and Republican, during my service on this committee, and all were men of dedication and determination. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not only an able chairman and a constitutional lawyer of great ability, but one whose tenure has been marked by fairness and equity. It has been his constant aim, as it has been that of the other members of this important committee of the House, to keep partisanship out of our committee labors. We who serve on the committee recognize that nothing would be more detrimental nor devastating to our work than to permit considerations of a partisan nature to interfere with the conduct of our hearings. In our determination not to permit our ranks to be split, we have proceeded to the execution of our duties in harmony and with a common purpose. Under the rules of procedure adopted several years ago by the House committee, witnesses appearing before the committee are given every consideration consistent with their own conduct. What the Committee on Un-American Activities requires is a clear-cut statement from the Supreme Court as to where the committee has erred and what improper assumption of power it has exercised. Although the Court has devoted a considerable number of words to its recent decisions, the words do nothing to spell out in clear terms what the Court considers the proper course of action for investigative committees to follow. The decisions are worded in a negative fashion, constituting a new series of prohibitions upon the committees, but they fail to delineate a constitutional pattern which might be accepted by the Congress in delegating required responsibility to its several committees.

But the Congress is not without constitutional authority to proceed on its own responsibility to correct the present situation and bring some element of order out of increasing turmoil. Legislation already introduced and now pending in the cognizant committees of the House will serve the purpose of plugging one of the loopholes. It may be found necessary to amend the Constitution to meet some of the other situations brought about by recent decisions of the Court. The Congress can either take the decisions lying down, and be steamrolled into compliance, or it can exercise its prerogatives as a coequal branch of Government and bring forth the necessary legislative devices to curb the expanding authority of the judicial branch. We are in a constitutional crisis, and the determination which is finally made relative to the question of jurisdictions, may well decide the future form and substance of the American Republic. A national concern is being expressed today regarding decisions of the Court, and the people whom we have the honor to represent are demanding that the Congress take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the traditional balance of power. To fail to meet the present challenge will mean that we have failed individually and collectively in our sworn duty to preserve and defend the Constitution. I have no quarrel with any man who accomplishes his duty as he sees it, but I

do reserve the right to take whatever actions are within my power to counteract and offset the possible catastrophic results which may follow on another's decision, no matter how sincere his intent might have been. Mr. Speaker, this is the situation in which the Congress finds itself today. Granted that the Supreme Court has acted according to the sincere beliefs of all of its members, the fact remains that the Justices are men, and that men are not infallible. Courts have reversed their own decisions, and are quite likely to do so again in the future. In the meanwhile we cannot delegate nor escape our own responsibilities; responsibilities which have been laid upon us by the American people to inquire, to investigate and to legislate upon the findings which are made as a result of such inquiry, investigation and findings. A Congress unable to investigate is a Congress unable to legislate, and whatever agency, judicial or otherwise, limits the power of the Congress to inquire or investigate, also limits the power and the capacity of that same Congress to discharge adequately the responsibilities placed upon it by the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the present hour finds a dispute of this kind developing, but the dispute is a fact and there is nothing to indicate that the Supreme Court intends to follow a course of action in the future different in any way from the course which has been followed for the past several years. Legislation is the only recourse, and it is to be hoped that the Congress will move promptly to the reestablishment of its powers and authority in the triumvirate of government.

Before going further I ask the membership to reflect upon, and to read this statement in the light of the following words of George Washington taken from his Farewell Address:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, pertinent to my discussion today is an article in the U. S. News & World Report of June 28, 1957, I include at this point in the RECORD the article in question, "Here's How the Supreme Court is Stirring Things Up." I also include the following the U. S. News & World Report article, several editorials, and articles on the same subject. [From the U. S. News & World Report of June 28, 1957]

HERE'S HOW THE SUPREME COURT IS STIRRING THINGS UP

The Supreme Court of the United States, asserting power in a way seldom before attempted in its long history, is playing a major part in the growing turmoil in Washington.

On this Court of 9 Justices are 4 appointed by President Eisenhower. Earl Warren, former Republican Governor of California, as Chief Justice, appears to be the driving force of a Court majority that is breaking down traditions in widening fields of law.

It is now clear that the Court set its course back in 1954 with the decision that ordered an end to separate public schools for whites and Negroes. This reversed a Court doctrine of more than 50 years' standing. Since that time, in a growing range of important decisions, a Court majority has limited the power of States in many fields, limited the power of Congress, asserted strongly the rights of individuals, added strength and breadth to the antitrust laws.

On June 17, 1957, after 3 years of pioneering, the Court had a field day. At one sitting, the Justices did these things:

Upheld the right of anyone to preach the overthrow of Government, so long as the preaching is limited to "abstract principle" and does not openly advocate specific action to overthrow Government.

Limited the power of committees of Congress to make investigations and to require witnesses to testify.

Limited the power of States to require witnesses to testify in investigations authorized by State legislatures.

Restricted the power of officials to discharge Government employees.

NEW PATHS

The June 17 decisions capped a term of the Court that saw the Justices carve new paths in many fields of law. As a result of decisions earlier in the term:

Reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Government agencies must be turned over to defendants in criminal trials, if persons who made the reports are called as witnesses.

Relatives of men stationed overseas cannot be tried in military courts.

Past Communist connections, or suspected connections, are not sufficient cause for States to refuse to admit attorneys to the bar.

Antitrust laws apply to firms that bought stock in firms that were their customers, as well as in ones that were their competitors.

NEW CONTROVERSIES

Each of these decisions has resulted in growing controversy and complaints that the Supreme Court, under Chief Justice Warren, is exceeding its powers by treading on the authority of the executive departments, the rights of States and the powers of Congress.

The Justice Department, for example, is concerned about the effects of the decision to open FBI files. In that decision, the Court held that Clinton E. Jencks, a labor leader convicted in a lower court of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, was entitled to a new trial because his request to examine the reports of two Government witnesses was denied.

Federal trial courts already have interpreted this decision in different ways. A judge in New York held that the files need not be supplied until the witnesses are called. But in Washington, D. C., Judge Burnita S. Matthews ruled that James R. Hoffa, an official of the Teamsters Union on trial for bribery, was entitled to a look at the documents before the trial began.

Elsewhere, some courts are applying this decision narrowly while others are ordering the records thrown wide open. In one case, the Government allowed a charge to be dismissed rather than produce its files. Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III, head of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, says it will take several more Supreme Court decisions and perhaps years of litigation before the full meaning of the Jencks ruling becomes clear.

ON COMMUNISM, CONFUSION

The same confusion follows the ruling in the case that involved Communist preachings. That decision resulted in the freeing of five west coast Communists and a new trial for nine others. In this case, Associate

Justice John M. Harlan held for the majority that the word organize in the Smith Act meant to establish, rather than continued organizing. From that point, the Court held that the 5 members could not be prosecuted because the Communist Party of the United States was reorganized in 1945 and the 5 were not indicted until 1951, after the deadline under the 3-year statute of limitations.

As for the nine other party members, the Court held that they should get a new trial because at the original trial, the judge issued a defective instruction to the jury. This instruction failed "to distinguish between advocacy of forcible overthrow as an abstract doctrine and advocacy of action to that end."

This decision is being criticized among attorneys and in Congress as "legal hairsplitting." Nevertheless, Justice Department attorneys are debating whether another trial is worth the effort. These same attorneys are puzzled about the effects of this decision and the Jencks decision on internal-security cases now pending. Nineteen are now being appealed, and all involve either the production of documents or the new, narrow interpretation of the Smith Act.

FOR CONGRESS, A SETBACK

The powers of Congress received a jolt from the Court in the decision that held John T. Watkins, a union organizer, was within his constitutional rights when he refused to tell a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities about past associates in connection with Communist activities. Here the Court held that the subcommittee failed to establish that the questions were pertinent to any legislative purpose.

In the Watkins case, the Court told Congress, in effect, that, if its committees want to get replies from witnesses the committee's legislative purpose must be defined by Congress itself, and the witness must be told why the questions are pertinent. Chief Justice Warren said in his opinion that "there is no Congressional power to expose for the sake of exposure."

This decision, besides freeing Mr. Watkins from a conviction for contempt of Congress, had a quick reaction from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, granted a delay in a subcommittee hearing on alleged Communist infiltration into the New York communications industry when the attorney for three witnesses called attention to the Watkins case.

The decision also is expected to affect convictions of others who refused to answer questions before Congressional committees. One of these cases involves Arthur Miller, a playwright, who, like Mr. Watkins, testified about his associations with Communists but refused to name his associates.

The Court struck down State powers of investigation in a case similar to the Watkins case. This involved the refusal of Paul M. Sweezy, an author and lecturer, to answer questions put by the attorney general of New Hampshire, who was conducting an investigation for the New Hampshire Legislature. Mr. Sweezy denied any Communist connections, but refused to answer questions about the content of a lecture he had given at the University of New Hampshire and about his activities in the Progressive Party.

In this case, the Court held that Mr. Sweezy was within his rights. It freed him from a contempt conviction imposed by a New Hampshire court and upheld by the New Hampshire Supreme Court. The issue involved questions of "academic freedom." The United States Supreme Court decided that the clause in the 14th amendment that protects a citizen from being denied life, liberty, or property, without "due process of law," protected Mr. Sweezy.

LESS POWER TO FIRE

In still another case, the Court narrowed the authority of Government officials to discharge Federal employees. This case involved John S. Service, onetime State Department employee who was discharged by Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State. Mr. Service had been repeatedly charged and repeatedly cleared as a security risk from 1945 to 1951, when Mr. Acheson discharged him after a negative finding by a loyalty review board.

The Service decision is patterned after another decision involving the late Dr. John P. Peters, who lost his Government post after a loyalty review board reversed a finding of a lower board. The Court held in that case that the review board had no authority to consider cases after previous clearance by other agencies. The Court also has decided that only Federal employees in "sensitive" jobs can be dismissed abruptly, without ordinary civil-service procedures, on suspicion of disloyalty.

NEW PATTERN

Actually, in all of these cases the Court appears to be following a pattern that has taken shape since the installation of Earl Warren as Chief Justice. That pattern tends to restrict government powers, State or Federal, over individuals. It favors Federal authority over State authority whenever there seems to be a conflict, and it tends to strengthen Government regulations of business activity. This broad trend of decisions now is prompting close study in Congress, inside the administration and among attorneys everywhere.

The Justice Department is reexamining the cases it has on file to see if they square with Supreme Court decisions on producing documents and on the Smith Act. These cases involve everything from charges of selling narcotics to Communist subversion and to actions under the antitrust laws.

Attorneys for corporations are giving close study to the decision holding that the Du Pont Co. violated the antitrust laws by a 23 percent ownership of General Motors Corp. These attorneys are wondering what effect this decision may have on the investments their corporate clients have made in other companies. Attorneys for people charged with criminal offenses are looking into new tactics that they may use for the defense of their clients.

Finally, Congress is being forced by the Court decision in the Watkins case to look at its own rules and to consider again proposals to try to restrain the power of the courts. Some Members of Congress have criticized openly the actions of the Court. Others are saying privately that new rules on investigations may have to be adopted if Congress is to avoid an avalanche of appeals to the courts.

Meanwhile, the Justices on the Court give no sign of changing the bold course they have adopted since 1954.

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of June 21, 1957]

HIGH COURT MAKES TREASON SAFE

The Supreme Court's decision freeing five southern California Communist Party leaders, including "Slim" Connelly, Los Angeles editor of the People's World, and ordering new trials for 9 others, including Mrs. Dorothy Healey Connelly, one-time chairman of the Los Angeles County Communist Party, has completely thwarted the effectiveness of Congressional investigations under the Smith Act.

Likewise, the Court's doctrine of particularization, aimed at Congressional committeemen's questioning of witnesses, will cripple further investigations into labor-union rackets, Government scandals, or any other public evil brought to Congressional attention. Justice Clark, a former Attorney General, in his dissent, put it correctly in saying

that "the majority of the Court has substituted the judiciary as the grand inquisitor and supervisor of Congressional investigations. It has never been so."

In its sweeping decision, the High Court majority of Chief Justice Warren and Justices Douglas, Frankfurter, Black, and Brennan, has opened the way to Communists, traitors, disloyal citizens, and crooks of all kinds in business and labor to refuse to answer questions which the witness himself arbitrarily decides are not pertinent to a legislative purpose. It means that every time a Senator or Representative asks a question during an investigation the witness must be given a clear explanation of what the legislative purpose is; and this might even have to be confirmed by a resolution adopted in each case by Senate or House. Following this, it may have to be passed on by the Supreme Court before it becomes really valid. It may easily be seen that congressional investigations are killed by the latest Supreme Court edict.

Had such a cumbersome procedure been in effect during the Harding administration it would have prevented any exposure of the Teapot Dome scandals. Had it been in effect in 1950 Alger Hiss could have avoided answering questions asked him by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, headed then by RICHARD M. NIXON. This committee's charter of authority now is torn to shreds by the Supreme Court.

Congressional power to investigate has been curtailed drastically on the ground that Congress has to particularize in every case and specify in its resolutions exactly why it wants certain questions asked. Again, quoting Justice Clerk, this "is unnecessary and unworkable. The resulting restraint imposed on the committee system appears to cripple the system beyond workability. This is because the Supreme Court has now set itself up as knowing more about what Congress needs to know to legislate than Congress itself thinks it does."

In another decision the same day State legislatures were told that they, too, cannot investigate and require witnesses to answer their questions except where it can be proved that the State has an overriding interest in a subversive individual which outweighs his right to silence; and this, in turn, might have to be reviewed in each instance by the Supreme Court of the United States.

For the most part, the majority of the presently constituted Supreme Court displays a curious indifference to the actual operations of Communist subversion in this country, perpetrated by people of the Connelly type. To these Justices, apparently, there is no Communist menace, no such thing as infiltration by Communist stooges. If a man admits he has worked with the Communists and then refuses to tell who they were, this is interpreted by the present high Court as a "right to silence" derived from the first amendment which, now added to the fifth amendment, makes it safe to wage treason within our country.

The conspirators in the Kremlin naturally will be joyous, for all they need to do now is to send word to their Communist Party leaders in the United States to adapt themselves to the new ruling of the Supreme Court.

The high Court's latest decisions will please the so-called liberal element which has long crusaded against congressional investigation of Communist activities, but it will cause just consternation among most sober-minded Americans and great puzzlement about our Supreme Court as at present constituted.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

SAVING GRACE OF COMMONSENSE

(By Kyle Palmer)

Whether the United States Supreme Court mostly needs a group of lawyers equipped

with commonsense, as one United States Senator has suggested, or is carrying out the law strictly according to constitutional requirements are questions most of us are now pondering.

As one of the three branches of Government constituted to protect our constitutional freedoms—of speech, the press, religious conviction—the Court is our last resort.

Hence, the current nationwide dissatisfaction caused by the Court's rulings on lower court convictions of Communists in California must be regarded as occasion for considerable restraint in our several reactions.

President Eisenhower, neatly sidestepping any indication of his personal opinions, stated the case more or less for all of us when he told his press conference: "Like all laymen in the law, I have my fixed convictions about these things and I suppose they are, on one side or the other, very strong."

Whether you are on one side or the other in this matter you must concede that doubts have been raised, that some feel the Court has tightened the bolts on our conceptions of human rights and others are persuaded that it has opened still wider the gaps through which our dedicated enemies may enter to destroy us.

Obviously either the citizenry as a whole is unacquainted with some of the basic factors in the American system or our High Court judges have reduced the law to an overrefinement of semantics.

In due course the wisdom of the Court's decision, or the reverse thereof, will appear. But the immediate impact on the country's thinking is already making itself evident.

Jubilant Communists believe they have a new dispensation for organizing and expanding; many of their sympathizers feel encouraged to move, and on the other side, anti-Communist elements are aroused and determined to effect measures making impossible any fresh or additional advances of the Red conspiracy in this country.

The best that can be said for the members of the Supreme Court responsible for the Court's ruling is that they acted with scrupulous and courageous regard for our constitutional guarantees and the worst, perhaps, that in seeking with great fidelity to protect the inherent rights of all citizens the Court may have inadvertently added to the perplexities and burdens of those responsible for discovering, exposing and aborting subversive undertakings.

The ordinary citizen is not called upon to receive without critical analysis the action of any official of Government, be he a member of the legislative, the executive or the judicial branch, but neither is an ordinary citizen endowed with any right to take law into his own hands or to disobey a law merely because he disagrees with its import.

Communism knows no law other than that of the dictatorship under which it exists; our system guarantees to a Communist as to any other the full protection of a constitution itself safeguarded against the whims and passions of men.

Perhaps most of us will agree that those who drafted the Federal Constitution did not anticipate or in any sound degree provide against a conspiracy such as communism in America represents.

With the experience of all history to guide them the framers of the Constitution sought to protect the individual citizen alike from the tyranny of the despot and the rage of the mob.

Yet here in the last half of the 20th century, 170 years after the Constitution was approved, we are faced with this bewildering, baffling and menacing problem of a Communist conspiracy.

No training or skill of legal minds is essential to a general understanding of what the Constitution commands and intends with respect to treason or to the right of

Congress to enact laws for the protection and security of the Nation.

And, further, in the first amendment of the Constitution the Congress is specifically prohibited from approval of any law abridging the right of free speech or of the press, or the right of peaceable assembly.

Acting by authority conferred upon it the Congress in 1940 adopted the Smith Act under which Communists have been tried and convicted. The act makes it a criminal offense to advocate or teach the violent overthrow of the Government.

The late Chief Justice Vinson, who wrote a majority ruling opinion in effect that the Constitution was not devised to prevent the Government from protecting itself against violent destruction, held that the right of free speech is not absolute, but must be considered subordinate to preservation of Government unless the people, by their votes, wish to change their system by peaceful means.

From that point the ordinary citizen must rest content while the courts, the lawyers, and the philosophers—as also the sophists—argue the questions.

On the basis of the commonsense mentioned by the Senator most of us will continue to recognize the Communist movement in this country for what it is—a poisonous, alien, ruthless, and sinister scheme to destroy our institutions, our liberties, and our way of life.

The so-called dedicated Communist, the man or woman who counts not the cost nor considers the price in duplicity, betrayal or deception, is a being which few in America can understand. And almost equally beyond our comprehension is the man or woman who can be seduced by the subversive Red doctrines.

Nevertheless, both of the breeds exist here, each working to a common end.

Obviously, either our laws are misguided, and are inadequate to subdue such endeavors, or the interpretations placed on the laws by the Supreme Court are wrong.

Instead of railing at the court, instead of feeling that this or that particular judge has failed to give proper weight to the laws and their intent, Congress should set about to plug the holes and mend the fences. Congress has the right to act and, within the limits of its constitutional power, can assist the courts in a clearer definition of what constitutes peril to the Nation and what steps to take to eliminate the dangers.

Communism received no clearance in the court's latest action on the legal status of a few individual Reds, but the peace of mind of the people has been shaken.

In such circumstances we should feel no inspiration to resort to impulsive, ill-considered action. We face a deadly enemy, and only by cold, logical, inexorable efforts to defeat him can we be secure.

Certainly we should not permit the enemy to use our free institutions and regulated authority as a means for our own dissolution. Commonsense is a force not essential alone to the courts and the judges.

[From the Los Angeles Times of June 26, 1957]

THE SUPREME COURT IN WATKINS CASE (By Walter Lippmann)

In the Watkins case the Supreme Court, with Chief Justice Warren delivering the opinion of the majority, has tried to set down certain limits on the rights and powers of Congressional investigating committees.

We must, I think, describe the opinion in this tentative way. For the limitations are stated in general terms, and no one can know how they will in the future apply specifically in concrete cases.

In practice, the application will depend on how much each particular committee is willing to accept, how much it is determined

to stretch the limitations, and whether the court will be disposed to construe the limitations strictly or loosely.

However, we have in the Watkins decision a powerful assertion of a principle which will influence the conduct of committees, the attitude of witnesses, the actions of the court, and the general posture of public opinion. The principle is that a witness, who believes that his constitutional rights are being abused, may appeal to the courts for protection.

Those who are opposed to the decision must say that they do not think that a witness should be able to appeal from a Congressional committee to the courts. This is, in substance, what Mr. Justice Clark, the lone dissenter seems to think—that for the courts to intervene is usurpation of power, and that, as a matter of fact, it is not in the public interest that the judiciary should "super-visit" Congressional investigations.

Mr. Justice Clark, who regards the decision as "mischievous," comes very near to saying that Congressional committees are a law unto themselves.

"Perhaps," he says, "the rules of conduct placed upon the committees by the House admit of individual abuse and unfairness. But that is none of our—that is, the Court's affair. So long as the object of the legislative inquiry is legitimate and the questions proposed are pertinent thereto, it is not for the Court to interfere with the committee's system of inquiry."

This is a masterpiece of confusion. For it begs the question before the Court. In the Watkins case was there individual abuse and unfairness because a particular phase of the inquiry was not legitimate or because the questions put to Watkins were not pertinent? It is not entirely clear what Justice Clark really thinks. But apparently it is that the Court must assume that what a committee does is legitimate and that the questions it puts are pertinent, and that if they produce "individual abuse and unfairness," it is none of the Court's affair.

On the broad constitutional issue, Justice Clark holds that it is a "trespass upon the fundamental American principle of separation of powers" for the courts to concern themselves with individual abuse and unfairness. But is it truly an American principle that the separation of powers is absolute, so absolute that a committee of Congress cannot be called to account for the lawfulness on what it does?

Surely, the American principle is that Congress is not a sovereign body, accountable only to itself, but that it is under the law of the Constitution—of the Constitution as interpreted by the courts and as it may be amended by the people.

The ultimate issue raised by the Watkins case is not constitutional. It is, if we are quite candid, whether in order to combat the Communist movement, which would, if it could, destroy the American Government and the American social order, it is necessary to encourage or to permit congressional committees to proceed outside the Constitution.

Can the Constitution be defended only by extraconstitutional means, or can it be defended within its own terms? It has been on the grounds that there was a desperate emergency that many sober and conservative men have supported or connived at McCarthyism.

The Watkins decision is addressed to this particular kind of extraconstitutional investigation, of which the object is to outlaw, by exposure and pitiless publicity all behavior which might assist, might favor, might tolerate the spread of Communist propaganda.

These investigations are not addressed primarily to illegal acts, to espionage and subversion. They are addressed to activities which are not, strictly speaking, against the law and could not be prosecuted in a court.

There being no legal way to suppress such activities as propaganda, infiltration and fellow-traveling, Congress, with the support of public opinion, has created committees which are designed, among other things, to suppress by intimidation what cannot be suppressed by due process of law.

The Supreme Court has waited a long time—some 10 years—before it has intervened in what is unconstitutional process, resorted to on the grounds that fire must be fought with fire, that the end, which is to stop the spread of communism justifies any means.

I do not think the long patience of the Court shows that the Eisenhower court is more liberal than the Roosevelt-Truman court but rather that the times have changed. The emergency—if there was one which could not be met by lawful means—is over, and the presumption is now that investigating committees must work within the limits of the Constitution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various articles, telegrams and other pertinent matter.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, just 10 days ago when the latest controversial decisions of the Supreme Court were handed down, the Un-American Activities Committee was commencing hearings in San Francisco. Although the press in California asked me to comment on those decisions, I hesitated to say anything at that time because I was so shocked and stunned that I felt my observations might be too intemperate.

Since then I have reviewed a series of decisions by the Supreme Court over the last 2 years. As I come to realize the full impact of these decisions on the security of this Nation, I become more alarmed about the direction in which we are heading. Legal principles, investigatory and judicial procedures which I learned in law school and which have been followed during 25 years of practice at the bar have been shattered.

When the most significant of these decisions were handed down by the Court on June 17, a former chairman of the Communist Party in California rejoicingly exclaimed that it was "the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received." She said:

It will mark a rejuvenation of the party in America. We have lost some members in the last few years, but now we are on our way.

The committee saw and felt that rejuvenation at the San Francisco hearings. During the last few years, the Communist hangers-on at such hearings had diminished. Enthusiasm had been dampened. The witnesses exhibited less confidence in the rightness of the Communist cause. All this was changed last Monday. The Communists filled the large hearing room and overflowed into the corridors. Their snide and vituperative remarks to committee members as they passed through the halls and on the elevators were again in evidence. The

witnesses and the lawyers were jubilant as well as arrogant. The delaying tactics, the evasiveness, and the long Communist propaganda speeches returned.

As we grappled during the hearings with the strangling directives of the Court, we came to the conclusion that Justice Tom Clark, in his dissenting opinion, was right when he said that the investigating committees and the Federal Bureau of Investigation "may as well close up shop" and go home. Yes; it was a great day for the Kremlin but an ominous one for the people of the United States.

I predict that, unless these decisions can be nullified by action of the Congress, there will be a resurgence of Communist activity in the United States that will not only make your hair curl but your stomach turn.

Lenin, Stalin, and other top Communists have always predicted that the United States would be destroyed from within, as have been most of the countries that have been taken behind the Iron Curtain since 1933. Their predictions have a far better chance of becoming a reality as a result of these decisions.

Not too many years ago the agents of the Kremlin succeeded in infiltrating the various agencies of the Government of the United States and the various institutions of American life. Our most vital secrets, including those of the atom bomb, found their way to the Kremlin. The new method of warfare, namely, the internal subversion of the free countries of the world, made phenomenal headway.

Most of the 800 million people of the Free World who have been taken behind the Iron Curtain since 1933 got there not by outward aggression but through the internal subversion of their countries by those who owed their loyalty to the Kremlin. One traitor within is more dangerous to our safety and security than 10,000 enemy troops poised on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Although the Federal Bureau of Investigation did its job well throughout the years and reported its findings faithfully, it was not until the investigating committees of the Congress moved in and brought to light this insidious subversion that we finally began to clean out this fifth column in America.

Patiently and carefully the Congress passed law after law recommended by the investigating committees to enable this Nation to deal effectively with this new menace from within, this new method of warfare.

In one fell swoop these decisions of the Supreme Court have all but destroyed the most powerful weapons that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Congressional investigating committees have in their fight against the internal subversion of this country.

The Court has usurped the powers of the Congress. It has rewritten and nullified laws to fit its own social, political, and economic philosophies. It has destroyed basic and fundamental States rights. It has invaded and taken over prerogatives of the executive branch. It has supplanted the jury and trial judge when expediency demands. It has

handcuffed the police and FBI in criminal cases, as pointed out by Justice Tom Clark in his dissenting opinion.

Perhaps I can illustrate by example how one of these decisions, namely, the one in the Watkins case, affects the committee's fight against subversion. Following the public hearings in California, the committee on last Saturday held an executive session for the purpose of obtaining evidence in the commencement of an investigation into a new and unexplored field of Communist subversive activity in the United States. The hearings were held in executive session because it was imperative that for the time being at least the objectives of our investigation be kept highly secret and that no notice be given to the Communists as to the fact that the committee had even any knowledge of these particular operations.

It was apparent that, if they had such knowledge, the whole investigation might fall completely. As an example, some witnesses and documents would conveniently disappear; witnesses would be alerted and their testimony changed or slanted. Of course, if Communist agents were aware of the fact that we had knowledge of the activity, it might be discontinued or go underground.

Now let us see what happened. When the witness appeared, his lawyer, armed with the decision in the Watkins case, demanded, before he would let his client even answer as to his occupation, that we outline in detail the nature and object of our investigation and then explain fully how each question we asked his client was pertinent to the subject and object of the investigation.

Obviously, we had no alternative except to dismiss the witness and forgo the investigation. Certainly it was better to do this than to tell the Kremlin what we knew.

The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are similarly handcuffed by the decision freeing the five California Communists convicted for advocating the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. By these decisions the FBI must either bare its secret files to the enemies of this country or forgo the prosecution of these traitors. Do you wonder why I say June 17 was a Roman holiday for the Kremlin but an ominous day for the United States?

The tragedy of the Watkins decision is that the conclusion reached by the Court is based on a false premise. The Court assumes that the Un-American Activities Committee is investigating communism as an economic and political philosophy and that the Communist Party in the United States is a political party as we know political parties in this country. On the basis of this false assumption, the Court comes to an apparently logical but novel conclusion.

However, every school boy should know by this time that the Communist Party is not a political party but a conspiratorial apparatus—a fifth-column arm of the Soviet Union with whom we are at war even though it may not be a shooting war. In fact, the Congress of the United States has by law so stated.

Perhaps the Court has never read the secret oath an individual takes when he joins the Russian conspiracy—the Communist Party. This oath reads:

I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, a land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself at all times to remain a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I should be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California on the very fine presentation he has made of one of the most important problems of our day.

I share the gentleman's concern as to the effect which these recent Supreme Court decisions may ultimately have upon our ability to wage war upon communism in this country.

There is no question that the Communist conspiracy still presents a serious threat to our security. We must be prepared to fight it with every weapon at our command.

Investigation and legislation by Congress are two of our most powerful weapons in this struggle. To put them aside or to allow them to be rendered impotent by our failure to act in the face of recent decisions would be to court disaster.

Yet, much as we may question the wisdom of these recent decisions of the Supreme Court, I think we are both in agreement with President Eisenhower who said just yesterday that, despite our doubts, it is vital that we maintain the independence of our judiciary.

I support the gentleman wholeheartedly in his assertion that the only positive, constructive course for Congress to take in the face of these decisions is to legislate wisely. These recent Court pronouncements make it incumbent upon Congress to reappraise its whole system of investigation, legislation and law enforcement in this area, which is so vital to our national security.

In that connection, I have recently introduced a bill to deal with this so-called Jencks decision which has been promptly referred by the chairman of our committee to the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is chairman. At this point permit me to commend our distinguished colleague from Louisiana who has so promptly called a hearing this very day on this important subject.

This bill is designed to stem the possible abuses likely to flow from this decision in the Jencks case, where it was held that in certain instances FBI files would have to be made available to the defense in these cases involving subversive activities. Under the provisions of this bill the defendant would be given the protection required by the Court's decision, but at the same time the Government would be protected against the necessity of having to open its files completely to unauthorized persons. Discretion would be placed in the Court to determine what statements in the file were relevant and it would allow the defense

access only to these statements. I think no one can argue that such a procedure is not completely fair and reasonable. It has the unqualified approval of the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, with the leave of other Members who have special orders, the gentleman from California may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROOSEVELT). The Chair would like to point out that there are three other special orders, for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the gentleman's proceeding for an additional time, and shall vacate my special order for today and postpone it until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. May I also point out that, in keeping with the gentleman's very persuasive argument that now is the time for Congress to act to re-establish its powers and authority, I have prepared for presentation to the full Committee on the Judiciary, at its next meeting, a resolution for the establishment of a special subcommittee to study and appraise our laws and Congress' power to investigate in the light of these Court decisions. I earnestly believe that such a study should be instituted at once so that Congress may be given an opportunity to act upon sound legislative proposals at the earliest possible date. I sincerely hope and am quite confident that the chairman of our committee and its other members will support me in this endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that many of us have been deeply disturbed by these recent Supreme Court decisions which seem to have clamped unduly tight and unworkable controls on the investigative powers of Congress and on the legislative means by which Congress has endeavored to combat the internal threat of the Communist conspiracy.

The proper way to respond to these decisions is not by attacks on the membership or authority of the Court. The proper response is by studying in mature and measured manner the problems raised by any decision of the Court, and then, if necessary, by proposing legislation to offset any serious effects which might arise out of these decisions.

This is the philosophy which has guided me in introducing legislation Monday to cope with the effect of the decision in the Jencks case. This is the philosophy which has guided me also in drafting the resolution to which I have referred.

It is my own personal feeling that careful study can lead to the framing of rules, procedures, and legislation which will enable the Congress to reassert its vital investigative powers

without in any way abridging the constitutional rights of our citizens.

And I believe we can and must formulate legislation which will effectively combat subversives, within the framework of the Constitution, and which will effectively and legally carry out what we all know to be the will of the loyal and law-abiding people of this country.

I am grateful to the gentleman for yielding to me to make these remarks.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for a very helpful contribution to the general discussion today and also the discussion with my colleague on the committee the gentleman from Ohio.

I should also like to express my thanks to the gentleman from West Virginia, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for their kindness in permitting us to continue for a few extra moments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I commend the gentleman from California and the other Members who have spoken. I heartily agree with what they have said. I touched on this matter very briefly the other day and I am thoroughly in accord with the very fine presentation you have all made.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to compliment the gentleman on what he has given us today. The Supreme Court cases have worried me, especially the Watkins case. I have been working rather diligently ever since it came to my attention to make a suggestion to the Congress and especially with reference to that case, and I expect to file that suggestion in the next day or two, not because it may be the ultimate but merely as a suggestion to begin considering the problems of the Committee on Un-American Activities and especially the result of the Watkins decision.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California on his splendid statement and to tell him that I concur completely in what he has said to us and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from California on the fine presentation he has made to the House on this very important matter. I wish also to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and others who have spoken. I, too, have been greatly concerned about this matter and I know the people of the country are greatly concerned. I have been hearing from the people I have the honor to represent here in the Halls of Congress. They tell me it is difficult for them to understand how such a decision could have been reached by that great Court, the Supreme Court of the United States. I sincerely hope and pray that

the Congress will soon take such action to clarify and solve these problems which are a source of great concern to every thinking American so that this great Nation of ours may continue to be free.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks today. It is incredible that the United States should get into a position where we cannot defend ourselves against the greatest enemy that civilization has ever known. I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROOSEVELT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: S. 1141, S. 806, H. R. 6182, H. R. 8005, and H. R. 8364.

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

There was no objection.

"DO NOTHING" DEMOCRAT CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, to date, the 1st session of the 85th Congress has earned for itself the dubious honor of being the champion "do nothing" Congress. The only other Congress in recent years to have been given such a title, and undeservedly so by President Truman, was the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, whose good record was besmirched by the failure of the Republican presidential candidate, Thomas Dewey, to defend and support the record of budget cutting and tax saving, which that Congress so effectively accomplished.

Since it was the Democrat President and the Democrat candidates for Congress who labeled the Republican 80th Congress a "do nothing" Congress, we should compare the accomplishments of both the 80th and 85th Congresses to factually determine which rightfully deserves this odious title.

In 1947 and 1948, the Republican controlled 80th Congress cut taxes by \$5 billion a year, of which 71 percent of this tax reduction went to people earning less than \$5,000 per year. The national debt was paid off to the extent of \$7 billion—the first real reduction in 17 years. A surplus of \$8.5 billion was left in the Treasury in 1948. This same Republican-controlled Congress forced the Democrat administration to set up a loyalty review program and brought about the spectacular expose of Communists in the Government, of which Alger Hiss was one. The passing of the Taft-Hartley

Act was another immeasurable aid to the working man in the way of keeping his unions and their officials within reasonable control. The Republican 80th Congress also accomplished the following: Unified armed services, launched European recovery program, voted Greek-Turkish, Chinese aid, created Hoover Commission, forced Government loyalty check, enacted labor's bill of rights, raised Government employees' pay, made farm price supports permanent, liberalized veterans' benefits, limited new Presidents to 2 terms, doubled housing construction, pushed income and jobs to record highs.

Now the 85th Congress is controlled by the same Democrat leadership which led the 84th Congress to be labeled a "disappointment;" even by the very organization which stomped up and down the country to elect a Democrat controlled Congress, namely, the American Federation of Labor, whose executive council, in August of 1956, classified the 84th Congress as a "disappointment."

Up to the present time, the only action taken by the 85th Democrat controlled Congress, has been on appropriation bills and matters of a routine nature in which there is little or no controversy. About the only piece of legislation, which could be termed as major legislation, was embodied in the Middle East doctrine, which Congress passed in its early session. During my 7 years in the House of Representatives, I have never witnessed such a leaderless and aimless attitude in the Congress.

Of course, we realize that politics is always rearing its ugly head, and that present Democrat inaction might be a program of planned confusion. Firstly, there is a notable and marked division of principles and opinions within the Democrat Party in the Congress; and secondly, the Democrats are definitely playing for continued control of Congress in 1958, as well as the winning of the Presidency in 1960.

Evidence of the Democrat Party division in Congress is most apparent in the great split in the principles of the southern conservatives and the northern liberals. This is so self-evident that little time need be spent in proving the point. In January, a group of liberal Democrats proposed a program in the House of Representatives, and it is most noteworthy that the acknowledged leaders of the House were made conspicuous by their absence. Eighty out of 233 Democrat Members joined in this proposal, which turned out to be a program of nothing but taxing, spending, giving, and bringing on a more powerful centralized government. This may be summed up as a continuation and extension of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, with a new raw deal for the middle class in America. According to press reports, this new liberal bloc is going to let Speaker SAM RAYBURN alone for the moment. The groundwork and tactics of this offshoot of the Democrat Party have been set forth, most brazenly, by its organizer, who is quoted as follows:

But we will not be especially active this session. Next session, however, we expect to use discharge petitions, committee votes, and

other legislative aids to make our positions very clear to the whole country.

In other words, these Congressmen are saying, in effect, let the country go to the dogs this year and we will put all of our efforts into reelecting a Democrat-controlled Congress next year.

Up to the present time, only 2 of 15 major legislative proposals have received final action, and even that stanch supporting organization of the Democrat Party, namely, the Americans for Democratic Action, stated that the Democrat Congress, to date, had "accomplished nothing during the first half of this session in the way of completed legislation of general application. But of even more concern, they have done little to lay the groundwork for action during the remainder of this session."

As a Republican, I regret very much that President Eisenhower listened to the political amateurs in his palace guard, who reputedly sold him a bill of goods to the effect that it would make no difference to his legislative program as to which party controlled the Congress. He has now learned too late that the Democrats play politics for keeps and that they go along with his program only when such programs are acceptable to Democrat philosophy and principles. The record of accomplishments of the Republican-controlled 83d Congress proves that even if a President does not receive 100 percent cooperation from his own party, he can still get the vast majority of his program through Congress.

The Democrat Party, in their 1952 and 1956 platforms, pledged all things to all people. A civil-rights program, revision of the immigration laws, improvement of the Refugee Relief Act, repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, extension of minimum wage coverage, occupational safety programs, statehood of Alaska and Hawaii, and postal pay increases constitute only a partial list of the many platform promises which have not been carried out during the last 3 years of the Democrat-controlled Congress.

In reviewing the platform of the Democrat Party, since they took over control of Congress in January of 1955, and comparing their campaign promises with their performance thus far, it is quite obvious that a "do nothing" spirit prevails. It is also obvious that it is their intent to let the citizens of America live on empty promises in the hope of recapturing the Presidency in 1960.

LATVIA: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH A BRIEF HISTORICAL SURVEY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of service to the Congress of the United States, and a duty I feel I owe to the American people in the contest that

now engulfs mankind, I want to call attention to a work of special merit and wide importance. This work is a brilliant compendium of information and analysis by Selma A. Ozols, of the Library of Congress, on Latvia. The title is "Latvia: A Selected Bibliography With a Brief Historical Survey." It is a superbly organized and lucid history of this tragic Baltic country told with a reverence for scholarship and accuracy that never loses its common and appealing touch even for those who find works of scholarship uninviting from the standpoint of interest and entertainment. Moreover, it includes a comprehensive bibliography which testifies to the research and effort that went into this work and provides the student, researcher and scholar of the future with an indispensable tool for studying the ramifying culture of this fabulously absorbing Baltic state.

When I say fabulously absorbing I hasten to add that it is Latvia's struggle for freedom and her undefeated spirit under the heel of the Soviet Union that renders her story, as told in this chronicle, so dramatic and so appealing to the people of America, and more especially to the people of all the Baltic countries now settled in the United States. Moreover the book fills a gap in the history of our own country for it reveals, sympathetically of course, but without exaggeration and with abundant and precise documentation, the role that Americans of Latvian descent and the early Latvian immigrants to this country have played and are now playing in American progress and good citizenship. The book rightly makes a point of the fact that as of the 1940 census, I quote:

Latvians are not mentioned in the report of crime surveys.

It is estimated that there are now altogether about 140,000 Latvians, including their descendants, in this country. This I learn from the author of this work. I should like to add on my own that what makes this country a bulwark of freedom and the last great hope of all mankind for a free society, is just the sort of human material represented by these 140,000 Latvians.

As a matter of fact as significant as any individual piece of evidence can be on the worthwhileness of these people is the author of this book herself.

Mrs. Ozols, who was born in Latvia, is a graduate of the School of Law and Political Economics, University of Riga, and also studied law at Heidelberg University, Germany. She was engaged in legal work with her husband, Jacob Rudolf Ozols, who was a member of the Bar Association in Riga, Latvia and a special legal consultant with the Latvian Government. Mrs. Ozols was one of the Latvians persecuted during World War II by the Communists and Nazis and was confined to a prison camp for forced labor. In 1949 Mrs. Ozols came to America under the Displaced Persons Act, and in 1954 she became an American citizen. After arriving in this country she attended the following schools at night: Americanization School, George Washington University, and from 1952 to 1957 the Catholic University of America.

Since February 1950 Mrs. Ozols has been employed by the Library of Congress.

This survey for all its warmth and appeal constrains itself to a sometimes severe objectivity. It is at once a labor of love and a work of austere scholarship. It is succinct rather than monumental and it is peculiarly useful because the orderly and organized mind that created it fashioned it so that it may serve as a ready reference volume. I may add that the book has already had wide approval from savants and experts in the field. It has been accepted by the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences in Library Science, a degree that Mrs. Ozols now holds.

It is, Mr. Speaker, an outstanding work in its field and I hope that this Congress and the people of America will recognize its usefulness and derive from what Mrs. Ozols has done a full measure of value.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 60 minutes tomorrow, at which time I shall speak on the subject of trade with Communist China.

I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order granted me for today.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (at the request of Mr. DELANEY) for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) for Friday, June 28, on account of important business.

Mr. LONG (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of official matters.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for Friday, June 28 on account of official business.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. KILDAY) from June 27 through July 2, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts for 5 minutes today.

Mr. COLE for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts for 5 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD for 30 minutes tomorrow, to revise and extend the remarks he will make then to include related matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCGREGOR the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain charts and extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) to revise and extend the remarks he made today during the consideration of the conference reports and the amendments on the bill H. R. 6070 and to include extraneous matter therein.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 20. An act for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 140. An act for the relief of Jan Szyptman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 178. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edward J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 439. An act for the relief of Susan Tsiang Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 554. An act for the relief of Giorgio Giordanello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 651. An act for the relief of Sister Clementine (Ilona Molnar); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Giorgio and her children, Antonio Giorgio and Menotti Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 789. An act for the relief of Herbert T. King; his wife, Chang Si-Ling King; and his daughter, Chen Hsiao-Ling King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 811. An act for the relief of Fannie Alexander Gast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 823. An act for the relief of Maud Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 832. An act for the relief of Matilda Strah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 846. An act for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 850. An act for the relief of Stavros Manousos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 862. An act for the relief of Barbara L. Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 875. An act for the relief of Vuokko A. Bingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 876. An act for the relief of Katharina Theresa Beuving Keyzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 957. An act for the relief of Calogero Maniscalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 960. An act for the relief of Fotina (Theresa) Wardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 969. An act to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Matilda Hajos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1053. An act for the relief of Poppy Catherine Hayakawa Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1082. An act for the relief of Katina Apostolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Francoise Beyronneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Adolfo Camillo Scopone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Tullios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Teiko Watanabe Holderfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1251. An act for the relief of Florinda Mellone Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1253. An act for the relief of Myung Ok Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1283. An act for the relief of Garth Cecil Briden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Susanne Burka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1311. An act for the relief of Maria Gradi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1361. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Vassillos Kostikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Angelina Mastro Mone (Angelina Mastroianni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1417. An act relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1508. An act for the relief of Salvatore LaTerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1510. An act for the relief of Reginald S. Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Issac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1718. An act to amend section 201 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relative to the terms of office of members of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1774. An act for the relief of Yee Suey Nong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1817. An act for the relief of John Panagiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1823. An act to authorize the conveyance of Bunker Hill Island in Lake Cumberland near Burnside, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Charles Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Vendelin Kalenda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2161. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1955 (69 Stat. 725); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2212. An act to amend the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2299. An act to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee to represent Congress at the 350th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Va.; to the Committee on Rules.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission for the publication of certain documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution favoring Congressional recognition of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum to be located at Oklahoma City, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1752. An act for the relief of Frank J. and Mae T. W. Burger;

H. R. 2964. An act to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States;

H. R. 3477. An act relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska;

H. R. 3836. An act to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended;

H. R. 3837. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 4945. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in West Palm Beach, Fla., to the port of Palm Beach district;

H. R. 6287. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6692. An act to authorize the transfer of the Coyote Valley Indian Rancheria to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7050. An act to amend the law with respect to the recoupment of funds expended in cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., because of the attendance of Indian children, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7249. An act to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7259. An act relating to marketing quotas and price supports for fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco;

H. R. 7835. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Hospital Center and facilities in the District of Columbia and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to waive the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

HOUSING ACT OF 1957

Mr. SPENCE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6659) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

985. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a progress report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, reflecting estimated activity under the various disposal programs, programs of disposition, and estimated remaining inventory as of June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

986. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relative to submitting notice of the intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands, pursuant to Public Law 804, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

987. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, relative to 29 reports covering 57 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 entitled, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

988. A letter from the Secretary, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a copy of notice of dissolution of U. S. Commercial Company as of the close of business June 20, 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

989. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of 88 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce at rates of compensation not to exceed the maximum rate payable under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended, and Public Law 854, 84th Congress"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

990. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

991. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Nathan Snider, also known as Nathan Gelb or Kuschneider, A-8957254, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

992. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 7, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Lake Taney-como, Mo., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6570. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 253. Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H. R. 5189. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 653). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1141. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to donate to the Philippine Republic certain records captured from insurrectos during 1899-1903; without amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the conveyance of an interest of the United States in and to fissionable materials in a tract of land in the county of Cook and State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 8364. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959; with amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6659. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, to improve the availability of mortgage credit, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 659). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1826. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the United States in Wyoming to Bud E. Burroughs; without amendment (Rept. No. 651).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1259. A bill to clear the title to certain Indian land; without amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 806. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to quitclaim all interest of the United States in and to a certain parcel of land in Indiana to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6182. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 8410. A bill to provide that an individual who is not eligible upon reaching retirement age for old-age insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act may obtain a refund of the social-security taxes which he has paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8411. A bill to amend section 1033 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of livestock sold on account of flood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 8412. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 8413. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 8414. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18 relating to demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 8415. A bill to provide for increased participation in the acreage reserve program by producers of basic commodities in major disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 8416. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to prohibit the introduction into evidence in criminal proceedings of confidential information from the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8417. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 8418. A bill to provide flexibility in the operation of marketing agreement programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NIMITZ:

H. R. 8419. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8420. A bill to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8421. A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8422. A bill to legalize maritime and building trades hiring halls; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 8423. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18 relating to demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8424. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitant service under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8425. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to grant a pension of \$100 per month to all veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 8426. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of certain adopted children, and other relatives of United States citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 8427. A bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and report on the problems relating to blindness and the needs of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 8428. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 8429. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer certain additional credits, exclusions, exemptions, and deductions for income-tax purposes, which may hereafter be referred to as the citizens' hardship tax relief bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y.,

from May 7 to May 17, 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. Res. 303. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restricting the importation of plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 8431. A bill for the relief of Florencio Mejia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 8432. A bill for the relief of Ted Lamb and Associates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 8433. A bill for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 8434. A bill for the relief of Choy Ahoi Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 8435. A bill for the relief of Aurelio and Vicenzo Restauro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 8436. A bill for the relief of Concetta Cancelliere Martorana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8437. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956, to authorize certain personnel of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations conferred by the Philippine Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

296. By Mr. CRETELLA: Petition of the Connecticut State Medical Society on results of membership referendum on compulsory social security for physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

297. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Headquarters of the General Eldership of the Churches of God in North America, Inc., Harrisburg, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record as opposing the continued exploding and testing of nuclear weapons by the United States and other powers, and to expedite a basis of international agreement by which all powers may terminate the testing of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. Also, petition of the Counselor, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting an English translation of a communication from 58 overseas Chinese organizations in Macao addressed to the United States Congress on the T'ai-pel riots which occurred on May 24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.