

204. Also, petition of Mabel M. Hand and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

205. Also, petition of Alfred B. Hunt and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. Also, petition of Rei Taketa and 1,450 others, Kumamoto Junior College, Kumamoto, Japan, requesting release of the Japanese people who are serving prison terms as war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, who amidst all the traffic of our busy ways dost lead our steps to this wayside sanctuary of the spirit, take Thou the dimness of our souls away. Our hearts are restless until we find Thee and are found of Thee. Without Thee we can find no light nor rest nor strength. Like those who raise their eyes from foul and narrow city streets to the snow-clad whiteness of mountain peaks and to the steadfast calm of the friendly stars, so we would lift our gaze to the infinite sky of Thy mercy and to the beckoning hills of Thy help; as we link our hopes for all human-kind to Thee, who seest our little, troubled hour as one to whom a thousand years are but 1 day. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 27, 1953, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is—

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young
Gore	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials bearing upon the issue now before the Senate be printed in the body of the RECORD. The first is an editorial entitled "Titan of Talk," published in the Washington News, and the second is entitled "MORSE Proves His Endurance," which appeared in the Washington Post.

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

[From the Washington Daily News]

TITAN OF TALK

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, set a new talking record of 22 hours, 26 minutes in the current filibuster. It cost the taxpayers between \$9,000 and \$10,000 to print the Senator's remarks—including some references to bologna—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A flag-pole sitter would be cheaper.

[From the Washington Post]

MORSE PROVES HIS ENDURANCE

Senator MORSE's feat in addressing the Senate for 22 hours and 26 minutes should be appropriately recorded in the annals of human endurance. The Senator has made pikers out of Robert M. La Follette, Huey Long, and others who have attempted to sway the Senate by the mere multiplication of words. The fact remains that most of his words were spoken to empty benches, a bleary-eyed presiding officer and two sleepy members of his family. Thus the Senator was denied the applause that used to be given to the winners of the old-fashioned

pie-eating contests and other extreme tests of physical stamina.

Mr. MORSE attributed his feat to his excellent physical condition and his moderation in sipping the bouillon, coffee, and tea that were brought to him. His health and his caution in some things are doubtless of interest to the public, but it does seem that he might have demonstrated both at less cost in time and money. As the speech will occupy about 95 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, its cost to the public will be more than \$8,000. As to its value, even when Mr. MORSE turned from his report for the Independent Party to the vital subject of offshore oil, his arguments were lost in the excess of verbiage. If it is mere endurance that he wishes to demonstrate, it is a pity that he does not take up pole-sitting or marathon dancing.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am hoping that we may today reach an agreement on the time when a vote may be taken on the pending joint resolution. The subject was discussed briefly yesterday. It seems to me that the proposal which I submitted yesterday was a reasonable proposal. However, it was objected to. It was a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on amendments, and to assign all of May 5 for final debate, so that in the late afternoon or in the evening of May 5 there could be a final vote on the joint resolution.

The Senators who have conducted the opposition to the joint resolution certainly have frequently expressed the view that a time should be set for a final vote on the measure, and that an effort should not be made to prevent a vote, and they have so stated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am taking them at their word. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on January 7, 1953, at page 202 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

A filibuster, it should be needless to say, is prolonged discussion of a measure which is designed to prevent it from ever coming to a vote. It is not discussion for the purpose of making voting more intelligent. Its purpose is to tie up business so completely that a vote will never occur. It is, therefore, a method of preventing the majority from making its decision effective. Hence it is a form of minority rule.

Mr. President, it seems to me that any Senator who believes what I have just quoted should be willing to agree to a vote on the pending joint resolution. We are now coming near to the end of the fourth week of the debate on it.

In my proposal of yesterday, I suggested May 5 as the date for a final vote. That is an entire week from today. It would seem to me to be a perfectly reasonable time to allow for further debate. However, I am willing to make the date for a vote later. I should like to have one of the Senators in opposition to the joint resolution say when the opposition would be prepared to vote. We are going ahead because of the fact they have said they want more time. I am taking them at their word. The Senate will run in continuous session tonight, tomorrow, and perhaps tomorrow night, in order that there may be full time provided in which to present all views.

The opposition has taken the view that they are not trying to prevent a vote. I can relieve the burden on many Senators and on the opposition Senators themselves, if the Senators in opposition will carry out in good faith what they have said. It is important that we agree on a date. That date may be May 5, May 15, or even May 25, so far as I am concerned. The important point is that so long as the present procedure continues we have no assurance that we will ever be able to get a vote on the joint resolution.

Regardless of what the Senators in opposition may say, the effect of their position amounts to an effort to prevent the Senate from ever voting. We are therefore trying to secure a vote with the parliamentary means available to us.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said:

One of the least defensible and, in my mind, most undemocratic procedures of the Senate is that which permits a minority of its members to prevent a majority from acting by the device of a filibuster.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota said further:

Let us not speak of minority control with pride as the prerogative of the Senate. It is just the opposite. It is the weakness of the Senate. It is a weakness that can make this Senate lose prestige in the public mind and lose effectiveness as a governing body. Now, Senators have likewise spoken of the dangers of the majority rule and of the fact that it can often be wrong. I agree. Certainly majorities can sometimes be wrong, but so can minorities, and even more often and more easily.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] said further:

We have this kind of distortion, this kind of legislative trickery, going on here respecting this important piece of legislation. That is done in an effort to do what? To prevent the Senate even having a chance to vote on one of the most controversial issues of our day. I submit that that shows lack of faith. It represents an unwillingness to test the courage of the respective Members of the United States Senate to see how they are going to vote.

The Senator from Minnesota said further:

I happen to be enough of a believer in the democratic process to say that if Senators do not like a bill, they should give their arguments and should register their votes . . . and should not resort to some sort of legislative trickery, or some other legislative procedure, call it what we will, to prevent the measure from being acted upon.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I certainly do not quarrel with what the Senator from Ohio has stated; namely, that it should be possible to fix a date eventually for a vote on the pending joint resolution. I am working to that end. I am not sure, but perhaps we will be able to arrive at an agreement before the day is over, at least on the first part of the problem.

I submit most respectfully a suggestion for whatever it may be worth. I say to the majority leader that I do not speak for myself alone, although I do not know whether I speak for the entire

group of the minority that has been working on this problem, but I speak for some of them when I express these views. We think we ought to sit down with the majority leader and discuss the procedure, to the end that we may determine whether we can make a start toward agreeing to a schedule for voting. However, I may say most kindly that the majority leader makes it a little difficult when he suggests that he will hold us in all-night sessions. I assure him that we can take it. We have already demonstrated that fact. On the other hand, I do not know of any better way to drive the Senate into the filibuster technique than to hold us in all-night sessions, when we say that we have no intention of preventing an ultimate vote on the joint resolution.

If the Senator from Ohio will check the personnel of the Senate he will find that they are pretty well fagged out. The official reporters are exceedingly tired.

What we ought to do is to negotiate, but not under the demand—I shall not use the word "threat"—which the majority leader has suggested, but rather that we sit down together and work out a time for a vote, with the Senate sitting for reasonable hours in the meantime. I am sure that under such circumstances the joint resolution will be disposed of in the not too distant future.

I meant it the other day when I said that I was not going to oppose a vote ultimately. The Senator has negotiated with his colleagues, and he knows as well as I do that when we sit down, as we on our side have been sitting down with 15 or 16 Members of the Senate, there is no unity of opinion among us, any more than there is among the majority leader and the Senators with whom he sits down in conference, as to just what the procedure is to be.

So, Mr. President, speaking at least for the group that I know I can speak for, if the Senator will meet with us today and discuss the problem, perhaps before the day is out we will arrive at some arrangement.

Mr. TAFT. I am encouraged by the words of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, speaking for the little band of liberals whom he defended the other night. I certainly am glad to negotiate with him. However, all the arrangements have been made for a full night session. We have worked the matter out so as to have the least burden fall upon the Senate employees and upon all others. I do not believe that we could change those arrangements, unless something very definite should be agreed upon. I do not mean to say that we must have agreement on a fixed date on which to vote, if I am satisfied that Senators are about ready to agree, because I am the last person in the Senate to want to go through a night session. I do not like night sessions. However, there seemed to be no other recourse to follow, after the long procedure, and I have given a full week's notice of our intention in that connection, during which time we have held sessions for long hours in order to permit Senators to make full statements on the subject.

Mr. President, I should be glad to meet the distinguished Senator this afternoon.

If I may, a little later, I shall name an hour for meeting with him.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the moment I withhold a unanimous-consent request as to a specific date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF TELEGRAMS AND LETTERS RECEIVED BY SENATOR MORSE IN REGARD TO SUBMERGED LANDS JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted, for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, various letters and telegrams which I have received in support of my position on Senate Joint Resolution 13. They were individual letters and telegrams. I could have offered them one at a time, at length, if I had wished to do so; but I did not. Apparently, a question has been raised as to whether they should be treated under the printing rules as a single manuscript.

This is not the time to discuss that point, although later I shall discuss it at some length, for I believe that under the rule it is clear that each letter or each telegram is a separate entity and can be presented separately, and therefore, does not come under the rule requiring that an estimate of cost must be made and stated.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent—because the telegrams and letters bear upon my argument against the submerged lands joint resolution—that the telegrams and letters which I offered yesterday and such others as I shall offer today, shall be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams and other communications are as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations to you for your courageous fight against a grab of the tidelands oil. That which belongs to all the people shouldn't be in the hands of a few, but it is hard for some selfish people to see that. Only men with courage can fight these predatory interests which seem to abound in our country. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

EFREM PERLIS.

DETROIT, MICH.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your stand on the tidelands issue. We need men in the Senate that represent all the people and not

those from a few States. May God grant you good health and strength.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY SELIGMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you on your courageous stand in regard to the tidelands oil. Your actions denote the true stature of a statesman.

We consider you the statesman of our generation and feel that our country is most fortunate to have an individual such as you in our governing body.

The best of wishes to you and your family. I know they must feel proud of you, too.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. SIDNEY SILVER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading about your heroic stand against individual States' title to the tidelands oil, may I in my humble way offer you my sincere thanks for your great effort in this fight. Certainly all the citizens of our great country should benefit from these natural resources, and not just a few favored States, and the big businesses within these States, who wish to gain control of this oil.

I favor the Anderson bill, and so intend to inform my own State's Senator, IRVING M. IVES.

I have generally registered as a Democrat but consider myself an Independent—going along on what I believe is the best for the most people.

Thank you again, Senator MORSE, for your valiant and honest stand on the issues as they arise.

Respectfully yours,

CELIA COHEN,
Mrs. Henry Cohen.

VALDOSTA, GA., April 25, 1953.
Senator MORSE:

I would like to congratulate and express my deepest admiration for your outstanding performance on the Senate floor. Your great display of support for the American people by halting, so far, this great "give-away" bill—the Holland resolution—shows the people which of their Senators are interested in their welfare. I close with the feeling that this bill will be defeated by your outstanding words and the few Senators of your opposition group.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM H. MOBLEY,
Student at Valdosta State College.

NORFOLK, VA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your wonderful feat of endurance. You are indeed our greatest Senator, a humble man with a supreme conscience. My only regret is that you're from Oregon rather than Virginia. Because I would consider it an honor and privileges to have voted for you.

You have magnificent principles and morals. History will record you along with our other greats—Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, Henry, Hale, and Franklin. You embody all of their fine independent ideas.

God be with you.

WM. GORDON DILLON.

HILLSIDE, N. J., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your speech against tideland oil.

You have earned the admiration of the American people in your fight for democratic principles for all the American people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. I. MARCUS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 23, 1953.
United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We esteem you for your opposition to the oil lobby, and wish you may be successful in your efforts. It is certainly an uphill fight you are engaged in, but what can be more important in our national life than to protect our schools.

Sincerely yours,

K. L. TREVETT.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although your marathon speech is undoubtedly unwise and extravagant from a personal point of view, let me congratulate you on your valiant effort to defeat a bad and costly bill.

While the press and radio have reported the efforts of yourself and others to prevent passage of this measure they have been very lax in informing the public of the actual provisions of the bill. Maybe your gesture will stimulate them to be more specific.

I hope you gain converts.

Very truly yours,

EUNICE DE CHAZEAU
Mrs. M. G. de Chazeau.

GOLCONDA, ILL., April 25, 1953.
WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your support of the oil for education amendment.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. LOWERY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a native Texan, may I congratulate you on your fine stand against the tidelands bill. Win or lose, you've certainly done your part in trying to stop this very unfair legislation. Thank you, and good luck.

Sincerely,

BETTY J. KELLY.

READING, PA., April 23, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to add my voice to the many who are appreciative of the single-handed battle you are waging for American democracy.

May I say that I am grateful for you and sorry that you stand alone fighting for a principle. In my mind you are the "Gad-fly" of whom Socrates himself would be proud.

Respectfully yours,

LILLIAN P. WOLFF.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., April 25, 1953.
MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We've just sent a telegram commending your action in the Senate against giving away the rights to the country's oil. It's wonderful to have one man take this stand almost alone, alone in being an Independent too. Here's good wishes to you on your wholesome and exceedingly courageous stand.

Mrs. L. COOPER.

MEDFORD, OREG., April 22, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your stand on tidelands oil. We don't know what we would do without you.

ATLANTA NOFFZIGER.

QUINCY, MASS.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just an inadequate expression of our appreciation of your stand

on the tidelands oil issue. Christ couldn't have suffered more on the cross than you did in those 19 magnificent hours of sacrifice. We slept while you suffered on the floor of the Senate. Keep up the good work while your strength lasts.

It is unfortunate that we do not have many Senators of your caliber. Your stand on all issues to date has been in the best interest of all the people. Your work has not gone unnoticed.

Respectfully,

MAURICE and JANE LYONS.

ASTORIA, LONG ISLAND, April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you.

HORACE MANNER.

CENTRAL POINT, OREG.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on the Hill-Anderson bill has the approval of both of us.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LESTER E. JAMES.

HOUSTON, MISS., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems obvious that you are to lose in your noble fight to preserve for posterity its rightful heritage in the submerged lands off the coast. But there is no failure in losing when overwhelmed by the powerful forces of greed. Is not the difference between the noble and the ignoble precisely this: The noble have a strong sense of obligation to the future—to the unborn generations dependent on those now in control of their whole fortune?

I have followed closely the debates on this vital issue as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our own newspapers—Scripps-Howard all—never give any space to the opponents of the grab. So I have sent clippings to other citizens who have no way of knowing the facts in this controversy. I feel that, vast as may be the wealth which is to be turned over to the selfish, an even greater menace is the fact that this measure will probably be only the opening of the gates to the despoiling of the whole national domain—a domain held in trust only.

To you and to Senators DOUGLAS, HILL, HUMPHREY, FULBRIGHT, LEHMAN, KEFAUVER, and others, I feel a great debt of gratitude.

If you, Senator MORSE, were a Mississippi Representative, I should merely wire you, "Attaboy" for that unprecedented marathon in which you have engaged. But, of course, I should not dare use such an expression in addressing a Senator. Nevertheless, you are entitled to exclaim "Rejoice, we conquer!" for yours is a moral victory which this Nation can never forget.

Yours most sincerely,

Mrs. L. B. REID.

P. S.—

"I shall have glory by this losing day
More than Octavius and Mark Antony
By this vile conquest shall attain unto."

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I think you are doing a magnificent job in behalf of all of the people of the United States.

If convenient, please convey my appreciation to those of your colleagues who are co-operating in this effort to prevent the Big Steal.

Yours sincerely,

MACK BLANK.

EVANSTON, ILL., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Like many others who appreciate your continuing efforts in behalf of all Americans, I send you sincere thanks for your dauntless opposition to the oil bill now before the Senate. Whether or not you are successful in this present test of the people versus selfish interests, I hope that you will feel sustained by the millions of citizens for whom you are crusading so valiantly.

Respectfully yours,

BOYER JARVIS.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Independent, Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Sincerest best wishes and congratulations on your courageous stand and debate on the tidelands oil question. This writer does not make it a practice to write letters such as this, but in this matter as in your general forthright stand on the issues of today, you certainly merit the good wishes and thanks of all the people and voters in this country.

Yours truly,

JOHN T. KELLY.

WESTPORT, CONN.

Congratulations, Senator MORSE, for your courage and strength. In Westport the board of finance is cutting back on education. Maybe if you can win and if the children of Westport can have their share of the tideland oil they can have more teachers at better salaries.

But thanks for the fight you and your allies are putting up.

WALTER K. GUTMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Bravo on your record-breaking talkfest. The people needed a rude awakening to the vital issue. Your service to the people of the United States is magnificent and I hope the press wakes up to the facts. Here in Philadelphia one can note the noticeable change in our newspapers, from the public, etc. Give my regards to fellow conscientious Senators. You are gaining admiration throughout by your independent thinking and action.

THERESA J. WRIGHT, R. N.

APRIL 23, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write to you for a long time. I have always postponed it until tomorrow. Tomorrow has arrived, ushered in by your brave fight against the tidelands oil bill. Not only myself, but thousands of other people are behind you in this fight. Regardless of what a number of newspapers say, most of us from this part of Oregon are with you and for you. Our Medford paper certainly is. Mr. Ruhl, the editor, has a great deal of public influence. His judgment is respected by both young and old.

Of our local taxes, 82 percent goes for the support of our schools. New school buildings have increased bonded indebtedness to the limit in some places. The only possible solution is the Hill-Anderson bill. Our Supreme Court has ruled in favor of 48 States, not three. If we are to respect the Supreme Court in some cases, why not now? If we are to economize in Federal expenditures, in millions, why give billions away?

Keep up the good work and may God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. MOLDOVAN.

BAKER, OREG., April 21, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following with great interest the debate on the so-called tidelands bill.

I do not ever recall in my lifetime anything comparing in the line of giving away our natural resources. In fact, I can hardly understand how a Senator or Congressman could take their oath of office and then cast their vote to give away the very thing they swear they will protect—our country and its sovereignty.

Then what comes next? Forests, timber, grazing? We in Oregon, a great timber and public-lands State, are becoming increasingly alarmed. I could not believe my ears, when I heard former President Hoover advocate selling away our big multipurpose dams to the power companies. Just how far will this administration go before the people back home realize that this is not a crusade for the people, but a crusade for the few?

You Senators that are fighting this bill on the floor of the Senate are doing the country a great favor. I really do not believe the people are awake to the far-reaching decision you are about to make.

I have been reared to believe the Supreme Court was the final authority on the laws of our land. I wonder what the press would have said had former President Truman asked Congress to overrule the Supreme Court in the steel case? There would have been an uproar, and rightly so. But what do we see in the press now? Not very much, I can assure you.

So I would say if Senator TAFT wants it called a filibuster, let it be called that. I would encourage you and the other Senators to keep up the fight, and once the people are really informed, I am sure your efforts will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

LLOYD REA,
County Judge.

APRIL 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: More power to you, and all the vast, disillusioned, liberal-thinking public is solidly behind your valiant fight for Federal control of tidelands. You need help and support. Where are the rest of them?

Be assured of many, many well-wishers and staunch supporters, Senator.

Our prayers are with you in all your efforts, and you will succeed.

Sincerely,

MARDEN BATE.

UNITED PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing for myself and the 900 members of Local 89, United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO.

We want to commend you and give our thanks for the stand you took on the tidelands-oil issue. We are aware of the attitude of the present Congress, and are wondering how much worse it will get before it gets better.

Enclosed are two leaflets we are now informing our members with. I thought you might be interested.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES VINCENT,
Education Director, Local 89, UPWA-CIO.

SWAMPSCOTT, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks and our heartfelt appreciation for your efforts,

as leader of the Independent Party, to defeat the so-called tidelands deal. You had your day in court last Friday, as you have many Fridays past.

For you to stand today for what you think is right requires much fortitude.

It is our feeling that we are in the midst of the dark ages, politically speaking, with the stake but one step removed.

May God continue to give you the power to discern the common good and to act upon it.

Sincerely yours,

MILDRED M. RAMSDELL,
FRANK E. RAMSDELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your magnificent stand on the Senate floor. I really appreciate the task you are carrying for all Americans. I hope by now that many more are beginning to see the folly of doggedly carrying through an opportunist campaign pledge such as the offshore oil reserves giveaway.

I might ask you how you did the 22-hour stint on the floor, but such details are perhaps best kept an eternal secret of yours.

Many thanks again from one constituent and let us hope that the giveaway can be stopped in the courts if not on the Senate floor.

Sincerely,

DAVID LENT.

P. S.—Please do not feel obligated to answer this letter. The press of work on you must now be very heavy.

CANAJOHARIE, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our heartiest congratulations and approval to you and your fellow Senators against this awful "Oil Grab Bill". We believe that the press, radio and television has deliberately kept the public in ignorance of the true nature of this bill. We most sincerely would like to see you air your gallant views on this subject—on television. That would give the public a true picture. Best of luck to you and our best wishes for success.

Sincerely yours,

JULIA KING.

NEW BERN, N. C., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just this note to let you know that thousands of your fellow citizens throughout the Nation feel very happy to know that we have in you, and your valiant colleagues, true representatives in the Senate at this crucial time. I refer to the tenacious fight you are waging against the passage of the giveaway submerged lands bill now before the Senate.

As I see it, Senator MORSE, the only sure way to defeat this iniquitous bill is to see that it is given ample and extended debate. Such prolonged debate will tend to acquaint the American people with the true nature of this proposed grab bill.

Keep up your good fight. Thousands of your enlightened fellow citizens are with you to the end.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST MURRAY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Heartfelt thanks for your magnificent fight against the offshore bill defending the interests of the American people against the interests of oil companies.

Very truly yours,

EDGAR L. TRIER.

FULTON, Mo., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a private citizen I wish to thank you for your efforts to preserve the tidelands oil for all the people of our Nation. You, indeed, deserve the gratitude of the masses of Americans, whether or not they are discerning enough to realize it at this moment.

The present trend toward the liquidation of public power, of aid for low-income housing, and of Federal ownership of offshore oil bodes, in my opinion, only ill for the future of our country. All that most of us can do is stand on the sidelines and watch, except for letters to our representatives. It is heartening, therefore, to know that there are among our legislators some who, like you, talk sense to the American people and strive to make themselves heard above the din and confusion created by the apostles of rugged individualism.

Since I did not do so at the time, I also wish to express now my admiration of the courageous stand that you took in the general election last November.

Sincerely yours,

ELSA WADE WILLIAMSON,
Mrs. Hugh P. Williamson.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is just a brief note of appreciation for the wonderful fight you and certain other Senators are putting up to stop the huge giveaway.

I hope you succeed in getting (1) the bill tossed out, or (2) modified so that the interests of the people of this Nation are protected.

But it looks very much to me that this administration is going ahead to undermine all the good conservation legislation passed since the days of Teddy Roosevelt.

Oil first, then forests, grazing, and mining, all seem destined to be taken out of Federal control. Water and electricity too.

Then when the Democrats get in again they'll have to go through the painful process of restoring these rights to the people.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE L. ERTZ.

DETROIT, MICH.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard about your record filibuster on the tidelands bill. I think you are doing a fine job to prevent a few States from grabbing all the oil.

I like the amendment proposed to provide for education for all with the oil-lands profits.

I am in accordance with the stand you take on this issue. Good luck to you and those that also oppose the tidelands oil grab.

Sincerely,

MORRIS ROSE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your fight on the tidelands issue was remarkable. Continue to fight the proposed bill to give to the oil interests what belongs to the people of the United States.

In conclusion, may I say well done, Senator.

Yours truly,

SYLVAN S. SZWED.

P. S.—I am a voter in the State of Pennsylvania.

BRONX, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am at a loss for words to express my gratitude for your superhuman efforts in behalf of justice for all the people of this our great Nation. If the Senate had more men of your caliber and principles (instead of being peopled with the errand boys of the selfish-interest groups) then our Constitution would become a living vibrant document instead of a piece of paper to be circumvented by legalistic machinations to thwart its intent and purpose.

It appears that the controlled press is deliberately withholding the issues and facts involved in this great debate of public versus private ownership of tidelands oil. If, for the moment, you should meet with temporary defeat, please do not become discouraged or discontinue your creditable work. Eventually the people will discern the pattern of private grabbing that is slowly developing, and take the proper corrective measures. As that great American, Lincoln, observed: "You can fool some of the people, etc."

I close with the profound hope and prayer that your efforts will be crowned with success to the everlasting benefit of our Nation's schoolchildren.

Respectfully yours,

LEON KRAUSS.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to express admiration for your heroic, and wholly justified, battle against the dangerous offshore oil bill.

This Nation is in desperate need of men like yourself, people who can and will struggle for the values of our liberal, democratic tradition.

I hope that you will sustain your fight despite all the pressure of powerful reactionary interests who certainly must regard you as their primary foe.

Sincerely,

JACOB H. JAFFE.

P. S.—It is obviously a compliment to the citizens of Oregon that they have the good sense to elect you to represent them in Congress.

RICHMOND, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hasten to airmail a word of encouragement to your group with respect to the tidelands issue.

I appreciate profoundly your services for the future of our country in continuing to oppose this shortsighted piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

RIDGWAY H. BROTHERS, M. D.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: It is my privilege to address this letter to a man of honor and courage in the United States Senate.

I am requesting that a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25 be sent to me containing your now famous 22-hour speech.

My deepest regret, sir, is that I cannot work for your reelection. May God be with you in your trials.

Respectfully,

MARTIN WOSKOW.

SNOHOMISH, WASH., April 25, 1953.

DEAR HONORABLE MORSE: Thank you very much for the way you and the other 24

Senators are fighting for the people for the oil lands. Keep it up; we of the United States need more men like you who have an interest of us common people. I like the stand you take all the time.

Sincerely,

HENRY C. QUADE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read your speech, or rather about your speaking, against the proposed giveaway of our oil resources, submerged lands, which naturally belong to the Nation as a whole.

It is rather a pity that in the greatest democracy in the world there should be only a handful of public servants in our Senate. I have admired and voted for Robert La Follette, Sr., back in 1924.

Why not start to organize now, with all progressive Republicans, progressive Democrats, and all liberal elements in the country. I am confident that we would be in the majority in 1956 for presidential election.

As it stands now the Old Guard Republicans, the Dixiecrat Democrats in Congress are in majority and will give away all of our natural resources. Today, oil; tomorrow, other mineral deposits and other vital resources of the Nation.

Please accept my heartfelt congratulations for your outstanding service for our country.

Dear Senator, and friend of the people, keep up this work and some day your philosophy will succeed. Abraham Lincoln had a hard time. So did Franklin D. Roosevelt, but both have won out at the end.

Good luck and good health.

Respectfully,

S. HOFFMAN.

MADISON, ILL., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I just want to congratulate you on your fighting spirit. Also, PAUL DOUGLAS, another great man. Let all the States share in this oil. We have two States that are rich in uranium and they don't want this for themselves only.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS STOCROFF.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for doing all you are to protect our great public domain—tidelands oil. Keep up your courageous work.

Sincerely,

JENNIE KASNIK.

ANDY KASNIK.

JOHN PRETNAC.

JENNIE PRETNAC.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Hurray for you Senator WAYNE MORSE. And all the other good Senators who are willing to endure an endurance in order to keep this oil money for the purpose of education—after using it for self-defense.

I may be only a housewife and the mother of 4 kids; but those 4 kids include 3 teenage sons almost ripe for laying down their lives for this country. And I am also an ex schoolteacher, and the wife of a schoolteacher and a League of Women Voter. As such, I am aware that we need more education and more and more education of the right kind—for political responsibility—instead of for competitive athletics. I am reading Morality in American Politics by George Graham, which makes me feel strongly that only education will make the people aware enough to do something about the stymied position we, as citizens, have placed ourselves in on all the levels of Government. If the schools can't be substituted for the pressure groups in order to get the facts

before the public, then we are a doomed country. And better teachers are needed to do it. Relegating public education to an inferior position in any State in a country that claims to be a democracy is ludicrous.

I stopped my ironing to clap for you as I heard Martin Agronsky tell me this morning how you are progressing with your talkathon. Swell. Keep it up.

Very truly yours,

MINABELLE STAIR VANSICKLE.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks and congratulations for your attempt to halt passage of a bill which would turn our national resources over to three States. If the President were motivated by a similar desire to represent all the States and not merely a cabal of 3 or 4 of them, we might hope for the best. But this is evidently impossible to expect. Keep it up, and accept our best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM ARROWSMITH.

JEAN ARROWSMITH.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., April 24, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good luck to you and the other valiant 24 Senators who are working so hard to save our country, and protect our sacred Constitution, and uphold the honor and dignity of the highest court in our land, the United States Supreme Court. I think very few people know or realize the momentous history which is being made on the floor of the United States Senate these days.

It is sickening to me that some Senators of the United States can put politics before their country, and take the oath of office so casually. To me, it seems like violating the public trust, and practically constitutes treason, to say nothing of showing contempt for the highest court of our land and the supreme law.

If our enemies succeed in passing this dangerous bill Senate Joint Resolution 13, I'm afraid it will have a very demoralizing effect on our allies, make them afraid, and perhaps force them into the arms of the Communists, in a desperate attempt to be on the winning side. After all, the Communists can say convincingly, that if Senators of the United States have no respect for the Bible they swear on, the Supreme Court or our Constitution, how can other nations have any respect for us either.

Senator LEHMAN sent me a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 20, April 1952, and it terrified me: "In time of war—the right of first refusal." Is our Nation to be helplessly shackled and completely at the mercy of all enemies? Was this bill written in Moscow? And Eisenhower says tonight "The Nation must remain strong and unafraid." How? By draining our Nation of its lifeblood, our priceless submerged oil? How naive can he get?

I hope and pray that your courageous group can win the other Senators to the side of right or prevent a vote on the giveaway bill.

You are fighting for the life of our country, and you will have the everlasting gratitude of all the people, when the truth becomes known.

Success to you. May God bless your fight to save America.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELSIE M. JOHNSON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations and God bless you for your great fight for our offshore oil.

You could not have broken the record for a better cause.

Yours very truly,

EDGAR H. BRENNER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. I am a regular Republican and support the present administration generally. Heretofore, in certain quarters, your sincerity has been challenged. After your masterful performance today and all through the debate on the submerged-lands legislation, I will ignore those challenges to your integrity. It is at times such as has presented itself that we, the public, are given the opportunity to assay the character of a man. Your worth has been proven and your work has not gone for naught. I am one who more or less was opposed to you, and now you have won me. How many more are there?

If it is not too difficult, would you send to me a copy of your remarks.

In the meanwhile, take heart and continue the battle. You have my heartiest good wishes and may God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HURLEY.

BRONX, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for helping the American people keep what belongs to them.

Keep up the good work in trying to kill the "oil-grab" bill.

We need more Senators like you.

Good luck.

DANIEL M. ABRAMOWITZ.

TOWSON, MD., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: Congratulations and best wishes for success in your courageous effort to save our country's resources for all its people, not just seacoast dwellers.

We're writing our own State Senators to support you, but we wanted to personally express our appreciation of your wonderful efforts.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JULES STREISAND.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a matter of principle, I am opposed to the existence of Senate rules which make a filibuster possible. However, inasmuch as this rule exists, I am happy to see you use it to good effect against those who would steal our natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ECKSTAT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE, SENATOR OF OREGON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to take a moment to do something I should have done months or years ago. I want to tell you how thankful I am that we have a man like you in the Senate. There are some other men of courage and high principle to whom I should like to say the same thing—men like Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and ESTES KEFAUVER. I am sure there must be at least 96 such people in the United States—I don't know why the 160,000,000 people of the United States can't find some way to discover 96 such people and put them in the Senate.

My main reason for writing at this time is to let you know of my respect, admiration, and appreciation—in particular as to the

stand you and a number of others have taken in the tidelands issue. I happen to be a Texan—I was born there, lived there all my life until coming to Washington, it is still my legal residence and still my home. I am proud to be a Texan. But I am prouder still to be an American. And the tidelands, I feel, should contribute to the welfare of all the people of the United States, and not just to the welfare of Texans, or Californians, or any other group who seek to claim certain special blessings of geography. I am sure there must be a lot of Texans who feel the same way I do.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

J. B. WILMETH.

UPPER MONTCLAIR, N. J., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I extend my congratulations to you for your stand on the "Tidelands Oil Grab." As a school teacher who enjoys visiting our national parks I feared that a precedent might be set which would see them exploited.

I would appreciate a copy of the Hill amendment which, as I understand it, would give much needed assistance to education in the States.

Thank you again and keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

FRANK SLOCUM.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your courageous stand against the present tidelands oil bill.

If the bill doesn't go through, it will be poetic justice indeed that the methods used were the same dilatory methods used by many of the bill's present advocates.

You'll be called a lot of names for using the filibuster but if the administration and many of its reactionary supporters really objected to the filibuster, they would have offered legislation against it a long time ago.

What they really object to is yours and several other men's clear and unselfish thinking on the matter.

Keep up the good work and please don't give up the fight.

Sincerely,

EDWIN S. SADER.

TOLEDO, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a short bit of encouragement that you and your fellow Senators and Congressmen should continue the good work in trying to preserve for all the people of the United States of America their interest in the oil-land fight.

Keep up the fight even if it turns into a filibuster. I think the reason you have not heard from a vast majority of the American people is that they do not really understand the significance of what is going on.

So again keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. SYRING.

P. S.—Kindly inform your fellow Senator—helpers of my position so that they may be somewhat encouraged.

NEW ALBANY, IND., April 24, 1953.

Senator MORSE:

What a wonderful stand you are taking, and what a magnificent fight you are making for Federal control of the offshore oil deposits.

You are a superior man who I suspect has learned that right so often stands alone. But you are not really alone. We followed

your course all through the campaign and believed you right.

God is with you and so many of us are with you—the little unknown people you never hear from but nevertheless believe you to be morally right.

Keep up the fight for us and God bless you.
LAVERNE ENDICOTT, R. N.

NORTH BROOKSVILLE, MAINE, April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long wanted to tell you how much we admire you up here in these parts.

I suppose you are going to lose this tidelands deal, but no one can say you didn't try. I wish the United States had a few more with your guts and stamina and courage of conviction.

I doubt if you'll ever get much reward for it except the knowledge that there must be thousands like me who are deeply grateful.

I wish the State of Maine had the same good judgment as the State of Oregon.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALETHA SWENSEN.

P. S.—While I don't approve of filibusters it doesn't make me mad to see the filibusters get a taste of their own medicine.

UNION CITY, N. J., April 25, 1953.

HONORABLE SIR: Congratulations to you on your speech against the tidelands oil bill. Perhaps your "small voice crying in the wilderness" may be heard and felt by the stony hearts and self-centered legislators who are interested in the almighty buck before justice and the best interest of these great United States of America. More power to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN LINDEN.

VENICE, FLA., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As private citizens my wife and I appreciate all your efforts to keep the tidelands oil for all the people of the United States, especially since the oil is so vital to defense and the proceeds from the sale of oil could give all the States fine educational systems for the children of the land.

We urge you to keep fighting; you have the people behind you.

Sincerely,

MORRIS G. SECA.

MENA, ARK., April 24, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are entitled to this little token of appreciation for your stand on behalf of common people, and particularly on the tidelands.

Respectfully,

L. R. JAMES.

MEDFORD, OREG., February 23, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just wanted to write and thank you for your courageous stand on the tidelands oil bill now before Congress. We are back of you 100 percent, and are urging our friends to write to the other Oregon Congressmen and Senator to back you up, not that we think they will, but at least we're trying to do our part as you are doing yours. God bless you always.

Our fine newspaper editor, Robert W. Ruhl, has surely been doing his share, too, to help you in this fight, as he apparently feels how much it will mean to all the people of Oregon.

Really, Senator MORSE, the greed and callous indifference of some of our people in government right now makes us sick. If it weren't for men of honesty like you to guard the people's interest, we'd be lost.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. H. McGUIRE.

EUCLID PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Euclid, Ohio, April 25, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God for men like you—may the tidelands bill fall by the wayside.

My deepest regret is that living in Ohio I'm not able to cast a vote for you.

Sincerely,

P. J. WINTERS.

P. S.—I'm ashamed and apologize for Ohio's representation in the Senate on this bill.

HOLLAND PARK, MICH., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you for your magnificent giveaway oil filibuster speech. Hoping you will continue to fight for Hill and/or Anderson amendment.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. E. J. GORALEWSKI,

P. S.—We would appreciate a copy of your speech.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Thanks a million for your terrific work on this tidelands oil issue. You have awakened me and I know lots of others to the facts of this grab. Win or lose you have given your best. That's all I ask.

Thank's again.

JOHN BRADLEY.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Even though your efforts to prevent the "tidelands steal" appears to be in vain at this time, I wish to express my appreciation and warm thanks for what you are doing.

Apparently you departed the GOP in the nick of time. When they succeed in accomplishing their foul purpose this will come to be known as the "era of the great oil robbers."

CLIFFORD T. GREEN.

CONCORD, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sure the filibuster was worth while in keeping up opposition to giving tidelands to States.

It is an ill-considered measure, selfish, and actually showing a frightening trend to power pressure. How about the Chief Joseph Dam bill going the same way? Can we know more about that, please?

Mrs. J. H. VOLKMAN.

CHESTER, PA., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speech against the submerged lands bill. I support you and feel that, win or lose, you have performed a great service to the people of the United States.

W. C. KLITSCH.

STONY CREEK, N. Y.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your efforts. United States property should not be given to any State, especially for political purposes in paying campaign debts.

Our boys are called upon to patrol and defend those waters above the submerged land. An education for all is a reduction in taxes for all, this could be had from this valuable land. If it had no value, States would ignore them and we would still patrol them at all States' expense and taxes. It is one of the greatest errors if ever allowed to be signed by the President.

The courts should decide if people approve.

HAZEL KELLY, R. N.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to extend my congratulations and sincere appreciation for the heroic and courageous position you have adopted for the welfare of the American people. Nowhere is that more evident than in your fight on the tidelands oil issue, and I am sure that there is a large personal sacrifice involved in your position. For this earnest and honest conviction, I salute you. May you continue in your efforts to serve as you are convinced in your conscience and judgment.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND LUKE.

NEW YORK CITY, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not one of your constituents I wish to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the silent millions like myself. I have never written to a Congressman before today, but I had to let you know that your efforts were appreciated. I look forward to a chance of someday being able to give you my vote.

SIDNEY A. COWEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your defense of the people's rights. Thank God for one voice in the Senate that can always be counted on to defend the fast disappearing rights of the American people.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. H. FITTINGOFF.

ROBINHOOD, MAINE.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your good work in behalf of the people of America in the matter of tidelands oil.

M. GWENDOLYN POWERS,
(Mrs. George A. Powers.)

MEDFORD, OREG., April 23, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your strong support of the Hill-Anderson bills has my approval. Please do your best to urge their passage. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

DR. BERT R. ELLIOTT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.

You certainly deserve a lot of credit in your fight against the tidelands bill.

Conserve your strength as the American people need more of your type around.

Mrs. E. GERAGHTY.

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for men like you who fight for the rights of all the people without regard for narrow party limits.

The people who gagged at mink coats and 5 percenters are apparently unaware of the really big steals contemplated by those in power. It is "straining at a gnat while swallowing a camel." If tidelands oil goes to the States, it will be the biggest blow ever dealt our public schools and defense.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. FLORENCE BOSSENBERGER
(A DAR who tried to think for herself on all public questions).

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks a lot. I'm considering moving to Oregon so that I may have an opportunity to vote for you in the future.

This thank you is as much for your 20-hour stint as it is for many of your recent statements.

Thanks again.

Best,

GARY BELKIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I urge you please to keep up the fight for the people to get a share of the tidelands oil which belonged to all of us. As those who want to grab it have enough when they get the 3-mile limit, I hope your gallant fight will not be in vain. Good luck to you, sir, and may your great effort bring success. May God bless you, sir.

Mrs. M. Povich.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the fight. I am with you in your fight on the submerged oil lands.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK ESCHLICH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have my support in your stand against the attempted 4-State grab of our offshore resources.

Keep up the good campaign.

Yours truly,

ELMER E. GLASER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your heroic effort to save the oil lands from "the big steal." This could be a wonderful world if people weren't so greedy and lusty for power.

My humble thanks.

DAVID WEINER.

SHAVER HILL, PA.

Congratulations on your record. I knew you had it in you. You are doing the country a great service. I am mighty proud of you. Keep up the good work.

PAUL TINE.

CAMDEN, N. J., April 25, 1953.

The greatest break of your career has been your assuming the independent role. You are doing splendid work and wonderful service to the country. Your talk on the tidelands oil bill has done wonders. It has forcefully made the press give space to you and your fellow colleagues' efforts. I appreciate your tireless public-spirited efforts.

HELEN J. PATTERSON.

PRINCETON, N. J., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your long and brave fight against the handing of the tidelands over to the States. Even though it may well be a futile struggle, many people will long remember your untiring efforts. I have written both of the New Jersey Senators to vote against the present tidelands oil bill.

Sincerely,

WILLARD F. KING.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your gallant fight on the Senate floor on behalf of the people.

Respectfully,

ALVIN SCHARF.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.

Congratulations on your fight against the greedy oil interests. Keep up the fight and defeat the tidelands bill.

J. GERAGHTY.

NIXON, N. J., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SIR: My congratulations to you on your fight to prevent the giveaway of America's resources—resources that belong to all the people. It is unfortunate that the

"gutless-wonders," the so-called liberals of the Senate are permitting you to carry on the fight almost single handed—more power to you.

LIONEL DOMASK.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Thanks Senator. You have restored my faith considerably. I consider you the most honest and patriotic official in office today. You are an American for all—not just the "66 Billionaire Club." The other Republicans smell. Any thinking citizen, with any morals, will appreciate your efforts in their behalf, which is more than the "30 pieces of silver" in the long stretch.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: My wife and I want to thank you for your gallant fight.

Once again the Republicans are befouling their nest. Congratulations on becoming an Independent.

Respectfully,

HERBERT J. SALOMON.

ROSELLE PARK, N. J., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Frank Edwards just announced you had talked for 9 hours in the patriotic effort to prevent the greatest colossal steal in United States history by a hogfish oil combine using a United States President, and G. O. P. Senate, of the billions of dollars in the oil resources owned by all the people of our country. You and the small band of honest Senators sharing in your grand fight to protect the public ownership of these rights have earned the grateful thanks of all honest Americans. Teapot Dome is dwarfed by this dastardly plot. I have twice written protest letters to our New Jersey Senators and Congressmen and the silly, shilly shally answers I received disgusted me. I am a Lincoln Republican, and cast my first vote in 1888.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE W. WILLIAMS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Wonderful. Your fight against the oil grab is a great thing. I highly commend you for it and sincerely hope you and the small group in the Senate victory. However, I am pessimistic and expect our group of politicians to defeat your attempt and let the oil get in the hands of the 3 States. It will be a dreadful and menacing tragedy. Good luck.

Yours truly,

MARTIN M. KANIN.

ITHACA, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is the first time I have written to a public figure, but when I heard this morning of your brave 19-hour fight for the public interest, I couldn't resist writing this to tell you that I am with you all the way and wish your efforts every success.

Congratulations to an outstanding public servant.

Miss SHIRLEY COLLINS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I humbly thank you for your superhuman effort in the fight for the tideland oils. They do belong to all of us and the profits should go to all the States for schools and other important improvements in our great country.

I pray for your good health in your vigorous fight.

Respectfully yours,

ROSE S. KRAMER.

PELHAM, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This to express my sincere admiration for your indefatigable

courage and for your sense of justice in fighting for the rights of all American citizens to share in the revenues from the submerged oil resources.

I was once a Republican, too, before I realized that most members in that party are working in the interest of big business and the wealthy, almost exclusively.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDITH DIGNAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 20, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Sincere and hearty congratulations on your fight in behalf of the tidelands oil. This belongs to all the people for all time.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ELIZABETH SMITH.

APRIL 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for the terrific job you did on the tidelands oil bill. This morning I wished I lived in Oregon, so I could have the chance to vote for you.

Sincerely yours,

MARTHA NATHAN.

BELLEVILLE, W. Va., April 25, 1953.

Congratulations on your endurance for the rights of all the people.

Gratefully yours,

EARL R. EVANS.

FLINT, MICH.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your stand against the "give away" bill coming up soon for a vote. I wish we had more men like you to represent the people. The offshore lands clearly belong to all the people as the Supreme Court has decided three times. Keep up the fight.

Mrs. NELLIE DUFURE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

HONORABLE SIR: Thank you for your efforts to keep tidelands oil for all of the States of our country and to use the income to equalize educational opportunities for all children of our Nation. Also appreciate your courageous stand on many other honest and progressive matters.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LUCILLE K. GRUMLEY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Thank God for WAYNE MORSE.

GERARD M. WEISBERG.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your heroic stand against handing public property into the hands of possible irresponsible politicians.

The revenue from tide oil should be given to the entire Nation for the benefit of educating the youth of the Nation as a whole.

Names of your opponents would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HANLEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Hon. Senator MORSE:

The soil, raw materials and its products, belong unabridged to its people. Thank you, sir, for your patriotic stand, opinions, and defense.

HENRY METISCHER.

TILLAMOOK, OREG., April 22, 1953.

People are pulling for your team in this fight to keep the natural resources out of the hands of the pack. Some day, if you just keep it up, people will know for sure that what you said about "trends" in government was right, and that we stand to lose everything to those internationalists who have cost us so much already.

We raise our hands in horror at the ancient practice of throwing children into furnaces to appease pagan gods. I wonder just what the difference is between that and sending our boys out to make it safe for their plundering. Why not father a bill to rotate those Pentagon guys into the Korea trenches, so they will know what war is like? Also why not force dairies to leave cream in the milk and sell it for a little more; people would buy it that way, and there would be no butter surplus. Why not really use our heads?

GRACE M. CHARLTON.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SIR: You and the others who are fighting the oil grab are doing a magnificent job. We, along with many other Americans, thank you and pray that you all will have the strength to continue your magnificent struggle.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. MAX HAUSEN.

NEW PROVIDENCE, PA., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Some of the people versus all the people. Just heard about your speech supporting all the people. Keep up the good work. Do whatever you can to defeat the tidelands oil bill.

H. EUGENE CARRIGAN.

MADISON, N. J., April 24, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you for your fine work and for your great heart, not only spiritually, but physically. How you stand all the strain, we don't know, but we were delighted to hear that your voice is still strong and clear. I guess your righteous cause gives you strength. Didn't I write you right after election that if Eisenhower lives up to some of his pledges, or any of them, he may count you yet among his greatest assets. I am still waiting for him to make a stand somewhere. And if has any support, it looks as if it will have to come from you and the Democrats.

Sincerely,

ALICE BALASSA.

BALTIMORE, MD.

DEAR SIR: Keep on with your noble stand on the oil grab. History will record you as being an outstanding example of a honest, upright man, who is doing his duty as a Senator, not a chisler who is being bought off. You are fighting heavy odds and unfair competition, but keep on, there are plenty of people cheering for you.

Best luck.

I. BARDITCH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo for your great effort in behalf of all the people in regard to tidelands bill. A flash just came over that the vote was postponed. I am sure that by that time all the people will wake up and back you to the hilt. Thanks and good luck. I am only sorry that I do not live in your State so I could vote for you.

J. E. AUSTIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your magnificent 22-hour effort and for your support of federally owned tidelands.

I am sure your fight has done much to show people the fallacy of State operation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN GOULD.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Your stand on tidelands oil is in the best interests of Oregon and the Nation. Please

accept the sincere thanks of one of your loyal supporters respectfully.

V. C. HEFFERIN.

MEDFORD, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Jackson County Democrats appreciate your fight against tidelands steal. We are proud to have a man of your honesty and integrity representing Oregon.

GUY D. CLORLISS,

Chairman, Jackson County Democratic Party.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Strongly endorse your strenuous efforts as well as those of other Senators opposing passage of outrageous tidelands oil bill.

C. STUART MACDONALD,

President, Cummins Diesel Motive-power Corp.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

God bless you. Always fight for our country. I think everyone feels the way I do.

RUFIO LUCIANO.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Thank you. Wish that there were more of you. Wishing you success on this bill. Speaking of eight others.

Mrs. ELVIRA CATALDO,

Ex-President of City Women's Republican Club.

SALEM, OREG., April 26, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on tidelands oil.

MAYOR FRANCIS G. BRADLEY.

SHERIDAN, OREG.

SCRANTON, PA., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In behalf of the children and teachers of Pennsylvania, we salute you on your courageous stand on the tidelands bill.

MARY H. RUDDY,

Secretary,

Dunmore Federation of Teachers.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We love you, respect, and admire you. Pour it to 'em.

Tom and FANN HARVEY.

BOB and MABLE SMITH.

ALBANY, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on speech. Wish I were Oregonian for 1956.

ARTHUR SILVERSTEIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We thank you for really representing the people yesterday.

DOROTHY and REVA FINE.

SALEM, OREG., April 26, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington D. C.:

Executive Board Oregon Farmers Union meeting at Salem strongly supports your stand for oil-for-education bills. We oppose Holland bill which we believe will pave the way for grabs for other natural resources and might jeopardize dam and irrigation program of Federal Government. Keep up good fight.

RICHARD MOELLER,

President, Oregon State Farmers Union.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Your courage, statesmanship, and genuine devotion to the welfare of the American people is like a breath of spring. May God give you strength to carry on in the true Progressive tradition of "Bob" La Follette.

H. J. RIPP.

HOUSTON, TEX., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Chambers, Capitol Building:

Stop liquidation and give-away of the people's property. Congratulations.

EUGENE and LILLAN HUDGENS.

LEVITTOWN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your effort. Wish our Senators helped. If Oregon thumbs down, welcome to Levittown.

Mr. and Mrs. CARL RIGDON.

TOPEKA, KANS., April 26, 1953.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you sincerely for your efforts to prevent tidelands oil passage. Such a bill would be most unfair to the American public. Although just an average citizen I want you to know that I and many like myself appreciate the battle you fight for us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. W. O'BRIEN.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y., April 26, 1953

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

You don't stand alone. Our hope lies in you. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. ANTHONY IMMARCO.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your courageous efforts on behalf of the people of this country in your recent 22-hour speech.

ROSEMARY and HARRY KLEMFUSS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

My thanks to you and to the people of Oregon who elected you.

PETER GOODE.

LAWRENCE, KANS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER MORSE: Congratulations on your record-shattering speech. We admire your fortitude.

BETA GAMMA OF PI KAPPA ALPHA,
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

LINCOLN, NEBR., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Senator Morse stay with it. Those tidelands belong to our United States. A First World War veteran just telling you stay with it.

W. R. RILEY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opponents announce their assurance of victory next week. You must not let them steal the property of the whole people at least until you have forced the press to inform the people of what is happening. We are grateful to you for giving us hope in these trying times.

HAROLD S. TURKEL.
Mr. and Mrs. JAMES E. SULLIVAN.
GEORGE KRONISH.
Mr. and Mrs. JACK CHURCHILL.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
The attorneys of Michigan admire your stand.

CONLEY AND GALLGHER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
This is the most important work you have done in the course of a great public career. Best wishes to you and all the Senators who are helping.

MRS. FREDERIC G. WEIR.

ORANGE, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on a wonderful job. If the Senate had more like you the country would be in better shape.

J. L. ZAR,
President, National Radiac, Inc.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
The schoolchildren of Michigan are with you. Keep it up.
PATRICK, TIMOTHY, MICHAEL, AND DENNIS GALLAGHER.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on successful speech against oil bill. Respectfully suggest aid to education with oil revenue. God bless you.
C. T. CAMILLI, Ph. D.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your magnificent effort.
BARBARA FERGUSON.

MADISON, WIS., April 25, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you and other Senators for your courageous fight against the big steal of tidelands oil. Your courage in the fight against greed will live long in history.
ARTHUR H. GORDON.

LITCHFIELD, CONN., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Agree with you. Offshore oil land should remain under the Federal Government.
AMY R. THURSTON.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Bravo, your heroic achievement. Your courage an inspiration to all America.
SELMA AND IRVING ABRAMS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
For a great statesman's courageous fight we thank you.

CECELIA M. TURIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight against the steal of tideland oil.

BERNARD ATKINS.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your brave fight from one of the many American citizens who are solidly behind you and deeply indebted to you.

NANCY MORSE.
(Not related to Senator MORSE.)

CHICAGO, ILL., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The fight is not futile. Keep it up, and please pass this telegram to our Senator DOUGLAS.

W. M. CRAMER AND A. F. JACOBS.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight against the scandalous tidelands steal.
EMERSON B. MILLER,
President, United Council of Municipal Employees of Springfield, Mass.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
My congratulations and thanks for your efforts to focus the attention of the American people on the preservation for all of us of our offshore national resources. The Detroit papers have given good attention to your holding of the Senate floor. Continue to serve us.

ROBERT GREENE.

STATE COLLEGE, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you and your colleagues for your excellent fight against the offshore oil grab.

FRED HOEHLER, Jr.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on stand in favor of oil for education and against relinquishing of national wealth; also congratulations on speech keeping the subject placing issue in public eye. We appreciate your effort to drive home the undemocratic nature of the filibuster. Keep it up.

EXECUTIVE BOARD, HARVARD LIBERAL UNION,
(on behalf of its 250 members).

DALY CITY, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck on your fight to keep Federal control of our marginal oil land.
MALCOLM G. MITCHELL.

WALTHAM, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
To the noble defender of the people's rights admiration and thanks.
OSCAR HOLGER.

LANSDOWNE, PA., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your fight on behalf of all Americans.
GEORGE and EUNICE GRIER.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
My sincere appreciation for your outstanding defense of the public's interest.
J. C. PARDEE.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

The Honorable Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Terrific your stand tidelands. Convey congratulations to Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico on Meet the Press tonight.
M. P. SCULLY.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We stand 100 percent behind you in your courageous fight to retain ownership of tideland oil. Our thanks also to Senators HILL and ANDERSON and the supporting Senators. Your marathon speech was stupendous. You are indeed a great man, and our confidence in you will never be shaken.
Sincerely,
JOSEPH HEIM.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
RICHARD PORTER, JULIA ROGERS,
JOHN WEGENER.

SOMERVILLE, MASS., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
On behalf of the officers and 1,400 members of Ford local union, No. 901, United Automobile Workers, I urge you and your colleagues to vote to defeat the Holland and Hunt bills in fairness to the just rights of all Americans in all States of the Union.
ARTHUR DEPIETRO,
President, Ford Local No. 901.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your speech against the tidelands oil bill. Would like to be sending similar congratulations to the Senators from my State.
DOROTHY HAENER.

NEW BOSTON, MICH.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 27, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Thoroughly agree with your magnificent stand against tidelands oil steal. Believe people here are finally becoming aroused. Keep it up as the public is now learning the truth. Tidelands for schools, not millionaires. Best regards.

JAMES C. JOHNSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Me and mine thank you and pray for you. Your valiant defense of the people's ownership of the offshore oil makes the voters of Oregon a first-line defense of the United States. You can lick 'em. Good luck.

TOM KIDDER.

BOISE, IDAHO, April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Thank you very much. Keep it up.

WALLACE K. POND.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your speech. It may help bring this important issue to greater public attention. Tidelands belong to national, should remain under Federal control.

LAWRENCE AUERBACH.

GLENSIDE, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We think you are doing a grand job together with the other Senators. Have wired Senators DUFF and MARTIN that we are in favor of the Anderson bill and Hill amendments.

Good luck.

PAUL SCHERR.

LOIS SCHERR.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Please accept my sincerest thanks for the effective manner in which you are upholding the rights of the majority of Americans. I admire particularly your recent herculean efforts.

H. S. MACLEAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

You have our support in your efforts to prevent the giveaway of the tidelands.

Mr. and Mrs. THOMAS C. COREY.

LEVITTOWN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of Levittown Democratic Club extend to you most sincere congratulations on your memorable speech last Friday which focused nationwide attention to devoted efforts of you and other liberal Senate colleagues to prevent historic rights of Federal Government to offshore lands from being subverted by selfish pressure groups and self deluded States righters. As a dynamic liberal force in Levittown our Democratic Club is proud to applaud efforts of any public official regardless of political affiliation who places general welfare above narrow partisan or private interests. You have our gratitude and thanks

XCIX—254

for talking sense to the Senate and to the American people.

LEVITTOWN DEMOCRATIC CLUB,

WILLIAM W. WEDIN, President.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

I applaud your stand. Am definitely behind you.

DAN CLANCY.

HAVERTOWN, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep it up; you're on the right side.

CATHERINE KINNEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand against oil lobby's attempt to plunder public wealth. Wired Senator CORDON strongly urging him to stand up and be counted with you in this fight to preserve natural oil resources for all our citizens.

MELVIN LONDON and ELLA LONDON.

LANSING, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your excellent fight against giving away our tidelands. Hope you keep it up. Our natural resources belong to all American citizens. I am a builder and realtor member both national associations but do not always agree with our policymakers. Keep fighting for the people.

JAMES L. MITCHELL.

ALBANY, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and thanks for your efforts against the willful and wasteful giveaway of United States property in offshore oil. Good luck.

BARBARA and DANIEL McNAMEE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to commend you for your effort to save the oil resources of the United States tidelands for all of the people of our country. We feel that this is only the beginning of the "big deal" grab of the national resources. We have too few representatives in Republican administration to protect the interests of the Nation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LUCILLE and ERNEST WESLECK.

VENICE, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

Senator MORSE of Oregon,

Washington, D. C.:

We commend you upon your stand against the tidelands bill. If such a bill passes it would be in contradiction to the best interest of the majority of the people. As a Senator, as a man, it is gratifying to know that you put democracy and justice above all else.

PAUL and DOROTHY MATTSO.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Re tidelands oil bill, that oil belongs to the American people, some of it belongs to the

fighting forces in Korea and some of the returned prisoners of war.

Congress has been showing an intense preoccupation with the purpose of giving away the Nation's rights to offshore oil and in doing so is writing a questionable (or shall I say another questionable) chapter in political history. Remember Teapot Dome. The good God knows, ask His help.

Mrs. JAMES DOONER.

NEWTON, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Thank God for you; our prayers are with you. Please contact my Congressman and Senators.

J. P. YOUNIE.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Thanks to you, honesty and good government have a chance.

Mr. and Mrs. S. BRANMAN,

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand on the tidelands oil steal.

ROBERT and LILLIAN POLATCHEK.

LOUISVILLE, KY., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senator:

Still admiration. Tidelands oil speech correct. Stay with the people.

W. F. HARRELL.

OVERLAND, MO., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Keep it up. I wish I could vote for you.

FRANK J. GRIPP.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Conratulations. Your great efforts winning new support from many people.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER T. COLADARCI.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thanks for protecting the rights of all people.

R. SUC ARDA.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

We are with you.

Dr. and Mrs. JEROME A. KRONGOLD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE:

Magnificent performance. Thank you. Keep it up.

WALTER J. HANNIGAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Accept my great admiration for your courageous stand.

HAZEL BARNES.

SCRANTON, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Hearty thanks your supreme effort against the giveaway. Bid your colleagues carry on. People not yet vocal but preponderantly with you.

JACOB ECKERSLEY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Thanks and congratulations on your courageous stand on tideland oil. Keep up the good work.

ALICE SHIELDS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations. God speed your efforts.
JOHN E. GERRITY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building:
Two more voices supporting your tidelands views and appreciating the splendid fight for the right.

Misses A. ISKIAN and J. JOHNSTON.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations for magnificent fight for the people on offshore land and in opposition to pending offshore oil bill.

NORMA MESSING.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Your magnificent fight on the tidelands and other issues has won the admiration and applause of many of us. We are proud to look upon you as a great Senator, representing all the United States. Keep up your efforts. We shall not forget you.

BERNARD E. KARLEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations on your record-breaking speech on the States' grab of the Continental Shelf. First good cause for filibuster.

BARBARA BUTLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Thank you for your courageous stand on the tidelands bill.

B. G. STEGMAN.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on record-breaking speech. It should do much to educate public.

JACQUELINE and DAVID CASSEL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for fighting for the rights of the people of all the States. Keep fighting.

JOSEPH ELIC.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations Senator for your achievement. More power to you in your work.
Sincerely,

HARRY J. PAULSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on fine speech from two supporters of your courageous battle. Keep up the good work to save resources of our great country for all Americans.

LUCY and GEORGE COOPER.

EDENTON, N. C., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
May God grant you strength in fight for American people. Keep up your good work.

ROBERT B. MARSH.

SAGINAW, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your magnificent stand against the tidelands bill. We Michigan liberals love you and wish you well.

ALICE W. WALLACE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily support your campaign to save the tidelands.

JACOB GOLDSTEIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Bravo, Senator, and thank you.

ALFRED STRAUSS.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The American people are with you. Keep up the good work.

J. S. MORIARTY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous speech and efforts to stop the tideland steal. Our solid vote of thanks. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. I. SHORE.

OSWEGO, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your great effort against the administration's tidelands giveaway plan. Time may help people to understand basic issues involved. You and the other liberals are helping to dispel the hero worship and to bring to the front common sense in the interests of all of us.

R. LEE MARTIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Great fight you put up for all the people. Thank you. Keep it up.

LAVERNE DONNAN.

BROOKLINE, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The people of the United States will eventually appreciate the efforts of you and the other honest men in the Senate. Offshore oil means more than \$60 billion. It means that the big business raid on our resources has begun. Congratulations on your great speech.

STANLEY M. BLOOM.
MALCOLM L. DORES.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations; keep up the fight; don't give in.

ABRAHAM M. DUBNO.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks to you for your splendid defense of the people's interests.

CHARLOTTE and DAVID LLOYD.

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.:
The magnificent fight you and the minority group of the United States Senators have given to Senate Resolution 13 commands the respect and support of every right-thinking American. Ill advised political commitments may force upon the Senate passage of Resolution 13 but always remember that the average American has a memory like, and of, an elephant.

B. M. MORTON.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your magnificent performance against tidelands giveaway. If available, please forward us a copy of your prepared address.

ARTHUR A. BROOKS, Jr., and CLARA B. BROOKS.

NORWOOD, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartfelt thanks for courageous stand against act to enrich stockholders at expense of taxpayers, would like more independence in Senate, with you all the way.

Mr. and Mrs. GUNTHER MOHR.

TACOMA, WASH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Had our regular monthly meeting today. Our local union went on record to support you and the other Senators with you on the magnificent stand you have taken on the tidelands oil bill now before the United States Senate. We hope that this bill can be defeated and any others as the return of power plants and synthetic rubber plants that the new administration intends to turn over to private ownership. Organized labor is squarely behind you in these efforts.

INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 23-9, CIO.

LONGVIEW, WASH., April 25, 1953.

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. I am behind you as a voter.

JOHN GLASCOCK.

BOISE, IDAHO, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your valiant and highly admirable record-breaking effort to bring the tidelands oil issue before the people of America. We are behind you 100 percent. The greatness of your actions and words will be more fully appreciated by the public as time goes by and the light begins to dawn. We indeed feel fortunate to have learned of your perspicacity and courage as early as we did. Some people are too busy worrying about themselves to truly comprehend or realize the self-sacrifice and devotion of public servants such as you.

Respectfully,
Lt. and Mrs. WHITNEY I. CRUM.

OVERLAND, MO., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wishing your best health and continued efforts tidelands oil. As individual, most appreciative your effort on behalf of all citizens.

Mrs. WOODROW J. BROWN.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am with you.

TOM GALLAGHER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations for courageous fight for tidelands oil as decreed by Supreme Court. You Senators fighting for the oil for all the States are brave soldiers, too. We the people thank you all.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FOREST W. HILL FAMILY
AND FRIENDS.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our congratulations on your wonderful job. We are behind you in your fight to defeat the tidelands oil bill.

Mr. and Mrs. ELI FISHLER.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Keep up the fight.

A. DINNERSTEIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. God give you strength to keep fighting.

Mr. and Mrs. LESTER HELLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

God bless you and keep you a force for public welfare against oil predatory interests.

STANLEY FEINGOLD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on speech. Keep up the good work.

RAYMOND H. KAARET,
JERRY BRIGGS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

You have my full support on offshore oil matter. Your magnificent demonstration has dramatized fact of opposition. Newspapers, however, are treating it as sportsmanship feat. Fact that this is \$40 billion giveaway is still not widely known. Best wishes.

BERNICE SOLOMON.

MT. ANGEL, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hurrah for you fighting Senators. Hope you can stop this political giveaway.

M. VAN BUSKIRK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Deepest appreciation for valiant fight to preserve for all the people natural resources belonging to them. Adequate funds for education desperately needed for preservation of our democracy. Oil for lamps of learning rationed too long. Keep fighting. Our children will live to bless you.

JACQUELINE HARTIGAN.
MARY SEEPER.

SHERIDAN, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our sincere thanks for your stand against tideland oil bill.

A. J. PAULOVICH.
HOWARD MULLER.
PETE BELL.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whether Republican or Democrat, I do not know or care, but the fact that you are a great American does count. Your stand in the tideland oil issue has proven that. Having lived in Long Beach, Calif., for over 30 years, the last 7 of which one dare not even think of opposing the tideland bill, yet I believe it is a bill that should be opposed. Senator MORSE, I have always believed that we are Americans first, citizens of our States second, and citizens of our community last, but not least. I personally own several pieces of property in Long Beach, and am very, very proud of my community, and certainly would like lower taxes if the oil revenue would bring this, but not at the expense of our Nation's welfare. Thanks a million for your stand in this issue, and hope that you will continue unceasingly in your efforts for the good of our country.

PAUL J. DESMOND.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Senator from Oregon:

You are to be congratulated for your inspiring tide oil stand.

HARRY LEVINE.

NUTLEY, N. J., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Nutley finally awakened. Have had 34 people contact Smith and Henderson as followup on your speech.

WALLACE.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest transfer of submerged oil land to State. In my judgment, sentiment is developing in Oregon like a tidal wave in opposition to such transfer. I think that history will record this as another Teapot Dome situation.

B. A. GREEN.

WELLESLEY, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
5020 Lowell Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on a wonderful speech and splendid personal achievement for a cause to which we adhere.

JOHN M. RAE.
BEATRICE M. RAE.
BRUCE A. RAE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Heartfelt thanks for your valiancy in the name of our unborn children.
Mr. and Mrs. BLANCK.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Hon. United States Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building:
For a magnificent inspirational stand, our heartfelt thanks and deep appreciation.
FOUR MEN FROM NEW JERSEY.

POTTSTOWN, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your courageous stand from the Senate floor on tidelands oil.
AL KOVAL.

QUINCY, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Senator, thank you for your heroic efforts in defense of great principle.
DANIEL J. LYNCH.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
United States Capitol:
Congratulations from a Texas Democrat, to you and colleagues who prefer being right to being popular with big business.
HELEN WATSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
This is to thank you for your valiant fight in the tidelands oil question.
Sincerely,
LOUISE S. STEELE.

IOWA CITY, IOWA, April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Congratulations on your stand against tidelands oil steal. This grab must be opposed by conscientious citizens.
Rev. ALFRED J. N. HENRIKSEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Many, many thanks from this deeply grateful citizen for your courageous crusade.
ROSLYN MASS.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Keep up the good fight on offshore oil. We are with you.

MARGARET WILSON.
ELIZABETH WYCKOFF.
VIRGINIA GALBRAITH.
ALAN MCGEE.
MARJORIE CRESSEY.
HELEN RUSSEL.
ALICE DAY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
What hath MORSE wrought—a dramatic and effective statement of the colossal and tragic importance of the offshore oil and related giveaway programs, and, within and as part of that statement, a uniquely effective renewal of your plea for an antifilibuster rule that would establish majority rule in the United States Senate. Congratulations.
PAUL SIFTON.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator MORSE:
God bless you for your effort on behalf of all the people.

R. KAUFMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Building:

Deepest and humblest thanks for your noble effort.

EDITH HAYES.

DETROIT, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

Good luck, keep fighting, keep the tideland for the people.

DR. ARTHUR P. CHERNEY.

WESTFIELD, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on magnificent fight for people of this country.

IRWIN KLINGSBERG.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Floor:

Big truth will be on front pages today, congratulations on dramatizing fight against giveaway tidelands oil bill.

DON MYRUS.

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thanks for sacrificing for your countrymen. I am praying for your strength.

LOUISE BRYE.

DENVER, COLO., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulations, only hope you succeed in your attempt to prevent another steal by the Republican Party.

FLOYD MARKS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulations on tidelands oil fight. Tennessee valley will be next.

A. L. HESS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Heartfelt thanks for fighting for the good and welfare of the people. The Bronx is with you.

O'SHEA FAMILY.

ARDMORE, OKLA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Keep up the good work.

C. W. VAN EATON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building:

Many of us who share your conviction and admire your courage, patriotism, and strength of purpose send you our thanks and our hopes for your success.

CHRISTINE S. HUGERTH.

LANSING, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

Congratulations on your vallant and courageous fight against the one campaign promise that Mr. Eisenhower should not keep.

Mr. and Mrs. STANLEY H. SHEAP.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Your outstanding fight for American people is an honor and tribute to yourself and your office.

JOSEPH BIAZ, Jr.

NEWBURGH, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

God give you strength, save the oil for the people.

MRS. MARION BEAVER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

God bless you in your noble fight for rights of all people.

JULIA and BEN SHAINBLUM.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

My appreciation for your understanding of the role of a man in society.

LEON DERKMAN.

BAYSIDE, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulations on your heroic fight. We are with you.

WALTER and DOROTHY KUHN.

AUSTIN, TEX., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,

United States Senate:

Congratulations, excellent job. Lets keep the tidelands for everyone.

HERBERT V. HILLERY.

DRUMRIGHT, OKLA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Building:

Appreciate efforts in behalf of the people. Mr. and Mrs. L. R. FINCHER.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

I glory in your spunk if we lose our form of Government. Will be from making laws for the selfish interest instead of the masses.

W. D. DOBBINS, SR.

HAMPTON, VA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate Office Building:

Congratulations for your courageous fight in tidelands bill.

W. F. JOHNSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

We need great leaders who do not surrender to personal or party motives congratulations.

DAVID WINDHEIM and FAMILY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Your heroic fight is more than just for the right cause; may God help you in this gallant stand and preserve your health.

ALFRED LINHARD.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Keep fighting for America and our children.

MARILYN and LEE STRANSKY.

RIDGEFIELD, CONN., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

We applaud your stand on offshore oil.

Mr. and Mrs. VAN KAUFMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Appreciate your defense of the people's resources; keep it up.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM T. GAYLE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on tidelands oil fight. Tennessee Valley will be next.

A. L. HESS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Concerning offshore oil bill call your attention to article by Bernard DeVoto in May issue Harper's magazine just out. Should be read into CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Keep up the good fight.

J. H. MEYER.

BUFFALO, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

More power to you. The children of America are deserving of your strength and talent.

LEON COOPER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

The American people will be eternally grateful for your heroic fight against those who seek to rob them of their heritage.

N. W. STRIER.

BAKER, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,

Senator from Oregon,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your fine American fight for the people against tidelands oil bill. Also for your stand for Hells Canyon. Keep up the fight.

KECKRITZ DELVUCHS.

COLUMBIA, MO., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate:

We congratulate courageous effort of you and colleagues against tidelands bill.

Jerome Landfield, Frances McCurdy, Webster Smalley, David Ralph, Irwin Kuhr, Otha Linton, Robert Friedman, Jay Sanders.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your fight to save the people's domain. Keep it up.

GEORGE and MIRIAM YARICK.

NEW YORK, N. Y. April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support your stand on submerged oil lands bill. The righteousness of your course will eventually triumph. May God give you strength to carry on in all your good works.

R. ROTHWAX.

B. and M. GELLER.

LYNDHURST, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Senate Office Building:

Keep up the filibuster.

IRIS ST. CLAIRE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

(Deliver on Floor of Senate)

Keep at it.

LAMAR MIDDLETON and WIFE.

DES MOINES, IOWA, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good fight on the tidelands oil issue.

HELMI MUSTONEN.

GLENDALE, Mo., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work. People's interest must be protected.

PAULINE SCHILLING.

St. Louis, Mo., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fine work, we are for you in your effort to save the tidelands for all the States.

EUGENE V. HENSCHER.

SEATTLE, Wash., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and hearty thanks for fighting giveaway of submerged oil.

LOU STEWART.

HELENS, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for the effort you are making that justice to the people of the United States concerning the oil land may be realized. As you know from my wire of last May I have kept in touch with the proceedings. Again I thank you. I am a Democrat and for justice to all. Sincerely.

Mrs. PEARL M. STAMMEN.

St. Louis, Mo., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
You are making a great fight against the oil grab. Thanks.

W. C. MEYER.

DES MOINES, Iowa, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Please continue your good work on tidelands oil. The present administration's attitude is entirely wrong.

MARY SCHACHTERLE.

FALLS CHURCH, Va., April 24, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Deeply grateful for your gallant statesmanship and courage in fight retain offshore oil resources for all 48 States.

Mr. and Mrs. CLAY F. ANDERSON.

DES MOINES, Iowa, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
In regards to tidelands oil, stay in there and fight. A lot of my good Democratic and Republican friends are behind you.

BILL CASKEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 24, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I wholeheartedly support your battle on the Hill amendment and hope the American people will be heard from before it is too late.

JOHN L. EVERETT.

ASTORIA, N. Y., April 24, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

We the people thank you for your fight. Good luck. God bless you.

CHARLOTTE GREENWALD.

GREAT NECK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations. Keep up the fight.

LEO THALER.

LEONIA, N. J., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building:

God give you success in your valiant fight to save tidelands resources for the Nation.

MARTHA and SELMA WASSON.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on maintaining public interest in offshore-oil debate. Convey my wishes to Senators DUFF and MARTIN.

Mrs. RUTH M. GLICK.
NATHAN MUELLER.
RAY MUELLER.
LILLIAN REIFER.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Since when are Republicans majorities in Florida, Texas, Louisiana, California worth trillions in public property. Thank you. Thank you.

ROBERT J. WOLFSON.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Congratulations in your fight against Eisenhower and the tideland-oil lobby. God bless you.

MURRAY B. SHAPIRO.

STAMFORD, CONN., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office:
I salute you for your courage and loyalty to the American people. Keep up the good fight and the people may be aroused. God bless you.

BEN ZIMMERMAN.

NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill:
Bravo, and thanks from grateful parent-teacher and taxpayer.

Mrs. EUGENE BRUCE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Keep up the good fight for all these people.

MAURICE B. CAUCHON.

DALLAS, TEX., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Thanks. Wish we could loan you our voice.

BYRON and DOROTHY BUCKERIDGE.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., April 25, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE:
Thanks for being a good public servant. We have so few these days.

GEORGE WESLEY.

HOLLAND, MICH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
All fair-minded, intelligent people are with you. Don't relax the fight.

ALICE POWELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Our warm thanks and deep appreciation to you and your colleagues in the tidelands battle.

DOROTHY SCULLY and FLORENCE CAMERON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
You have alerted America to wholesale theft of your national resources. Thank you for your integrity and courage in the tidelands fight.

ROBERT FRANCIS STUBENRAUCH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, keep on talking. We are with you.

Dr. SEYMOUR LEVIN.

EUGENE, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your efforts regarding tidelands oil. The welfare of the Nation as whole should be the first concern of all.

RUTH D. MARSH.

EUGENE, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Want to encourage you in your stand on tidelands oil.

Mr. and Mrs. A. S. PRESCOTT.

EUGENE, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:
Appreciate your gallant efforts to inform public on tidelands. More power to you.

Mr. and Mrs. W. F. MADRON.

SALEM, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your great effort to forestall the tidelands oil grab. May God give you strength to continue the fight.

JASON and DOROTHY.

FRESNO, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
May some big D Democrat stand on their platform and help you "educate the people." Our thanks and congratulations.

FRESNO COUNTY YOUNG DEMOCRATS.

NEWARK, N. J., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
We admire your stand on the tidelands bill and agree with you wholeheartedly.

PAUL B. WILLIAMS.

SCRANTON, Pa., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate office Building:
Sincerest congratulations for your stand on submerged oil-bearing lands. Scranton, Pa., school board members support your stand 100 percent.

SCHOOL DIRECTOR DOUGLAS JENKINS.

LAJOLLA, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
We fervently admire your heroic efforts to save public domain and thankful your your vigilance.

ARTHUR and ELIZABETH STEAKE.

EUGENE, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We applaud your courageous fight on the tidelands oil. Assure you there are many others like us.

KEITH and ELLEN SKELTON.

CORVALLIS, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on tidelands oil bill. May you win.

INA CHRISTY.

MEDFORD, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Approve and appreciate your stand on offshore oil.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT B. DUNCAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Thanks and best wishes. Letter follows.

MAX FROELICH.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God that we've got man of your type. May God give you strength to keep up fighting for all the people's rights. Continue your wonderful work. May God bless you.

SAMUEL SPIEGEL.

WEST HAMPTON BEACH, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great effort, hope you and your colleagues will continue and defeat tidelands bill.

HERMON L. BISHOP.

BALTIMORE, MD., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

May you continue to have the strength for many years to speak against what is wrong.

FANNIE E. and EUGENE BLANK.

RYE, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for over 22 hours on two feet for a great cause.

WOLFGANG MEGNUS.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Independent Senator United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your magnificent battle to stop the tidelands oil grab. I admire a man who has enough backbone to stand up and be counted. If we can't afford to cut taxes, how can we afford to give away \$40 billion worth of oil?

ROD PEARSON.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your magnificent effort to stop the ugliest steal in the Nation's history. How can lawmakers justify subverting the Constitution and Supreme Court. Thus, what an example to set. It is unthinkable that so shameful an action should dishonor the Congress.

RUTH ADAMS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and heartfelt thanks for your magnificent dramatic speech opposing the administration's oil grab. Your liberal thoughtful approach inspires all interested

in the welfare of all the people rather than a powerful few. Our best wishes for your continuing attempts to sponsor and support liberal legislation.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN M. GILL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Honorable sir, in the name of our local union representing 1,200 members, we wish to express our sincere thanks for the courageous fight you have put up against the tidelands oil bill. Our members are looking forward to your leadership.

GEORGE PELLETIERE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Barbers and Beauty Cultures Union, Local 3.

PENDLETON, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Approve your fight on oil lands issue. Congratulations to you and colleagues in your efforts.

JACK W. WHITEMAN.

HUNTINGTON, IND., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Thank you for your vallant stand against tidelands oil. Have also telegraphed our Senators.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD KROOT.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y.,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

In the name of Local 425, IUE-CIO, I wish to extend my congratulations for the splendid fight you have made toward the oil interest.

WILLIAM BY WATER,
President, Local 425, IUE-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y.,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your gallant fight to expose the tidelands oil deal. This makes Teapot Dome seem petty. Keep up the good fight. We pledge full support.

RETAIL, WHOLESALE, AND DEPARTMENT STORE UNION, LOCAL 260, CIO,
JOHN J. HORAN, Manager.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y.,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your mighty effort in your exposure of the tidelands oil grab.

UNITED OFFICE AND CLERICAL WORKERS,
LOCAL UNION 1772, CIO,
JOHN ROSENKRANTZ, President,
JACK IZZO, Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y.,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on a wonderful job in exposing the tidelands oil grab. You have earned the respect of those in our community that have the interest of all our people at heart.

LOCAL 721, RWDSU,
MARTIN KOPPEL.

KENT, OHIO,

April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on tidelands bill. Sorry Ohio Senators not with you.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. MCGUIGAN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

In the name of our local union representing 1,100 members we are proud of the courageous fight you are putting up against the tidelands bill. Our membership is looking forward to your leadership.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH TRIFILETTI,
Secretary-Treasurer, Barbers and Beauty Culturists Union of America, Local No. 2.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Thanks and appreciation for the splendid work you are doing.

MARGARET L. TAYLOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Our heartiest congratulations upon your wonderful speech and our prayers for continued health.

JOE and ESTELLE STONE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Our sincere congratulations on your splendid sight to prevent the old grab. You deserve high praise from the American people. Keep up the good work.

BREWERY WORKERS JOINT BOARD
OF GREATER NEW YORK CIO.

BAYONNE, N. J., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

When God made you he made a man sincere. Congratulations to you for your courageous effort to stop that national scandal.

HENRY A. BENDER, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

National Maritime Union in the Port of New York congratulates you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight in exposing tideland oil deal. We realize that this gigantic steal makes Teapot Dome affair look small. We pledge you our full support in your fight for best interests of American people.

JOHN T. HUNT,
Port Agent, Port of New York.

CAMDEN, N. J., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Our sincerest congratulations and support for the position taken by you in the tideland oil legislation. It's your type of statesmanship and willingness to represent all of the people that will long be remembered. Congratulations on behalf of our entire membership.

FRANK ANNIBALE,
Chairman Legislative Committee Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Local 1, A. F. of L.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

New York City CO Council, with 500,000 members in New York City area, hails you on your great and magnificent speech on the off-shore oil steal and congratulates you for exposing this on behalf of all the people of the United States. We pledge you our full support. Our continued good wishes to you.

MICHAEL J. QUILL,
President,
MORRIS IUSHEWITZ,
Secretary-Treasurer.

AGAWAM, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Hats off to your determined stand against the shameful Holland bill. Applause also for 23 Senators. May your ranks be speedily increased. Your critics don't realize passage of Senator HILL's bill will be a blood transfusion to our nearly dead school system and a thorough treatment of DuPont ammate against the poison ivy of juvenile delinquency. Whole future of education is at stake. Down with Holland bill—long live Hill bill.

MARY A. BALL.

NORFOLK, VA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Your gallant stand on the tidelands bill will save the Nation from folly. Please fight on.

ADAM ZABINSKY.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand on tideland oil. Keep up the good fight.

ANNIE W. McCORMICK.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Building,

Washington, D. C.:

IUE, CIO, Local 254, is behind you in your fight against the tidelands oil grab.

EUGENE O. SULLIVAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

BAKER, OREG., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,

United States Senator From Oregon,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your tidelands oil and Hells Canyon fight. Keep it up. Real statesmanship.

E. R. CURFMAN,
ALBERT C. ULLMAN,
THOMAS RITCH,
GRACE CURFMAN,
LYNEA ERVING.

AUSTIN, TEX., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

It is gratifying to have you, Senators ANDERSON, HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, and others expressing the views of some of us regarding offshore oil lands. Among those who agree with you are many Texans like ourselves. It is truly a time for the greatness and courage you are showing.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY C. WILSON,
SELBY FLY.

BREMERTON, WASH., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort in valiant fight to retain control of offshore oil for benefit of all the people.

FOUR WASHINGTON STATE VOTERS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We congratulate you on your courage and endurance and wish you all possible success in blocking the oil giveaway.

Mr. and Mrs. K. A. SOLMSSEN.
Mr. and Mrs. A. R. G. SOLMSSEN.

EVERETT, WASH., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Everett Federation of Teachers, Local 772, unanimously congratulate you for courageous fight against tidelands bill.

DENZIL WALTERS,
Corresponding Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your tidelands speech. Best wishes for eventual success.

CHAS. BUSHONG.

DENVER, COLO., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your heroic effort against tidelands bill. There are many people like us who feel as you do, and whose sentiment should mobilize.

BERT and BETTY NASTER.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

We commend you on your stand re tidelands oil.

PETER KLOPPER.
TAD GESEK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations and continue the great fight against the oil grab.

WHOLESALE CLOTHING CLERKS UNION.

DETROIT, MICH., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate extraordinary tidelands fight. Success in your independent efforts.

JERRY RAZNICK.
SANFORD ROSENZWEIG.
CHESTER BEEMAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the remarkable educational job on tidelands oil. We hope you and your colleagues will continue to carry on the effort to educate the people on this important issue and enable us to retain these natural resources for all.

LESTER WASHBURN,
International President, United Automobile Workers, AFL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous uphill fight to defeat the gross injustice of the tidelands oil legislation. The campaign you are conducting will arouse the American people against this great give-away and even compel the press to give this important problem the attention it deserves. On behalf of the 26,000 dressmakers of Local 22, ILGWU, I wish you strength and good health to continue the concerted effort to preclude the dissipation of our Nation's resources.

CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary-Manager, Local 22, ILGWU,
AFL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your speech before the Senate against tidelands oil bill. You have

shown forthright courage in denouncing the offshore oil grab. May God give you strength in all your future undertakings.

FRANK FINK,
President,
Bottlers and Drivers' Union, Local 345.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Sincere congratulations for your splendid speech in the Senate last Friday. We should like to have a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the same is printed.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM GIERSBACH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee,
Local 116, UAW-CIO.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE C. MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

Unqualifiedly behind your brilliant fight to stop discredited oil grab. Right to prolonged discussion. Long approved by members of opposition. Your integrity an inspiration.

Mr. and Mrs. M. POSIN.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

We heartily support your strenuous efforts to prevent the Federal Government from giving away the tidelands oil. Please continue to do your best.

JOSEPH KRUSKAL, JR.,
MORRIS, BETTY, RACHEL, and
ADELE SOLOMON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great speech exposing attempted tidelands-oil grab. American public looks to you for protection.

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS
OF AMERICA, LOCAL 324,
VINCENT MESSINA.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Your 22-hour stand in an inspiration. You stood for everything decent. You stood for the people for whom Lincoln died.

Your stand was for valor, honor, and brotherhood. With your permission we should like to memorialize your stand by the allocation of a stand of 22 trees.

BENJAMIN H. DYSHIEL,
Dyshel Foundation, Feasterville, Pa.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

School Lunch Employees, Local 372, GCEOC-CIO, applauds your magnificent fight against tidelands-oil grab. You have our full support in fighting for the best interests of our country.

HARRY GRAY, President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

The Nation is proud of one of the most independent Senators we have. Congratulations.

HUGH O'DONNELL,
Vice President, TWU-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on great fight against tideland-oil grab led by you. Your fight is

people's fight. I am sure people will not forget. Behind you 100 percent.

ELLIS F. VANRIPER,
Transport Workers Union, Local 100.

DOYLESTOWN, PA., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations to you in protecting the tidelands-oil bill. Keep it up.

PETER W. ELKINGTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations on the splendid job done concerning tidelands oil.
LOCAL 977, UNITED AUTO WORKERS, CIO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As an officer of the Transport Workers Union, Local 234, a hearty "thanks" for your magnificent stand on the rights of the people against property rights, the issue of tidelands oil.

JOHN DONNELLY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
On behalf of Brewers Union, Local No. 1, please accept heartiest congratulations for your magnificent speech exposing attempts to steal tidelands oil from the American people.

EMIL T. WEICHAND,
Secretary-Treasurer.
HENRY BARTELS,
Secretary.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
On behalf of the Transport Workers Union, CIO, I say "Thanks" for a job well done on the tidelands-oil issue. The so-called little man is behind you 100 percent.

LOU DWYER,
International Vice President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
The people of the United States will long remember you for your stand in tidelands oil. Millions of young Americans, if this is won, will be eternally grateful.

WILLIAM HOWIE,
Vice President, Transport Workers Union.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your great exposé of the tidelands-oil steal. Urge you to keep up the great fight for the people.

MORTIMER GELLIS,
President, Local 1706, IAWOC-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your magnificent fight in exposing tidelands oil steal. We pledge you our full support in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

RAYMOND DIANA,
Executive Secretary, New York Joint Board, Government and Civic Employees, CIO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say thanks for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

JEAN REILLY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
I am sure that I do not speak for the Transport workers of Philadelphia only when I tell you that we are behind you in your stand on the tidelands oil issue 100 percent.

FRANK FINN,
Staff Officer, Local 234, TWU-CIO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
I am sure that the 22 hours will seem a fleeting moment when the issue of the tidelands oil is resolved. I have no doubt that the question will be resolved in favor of Federal ownership. Congratulations.

TED JOHNSON,
Staff Officer, TWU-CIO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say thanks for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

KATHERINE TAYLOR.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say thanks for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

BARBARA LICHTMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say thanks for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

BETTY BROSKO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say thanks for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

MARGARET BARNES.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor, I want to take this opportunity to say "thanks" for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

FAY LOVETTE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say "thanks" for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

ADA KATZ.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
On behalf of our 3,000 members we congratulate you on your great feat of exposing in your marathon speech the offshore oil steal. This fraud upon the American people makes the Teapot Dome swindle look like petty larceny. Please keep up the good fight.

N. JEROME KAPLAN,
President, Retail Drygoods and Chain Store Employees Union, Local 1102, CIO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As a member of organized labor I want to take this opportunity to say "thanks" for your stand on the tidelands oil issue.

EVELYN FABRICOL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulate you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tidelands oil steal. We realize now that this gigantic steal makes the Teapot Dome affair petty. We pledge you our full support in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

IRVING M. SIMON,
President, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
The New York joint board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America congratulates you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tidelands oil giveaway. This attempt to rob the American people of its natural resources deserves the condemnation of all patriotic citizens. We are all with you in this fight.

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
VINCENT LACAPRIA, Comanagers,
ABRAHAM MILLER,
Secretary-Treasurer,
New York Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
As president of local 234, Transport Workers Union, CIO, representing 10,000 members in the Philadelphia area, I wish to congratulate you on a magnificent job done on behalf of the people of the United States. Your stand on the tideland oil issue is consistent with the principles on which this country was built and on which it has attained the high measures of achievement that it has both in the economic and social field.

PAUL O'ROURKE, President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
On behalf of over 3,500 members of our union and their families, congratulations for your courageous fight for us and all Americans against the tidelands oil steal. Citizens and children of our State too will be deprived immeasurably of much needed aid in education and other benefits. The expose of the big oil stake by special interests must be on the record for all Americans to take note. Congratulations.

FRANK FOTI,
President, Watch and Jewelry Workers Union, Local 147, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:
We are applauding your marathon speech of the tideland oil steal which rich resource your aim is to keep for the benefit of all American people instead of a few oil barons. We are gratified to you Senator for such stand of bravery of civic service to the country in the name of 15,000 shoe workers of Greater New York and of our joint council Number 13. Please accept our expression of deep admiration.

FIL DENOVELLIS,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Chamber:
Congratulations. Talk to kill that bill. Don't let them steal public property for private gain.

MRS. G. KROTINGER.
JOY KROTINGER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Please support the Senator HILL amendment to the oil bill now under debate in the United States Senate. The President seems to ignore the three favorable decisions of the Supreme Court on this matter.

JAMES P. WARREN.

WADING RIVER, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Delighted to hear of your perseverance in opposing shortsighted sell-out to local interests by Republicans on tidelands oil.

ELEANOR DELAGUNAIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Sir: Thank God there are still a few men willing to stand up against this oil robbery. How many mink coats will tidelands buy?

HERBERT BARNETT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Don't let those thieves steal our oil.

HARRY MARSHAK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Our prayers are with you to fight those ghouls and moral IV-F's. Keep tidelands for America.

KARL CERNY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations. Superb sacrificial performance on public behalf. Keep slugging against base stealers.

ROSE TERLIN.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 25, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for your tireless effort to throw the spotlight on the iniquitous offshore oil grab. Those greedy despoilers of America's natural resources deserve your continued and unstinting opposition.

WARREN BECKMAN.
RICHARD KEARNS.

BROCKTON, Mass., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Am prouder than ever to have had the opportunity to shake your hand prior to the election in Boston. If southern Democrats can stop civil-rights legislation certainly we can stop what is an attempt to legalize an oil scandal.

GEORGE M. ROMM.

GREELEY, Colo., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your wonderful all-night speech. The misnamed tidelands oil bill is the biggest financial grab of the 20th century. Its passage can and must be prevented. Talk until the citizenry of the United States becomes aware of the implications of the attempted robbery of wealth belonging to all.

H. P. CHRISTENSEN.

ERIE, Pa., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR: Accept our many heartfelt congratulations on your tremendous feat on

holding the Senate floor for all-time record of over 22 hours against the scandalous and disgraceful plunder of the Nation's oil reserves. We all pray for additional strength and encouragement for yourself and your colleagues to hold out for many days against this brazen looting of the national domain.

RALPH W. TILLOTSON,
CIO Director.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hearty congratulations on your wonderful fight to prevent the plunder of our country's natural resources by private interest. It's about time we gave the southern reactionaries a dose of their own medicine. Keep up the good fight.

HERBERT HILL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your forthright and dramatic stand against the tidelands oil grab. Your leadership in this debate has given new hope to many people.

MICHAEL J. QUILL,
International President, Transport
Workers Union of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Our sincerest congratulations on your marathon speech exposing the tidelands oil steal. You are doing yeoman service for all of us.

SEBASTIAN J. REBALDO,
Business Manager, United Optical
Workers Union, Local 208, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

The New York Newspaper Guild, representing 8,000 working newspapermen and women, salute you for your most courageous fight against the tidelands-oil steal. We stand ready to lend you any assistance to prevent another Teapot Dome.

OFFICERS OF THE NEW YORK
NEWSPAPER GUILD,
M. MICHAEL POTOKER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Six thousand furniture workers, members of Local 76-B, CIO, wholeheartedly congratulate you on your gallant fight exposing tidelands-oil steal. Fully realize this gigantic steal makes Teapot Dome affair insignificant. We pledge you our full support in your fight for best interests of American people.

MICHAEL DECICCO,
Manager.
JOSEPH GARRAFFA,
Financial Secretary.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulate you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tidelands-oil steal. We realize now that this gigantic steal makes the Teapot Dome affair petty. We pledge you our full support on behalf of 3,000 of IUE-CIO in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

HUGH AMIDEO,
President, Local 463, IUE-CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Full support of our membership is behind your splendid efforts to prevent tidelands steal.

FEDERATION OF SHORTHAND REPORTERS, LIU, LOCAL 1813, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

In behalf of the membership of our union wish to congratulate you on your heroic effort to stop the tidelands oil steal. The American people will remember and honor those who fight in their cause.

DAVID KRUMHOLZ,
Business Manager, Retail Furniture
and Floor Covering Employees
Union, Local 853, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

On behalf of the 40,000 members of local 100, transport workers union, may I extend our congratulations on your outstanding feat in exposing in your marathon speech the tidelands oil steal. Your daring and courageous stand on behalf of all the people is deeply appreciated by our organization and its members.

MATHEW GUINAN,
President, Local 100, Transport Workers Union.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate:

Your fight on tidelands commendable. Keep up the good work.

(Unsigned.)

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulate you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tideland oil steal. We pledge you our full support in your continued fight for the best interest of the American people.

G. D. PROCOPIO,
President, Shoe Service Union, Retail
Wholesale, and Department Store
Union, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

In the name of the Journeymen Tailors Union, local No. 1, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, we congratulate you on your great feat in exposing the tidelands oil steal.

JOURNEYMEN TAILORS UNION, LOCAL
No. 1,
VITO GIOSA.

ONTARIO, CALIF., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your logical debate and effort to save tideland minerals and oil. These belong to all the States by divine gift. States right is a misnomer and indirect road to giving to international cartel. Continue your fight. Use every parliamentary means to delay and defeat opposition.

M. A. TRIPP.
E. E. JOHNSTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great feat of exposing the oil steal.

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND
SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 22,
LOUIS J. BRAVERMAN, President.

LESTER, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

(1) To Senator WAYNE MORSE my most heartfelt congratulations to you for your strong stand on the offshore oil bill. Each and every schoolroom in America should give your portrait its place of highest honor. Every liberal of this Nation is coming to look to you as his champion and the champion of his children. God willing, I could think of no greater honor than to introduce you as our next President at the 1956 national convention of any party whose banner you choose to carry. (2) To you, President Eisenhower, and do not make the mistake of thinking that I do not know my literary ethics. You were addressed in second place with calm deliberation. My views on this bill are the views of my party. It is very apparent that you are more concerned with the setting back of the clock than you are in the education of American children. (3) A Philadelphia bulletin, dateline April 21, states that Automobile Charlie Wilson wants to concentrate all production of war goods in a few big factories "to save expense." Oh, to be sure, but it does not take a crystal ball to tell that that is putting all your eggs in one basket and I'm not fool enough to think that Russian espionage will not know the location of that basket. Pearl Harbor is only 12 years history. You may rest assured, Mr. President, that by means of newspaper clippings and magazine reports a careful file is being kept of your record and come 1956, with your present force, that record will be fit only for crowbar. (4) To you, Senator DUFF, I think that in the above portion of this message addressed to Senator MORSE and the President, respectively, I have stated my views with sufficient clarity that you must realize that your voting record will be carefully checked and my action at the polls controlled thereby. A vote against America's children is a vote to upset our political applecart.

GARFIELD C. BURKE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

On behalf of the members and officers of Local No. 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, I wish to congratulate you for your valiant effort on your great feat of speech-making to stop the tidelands oil steal.

FRANK GILLIGAN,
Recording Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Congratulations on your stand on behalf of all the people against the tidelands oil steal. Our sincere thanks for your outstanding efforts.

DANIEL GILMARTIN,
JOHN HAMILTON,
FRANK O'CONNOR,
PATRICK MAHEDY,

Vice Presidents of Transport Workers
Union, Local 100.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your wonderful battle to save tidelands oil for all American people. Your efforts deserve the undying admiration and appreciation of every American.

AMERICAN RADIO ASSOCIATION, CIO,
W. R. STEINBERG, President.
PHILIP O'ROURKE, Vice President.
BERNARD L. SMITH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

FARMINGDALE, N. J., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily support your stand on the offshore oil bill.

Yours truly,

DAVID BOYAVIN.

GARRETTVILLE, OHIO.

Good work on the tidelands oil bill. Congratulations on getting it set aside. Hope you can kill it permanently.

Yours,

HOMER D. TITTLE.

BUCKHANNOON, W. VA.

Senator MORSE,

DEAR SIR: Keep the good of the United States in mind not three States. I am sure you will defeat the tidelands bill.

WM. H. HILLHURT.

BROOKFIELD, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand on the tidelands oil question.

You are to be commended on your independent stand on all questions.

Keep up the good fight on the sellout to the special privileged.

MARVIN W. TOEPPER.

HAMILTON, OHIO.

Congratulations on resisting the grab of Tidelands Oil for a few States. "The earth is the Lords and the fulness thereof," should certainly be quoted to support the general welfare.

HERMAN GECKLER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: More power to you! Congratulations on the fine stand (!) against the Tidelands Oil grab.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. KANE.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Sir: Please, please keep fighting for the Nation against special groups. Have heard many favorable comments on your Tidelands fight. I'm sure the bulk of the Nation is with your group. More power to you.

Respectfully,

JAMES HILL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Good luck to you and keep up the good fight!

HARRY BROWN.

CEDAR GROVE, N. J., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm with you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH SIEGER.

MEADE, KANS., April 25, 1953.

Congratulations on your courageous stand against this tidelands oil giveaway. I very much approve of your position.

Best wishes,

LEONARD M. WOLFE.

WORTHINGTON, OHIO.

Please continue fight against (1) tidelands oil grab; (2) gift of synthetic fuel plants to industry; (3) ditto for synthetic rubber; (4) selling out TVA to public utilities lobby.

C. M. ALLEN.

AURORA, ILL., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good fight. America belongs to all Americans, not just a select few.

KENNETH J. DIXON.

LAWRENCE, KANS., April 26, 1953.

Senator MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your effort to prevent the tidelands giveaway.

W. H. BUCK.

LONG ISLAND, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My thanks and congratulations on your gallant effort to drama-

tize the offshore oil issue. I know that defeat on this issue will not diminish your zeal on behalf of the people's welfare.

Most sincerely,

IRVING AMDUR.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on a wonderful fight. Don't give up that tidelands battle now. I feel that we've got 'em on the run.

Again, good luck.

JOSEPH A. LOUIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo for the splendid battle you have been waging to defeat the underwater oil grab.

Sincerely,

G. R. GARRETT.

TEANECK, N. J., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. Thank you for doing what you did to dramatize the tidelands issue now being debated in the Senate. Keep up the wonderful work. Don't let them steal the tidelands.

Sincerely,

MARVIN D. EINHORN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your attempts to educate the people about the issues of tideland oil. More power to you.

Sincerely yours,

MYRON EISENSTEIN.

MELROSE PARK, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We appreciate very much your stand on the so-called tidelands oil bill, and feel that the fight you are making is in the public interest.

ARTHUR FLORY.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT,
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORK-
ERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO).

Milwaukee, Wis., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your wonderful 22½-hour effort to bring to the attention of the American public the vital Anderson-Hill bill.

I think you were very successful in bringing the attention of more and more people to this subject, as your speech brought forth the most publicity yet on this terrible giveaway of offshore oil. Keep fighting, keep talking, more and more of us hear your voice.

Very truly yours,

BILL DODDS,
Director, Education and Political
Action, Region 10, UAW-CIO.

P. S.—I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a copy of your extended speech.

PITTSBURGH, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am for Federal control on tide-land oil.

I also want to thank you for your effort you put forward in order to arouse the public. I hope your work was not in vain. Keep up the good job you are doing.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANNA EILERS.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to commend you for the valiant fight you have been making against the so-called tidelands-oil bill. This bill is an outright steal on the American people, and it should be fought to the last ditch. I hope you will continue your opposition to it.

Ordinarily I do not approve of the use of the filibuster. But in this case it is plain that certain selfish interests have tried to blitz the American people with their propaganda, and they have succeeded only too well. Something dramatic, such as your record speech on Friday, may catch attention and draw interest to your side of the case. In any case, if the proponents of this bill bring out their heavy guns to break this filibuster they will probably be forced later to use the same weapons to put over civil-rights legislation. The reactionaries can't win both ways. Or can they? Let's hope not. Again I want to commend you for your great stand for the public welfare.

Sincerely,

FLOYD MULKEY.

MADISON, WIS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I have been meaning to write you for some time in order to thank you for taking stands that truly represent our beliefs and interests to a greater degree than any other Member of the Senate. Your latest speech against the tidelands-oil steal is only one episode in a long line of courageous, public-spirited acts that merit our hearty approval and sincere thanks. And since you doubtless get more than your share of personal abuse and vilification, to say nothing of having to bear the cross of an unfair press, we want you to know that you have many friends across the country who admire you and appreciate your efforts on our behalf.

We are living in discouraging times for liberals and those who try to think in terms of the commonweal, but we can take heart as long as we have men like you who are not afraid to stand up for what is right, rather than follow the shameless course of political expediency, individual chicanery, and unconscionable fraud. We who are deeply ashamed of the misrepresentation that we Wisconsinites have today in the Senate are proud that you are carrying on in the old Bob La Follette tradition—a fitting course of action for a former native of the State that has contributed so much to the progressive movement in days gone by.

Keep up the good fight, Senator MORSE, and more strength to your arm. We are proud of you and we want you to know that you have many friends throughout the land who realize your worth and appreciate your many battles in our name.

Yours sincerely,

JEAN CRONON.

EDMUND D. CRONON.

Mr. and Mrs. Edmund D. Cronon.

PRINCETON, W. VA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Strange things happen—only scanty news over the radio and practically none in the press about the fine speeches that you Senators are making who are in opposition of the oil grab by the coastal States.

You are making a noble fight for all the people of the Nation and I know there must

be many who are grateful to you for the splendid stand that you are making. I can see another Senator Norris or Senator La Follette in you. My prayers are with you and may God bless you and keep you steadfast in the great work that you are doing.

Very truly yours,

LAWSON FAULKNER.

MURPHYSBORO, ILL., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have my personal appreciation for the great stand you have made against the tidelands oil grab; and I will add that I have heard many people express the same opinion, giving you high praise.

Sincerely,

THEODORE BRADLEY.

DETROIT, MICH., April 26, 1953.

SIR: For your great and valiant fight for all the people on the tidelands issue currently in the Senate, all we can say is, God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. KLAVOUS.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Just an appreciation of your efforts to save the tidelands for the Nation.

Yours truly,

BELLE HANSEN,
DENA HANSEN.

ATHENS, GA., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a subscriber to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have had the opportunity to read the many speeches you have made on the Senate floor during the current session. First of all, since I find them to be an excellent presentation of the independent, liberal, and progressive program, I would like to obtain reprints of them if you have made copies available in that form.

I hope you will continue your battle to obtain justice in the matter of committee assignments which you have been denied because you dared follow your conscience in certain matters.

In today's news I read that you have finished one of the longest speeches on record. I am looking forward to reading it in the RECORD when it is released.

I have always been an opponent of the filibuster as a means to defeat legislation—and it has been used successfully for this purpose in times past. However, those who rule the Republican Party have condoned its use in the past, and their support of the Wherry rule has made it well nigh impossible to obtain a working rule to eliminate its use. I feel, therefore, that if they condone its use—and they have—let them have it now. Let it be used now to help prevent the passage of what I believe is one of the most vicious pieces of legislation ever proposed.

Again, Senator, keep up the excellent work you are doing. I know that at times it may seem that you are battling alone, but I believe you do have the admiration and support of independent, thinking men and women.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. ANDERSON.

THE ATOKA COUNTY TIMES,
Atoka, Okla.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first time in my life that I have ever written a Senator from another State on any matter, but I just must congratulate you on your gallant tidelands fight. It does my heart good to see a man

who places his country above his party, and perhaps before his own success.

I see the tidelands matter as a vast giveaway of inherent rights of the Federal Government. If you lose this fight (Heaven forbid it) I hope you can tack an amendment onto the tidelands bill that would prohibit the spending of any Federal money on any rivers, harbors, or tidelands improvement of any State exercising their rights over the tidelands.

Sincerely,

ANDREW PHILLIPS.

SHIPPENSBURG, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With the very essence of sincerity I wish to commend you on your Senate voting record of the past. Your position on the tidelands oil issue is quite consistent with your record of liberal leadership within Republican ranks.

I cannot contain some expression of appreciation for the fact that you have, according to the mandates of your own conscience, kept faith with the democratic maxim—the greatest good for the greatest number. You have shown that principle need not be alienated from politics. For this, the people of Oregon, and indeed the people of the United States, should be very appreciative.

When I consider your unique political situation I think of a statement by Woodrow Wilson: "God save a free country from cautious men—men, I mean, cautious for themselves—for cautious men are men who will not speak the truth if the speaking of it threatens to damage them." I am proud that the Senate contains a man whose thoughts have not been channeled by the caution of which Woodrow Wilson spoke.

With personal best wishes for the future and a lengthy Senate career devoted to the principles of liberalism, I am

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. ROTZ.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Had I the tongues of men and of angels, I could not convey to you my sense of gratitude for your superb 22-hour attack on the tidelands oil bill. What a man! There is so much chicanery and stupidity in Congress that such exhibition of mental and physical energy and discipline and above all of courage, electrifies the public. Few men could put on such a demonstration, and I doubt if anybody but you would! For no matter how you may minimize your effort, I can only think of Hercules' job on the Augean Stables in comparison.

With deepest appreciation,

MARY GRAY PECK.

ROSLYN, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your courageous speech exposing the tideland oil steal. The workers of this local are solidly behind you in this most important struggle with the greedy oil trusts.

ANTHONY MAZZOCCHI,
President, Local 149, United Gas
Coke and Chemical Workers of
America, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

On behalf 2,600 members our organization most heartily and sincerely congratulate you your outstanding effort in tidelands oil issue. We urge you continue your good fight.

MURRAY WEINSTEIN,
Manager, New York Clothing
Cutters Union.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your great assistance to save the tidelands for all 48 States. With admiration we read of your great support against this measure.

EVELYN WALTON.

MADISON, WIS., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Go to it. The people are in back of you. The politicians who have been bought off will be forgotten. But you and the rest of the good men who are fighting the battle for our children's education will be honored. Those in power are laughing now, but we will beat them.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP SIEKERITZ.

NEW YORK CITY, April 27, 1953.

Just a word of admiration and approval for the fine job you are doing regarding the tidelands oil. It is most encouraging to realize there are men like yourself in government. I hope you will continue your excellent activities for a long time.

Very truly,

BEVERLY GEIGER
Mrs. Lewis B. Geiger.

APRIL 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you, and the other Senators who have stood with you, including our own great Senator LEHMAN, for the good fight you are waging in behalf of the people's rights. I hope you are getting plenty of encouragement, and that your efforts will have the desired effect of arousing the people to a realization of what is involved. What a fraud has been perpetrated on the people by the "great crusade."

Sincerely,

REBECCA JAFFE.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Although I am not a constituent of yours, after reading about your remarkable stand in the Senate against the tidelands oil bill, I felt that I must congratulate you for the courageous action that you have taken. Too few of your colleagues have dared to speak out against this infamous plunder of the country's natural resources. It is not a proud moment in the Nation's history, except for the fight waged by you and a handful of courageous Senators. Whether or not you are successful in the battle, you have earned the admiration and gratitude of the American people.

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN BLUMBERG.

DECATUR, ILL., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my sincere thanks for the magnificent fight you are waging against the offshore oil bill. The people owe you a great deal.

Very truly yours,

W. H. BATTERSHELL,
(A school teacher).

APRIL 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Your conduct and remarks of the past few days on the Senate floor has placed your name alongside such distinguished Senators as Senators Borah, Norris, and other great Senators who always maintained that the welfare of the Nation transcended the "rights" of the individual States. If I am among the living in 1956, I shall feel honored to contribute to your campaign for reelection. I do not believe that the citizens of Oregon will fail you; on the other hand, I am sure that they are proud of you.

Yours truly,

OTTAVIO CONTI.

URBANA, ILL., April 24, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your fight for liberalism and a government dedicated to benefiting the people, rather than the powers. As a former social-studies teacher and a teacher of social-studies student teachers, I find it increasingly difficult to inform myself and suggest sources where-by their future students can get at the facts.

I am encouraged by your Friday speeches, of which I learned through your talks on Frank Edwards' program, and your fight on the so-called tidelands oil legislation. Would you be willing to send me any materials you may have on these Friday speeches and the oil fight.

Senator, thank you for carrying on the fight. What can we do? What can I do?

Sincerely yours,

OMER WILLIAM RENFREW.

STATE COLLEGE, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inspired by your courageous stand on the tidelands oil bill, and other issues. It is truly rare that one finds a man in the legislative branch of our Government who has the courage to do what is right without regard to the personal consequences. Keep up the good work.

Very sincerely yours,

GERALD HUGH ELKAN.

ST. PAUL'S METHODIST CHURCH,

IRVINGTON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. God bless you for your gallant fight in behalf of the American people. Your name will go down in the history books, and will be remembered long after the names of the "what's good for General Motors is good for the country" boys have been forgotten.

May your courage inspire others to join the fight for the future.

Sincerely,

LEE H. BALL.

HIGH POINT, N. C., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not a constituent of yours but may I thank you for the splendid battle you and other Senators are waging for all the people of the United States. Your magnificent debate against the tidelands bill and your unceasing fight for all things that are right leaves the American people deeply in your debt.

Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE MORRIS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my appreciation for the grueling task that you undertook in order to call the tidelands oil issue to the attention of the people.

I think it was a very courageous and fine thing to do. Good luck.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BEATRICE GOLDBERG.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your splendid endeavor to awaken interest in the crucial tidelands debate. Also, I think you've shown remarkable foresight in withdrawing from the Republican Party when you did.

ANTHONY MONTIGLIO.

FLUSHING, N. Y., April 28.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a Purple Heart veteran (78th Infantry Division), I want to congratulate you on your unceasing efforts

to speak in favor of Federal control of our mineral resources.

May I receive a copy of your extensive speech delivered for almost 1 full day.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN MIGDAL.

APRIL 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fight against the tidelands oil bill. Your fine showing should help to wake up Americans to the consequences should such a bill, as you're fighting against, ever be passed.

I truly admire your courage and it's refreshing to know that we still have a few men left in this country who stand up and fight for their convictions.

I regret not living in your home State as I would be honored to work and to cast my vote for your reelection.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD J. MCGEE and FAMILY.

GARDEN CITY, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your gallant fight to prevent the largest giveaway in history.

Has it been emphasized that the oil royalties from these offshore oil reserves could help (a) balance the budget, and (b) reduce taxes?

Posterity will record who was right on this issue.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. FAGER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your wonderful effort to bring to the attention of the public the fact that "its pockets are being picked" of billions of dollars of natural resources.

It is work like yours that leaves its mark in the history of our country.

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY J. RODNER.

WYNNWOOD, PA.

OFFICE OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations.

You're a true liberal and a patriot.

Sincerely yours,

ADELIN S. LAPLANTE.

FAIR LAWN, N. J.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,

Senate of the United States,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations. Your stand on the tideland oil bill inspires us.

Sincerely yours,

GERTRUDE and HANS HARTZ.

WEST CHESHIRE, CONN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At long last the newspapers of Connecticut are bringing to light the long debate of the oil issue. My congratulations to you for your part in forcing this issue to a head. It is imperative that such important debate reach the eyes and ears of the populace, and if this can only occur through a 22-hour and 26-minute speech I thank God for your strong voice.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD T. SKINGER.

Bronx, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your epic stand against the offshore oil bill will not easily be forgotten.

Respectfully yours,

WARREN A. KISCH.

Truly in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

EAST LEVERETT, MASS., April 27, 1953.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I decided that if you could give so unostentatiously of yourself to awaken public interest and defeat the tidelands oil bill, the very least I could do is to let you know that some of us are grateful and wish we could do more to help you.

I enclose a copy of my letter to the New York Times seconding your efforts. I don't expect it will get published, and I'm not sure that it agrees with your own views, for I have not seen your long recent speech. You are free to make whatever use of my letter you wish—which is probably very little. I shall certainly get in touch with my Massachusetts Representatives.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SANFORD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express my complete admiration for your wonderful work? Your principles are good, but your fight for them is better.

Keep up the good work. You're bound to break through some day to the people for what you are and then everybody will be better off.

Sincerely yours,

BENJ. HERBSTMAN.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N. J., April 26, 1953.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Let us commend you on your temporary triumph against the offshore oil bill. This is at least bringing the matter more to the attention of the public.

We applauded your stand as an independent at the time of your exit from the Republican Party. Much interest is aroused when we see the name of Senator MORSE in the news.

The revenues from the offshore oil could certainly do a great deal toward improving the educational facilities of the Nation.

More power to you. May more men in public life catch your inspiration.

Sincerely,

ISABEL MOLL,
 JOHN MOLL,
 Mr. and Mrs. JOHN MOLL.

EAST LEVERETT, MASS., April 26, 1953.
 EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES.

SIR: Debate in the Senate on the so-called tidelands oil bill has raised in my mind some disturbing questions:

Whether the attempt to transfer the submerged oil reserves to the disposition of the several States is not the latest step in the pillage of the natural resources and public domain of a continent primarily for private profit?

Whether the several States would not in turn relinquish their paramount interest in these oil reserves to a few individual speculators and oil men?

Whether the money of the Texas oil millionaires is indeed clean money?

Whether the Republican administration is not in effect trying to legalize a steal quite as venal as the corruption against which it has been avowedly crusading?

Whether the general public, if it fully understood the issues, would not prefer to have the National Government keep these oil reserves and use the income from them to improve the public school system?

In the light of these questions I find it difficult to believe that General Eisenhower received a mandate to dispose of public oil reserves valued conservatively at \$50 billion.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SANFORD.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
 United States Senator.
 DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations and the more power to you.
 I wish I were an Oregon resident so that I could vote for you in the next election.
 Sincerely yours,
 REUBEN GOODMAN.

APRIL 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building.
 DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your work on the tidelands oil bill.
 We need more men like you in our Senate and House. Why do some of the Senators want to give that oil land away. That is beyond my understanding.
 Sincerely yours,

CORA E. EVERSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your lengthy speech in the Senate yesterday. Perhaps a small band of liberals can still protect us from a grande theft.

Your spirit of political independence is in the nature of supporting legislation which is beneficial to most people, and it is the most honorable line any elected figure can follow.

Respectfully yours,

BERNARD JOBACMAN.

ALBANY, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 United States Senator,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If I were your constituent, you could be sure of one additional vote. I am sorry, I am not.

I want to express my admiration and thanks for your courageous fight against the oil grab.

My humble opinion is that you are 100 percent right and if I were in your place and had the strength and the character, I would do the same.

Unfortunately there are too many ignorant, selfish, or cowardly people in Congress and outside of it. They don't seem to be able to see the implications of what they are doing. Don't let that discourage you and your friends who fight with you. We need men like you who represent the country and all of us, not just for themselves and a few of their friends.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SCHEIDER.

BALTIMORE, Md., April 25, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to express my personal appreciation of your splendid efforts in opposition to the Submerged Lands Act.

It may be a losing battle for now, but I feel certain that public opinion will be so aroused that the problem will be a national issue again in 1954.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT B. KIMBLE.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your dramatic demonstration of the absurdity of the giveaway. Please talk until 1954, if necessary, so that the people can express themselves.

But let the liberals now be as crafty as the reactionaries. Take all the quorum calls you can. Spare yourself as much as possible for further great work.

PASSAIC, N. J.

Thanks to your great speech, I've just written Senator Ives, asking in a moderate tone how a New York Senator can favor this gift. And I'm telephoning my friends to try to start a small chain reaction.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD MALKAN.

Don't let up.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express my thanks for your fight in behalf of all the people on the question of tidelands oil.

I hope that you and the other fighters for the people will talk for weeks and weeks to prevent a vote from being taken.

Yours very respectfully,

PAUL J. BONOM.

P. S.—Up to now I've been against filibuster—but not on this issue.

YONKERS, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 United States Senator,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hasten to join your many well-wishers and offer my personal salutations and congratulations upon your courageous and determined stand in focusing attention on a deliberate attempt of a tremendous steal of offshore oil that we feel belongs to the whole Nation.

Men of your type are far and few in between, and our beloved country needs many more of your caliber to protect it from selfish-seeking groups.

We pray that you may be spared to your family and country for many more years of usefulness.

It is the earnest hope of the undersigned that your little band of liberals will continue to grow and thereby be able to assist you in your courageous progressive stand.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS LEBLANC.

P. S.—Remember "T. R." was a great progressive, too.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA, April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a word of commendation to you, and the other truly public spirited Senators, for the valiant fight you are waging against the so-called tidelands oil bill.

In view of President Eisenhower's commitment to sign the bill, it was our feeling at the beginning that this was a lost cause. However, there now appears to be a possibility for accomplishing its defeat, and we want you to know that we are in hearty accord with the principle that the natural resources of this Nation should devolve to the interest of all of the people.

If you have the means at your disposal, please convey our sentiment to the other Senators who are assisting in efforts to prevent that nefarious oil grab.

With a fervent wish for success, and with kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SCHOEN, Secretary.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is an expression of thanks for your courageous stand on the tidelands oil bill (S. J. Res. 13), which has commanded the attention of honest and fairminded people everywhere.

I have admired and sympathized with your lone-wolf position since the November elections, and there must be millions of thoughtful people everywhere who hold in esteem men of your caliber and integrity, but who, unfortunately, do not take the time to express their thanks and appreciation. It sometimes seems strange in contrast, that one's critics are so vociferous.

Please do not allow this terrific antagonism which you face in the Senate, to dampen your spirit, or get you down physically, as so often happens when one feels surrounded by critics and detractors.

As union steward for a group of clerical workers, I have learned what it means to try to please everyone, and to be virtually crucified by the very people one is trying to help, and have come to truly recognize and draw courage and solace from Christ's words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Be of stout heart; and thank you again.

Gratefully yours,

ALBERTA SMITH.

HYATTSVILLE, MD., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you most sincerely for your heroic performance to prevent the unscrupulous paying of our birthright for a mess of pottage.

Truly yours,

SUE M. BRETT.

AILEEN W. BROMLEY.

GAY S. DONNALLY.

HELEN C. DERRICK.

APRIL 26, 1953.

Thank you, Senator MORSE, for your sincere effort to protect the interests of all of us by keeping our oil out of the hands of a few whom I fear would not use it wisely. Thank God, we have you in our Senate, one who is not afraid to speak and stand on the faith of your conviction.

Only a few weeks ago in a letter from our good friend and yours, Knute Hill, former Congressman from Washington, he said, "Thank God for WAYNE MORSE" and I want you to know many people from whom you will not hear are echoing the same words. Keep up the good work.

Very sincerely,

MRS. GOLDA MANLEY.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we commend you and your colleagues, Senators HILL, LEHMAN, and KEFAUVER, for your courageous stand in the submerged lands debate.

Best wishes for your continued strength.

Sincerely,

E. MEREDITH HAWKINS.

VIRGINIA C. HAWKINS.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you very much for the good work you are doing for the people of our country. My family and I greatly appreciate your efforts in trying to defeat the tidelands oil bill.

I only wish we had more Senators like you in our Senate.

Respectfully yours,

MARVIN A. BERGER.

Mr. and Mrs. MARVIN A. BERGER.

Mr. and Mrs. BENJAMIN COST.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for a really inspiring exhibit of oratory on behalf of the liberal cause. Your speech of April 24-25 was timely, interesting, to the point.

The "small band of liberals" is not alone in their fight on Senate Joint Resolution 13—nor are you alone in your criticism of the Eisenhower foreign policy and the congressional committee system. We're behind

you 100 percent. I wish we could have applauded you on Friday night, without fears of an order to clear the gallery. Keep it up, Senator MORSE, until the American people come to their senses.

Very truly yours,

BETTY ANN HERSHBERGER.

WEST HEMPSTEAD, N. Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are two of the many millions who ardently support your thinking. We wish to encourage you in your fight to keep the tidelands in Federal hands. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. M. ROOD.

SEA CLIFF, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my sincere appreciation for your statesmanship and moral integrity in your stand on the offshore oil lands bill.

You and your courageous colleagues are performing an invaluable service to your countrymen. I hope history will accord you the credit you deserve, if you continue to speak for truth and enlightenment. The press is not treating you fairly. Many of the public are concerned with the principles involved, and disagree that Mr. Eisenhower's election was an endorsement of this matter.

I hope it will encourage you to know that your voice is heard and valued by some citizens.

Yours very truly,

ESTHER D. LIPSON.

SWARTHMORE, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to congratulate you for your magnificent struggle against the Holland tidelands oil bill. I have been most discouraged by the scanty coverage given to this most important issue by the press and radio, but I think that your campaign is beginning to succeed. The most recent newscast gave the tidelands oil bill top billing, repeating the bulletin twice. One of the things mentioned was that you had just completed a 22½-hour speech. Good for you.

You may be condemned for filibustering, since you are among the liberal Senators who wish to change rule 22, but it seems to me that if the majority of Senators wish the rule to stand, then you have every right to use it. Considering the circumstances—the likelihood of offshore oil rights being given to a few States, instead of being used to benefit the whole Nation—you have a right and a duty to use every weapon at your disposal to defeat the Holland bill.

Again, congratulations.

Sincerely,

JEAN MCKEE.

P. S.—Me, too.

EMILY RAWLINGS PRICE.

WOLLASTON, MASS., April 28, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to congratulate you on your determined stand against the tidelands oil steal.

I agree heartily with you that the proposal to turn this back to the States is absolutely against the public interest and totally unnecessary.

It restores my faith in human nature to find you willing and able to make a strong fight whenever you see that special interests are exploiting natural resources.

More power to you and thankful admiration.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY P. HILL.

BROWNSVILLE, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR SIR: Just a note to thank you for your valiant fight to preserve the interest of all the States against the Holland bill. Also to commend your courage in facing up to realities, and your perseverance in this debate. We are Republicans but were for Governor Stevenson last fall, as his philosophy came much nearer to what we want in our Government.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Truly yours,

MARIE T. WOLKE and FAMILY.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a citizen of the U. S. A., I express my appreciation and admiration for your great effort to prevent the oil grab.

Very truly yours,

SAM NORKIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to express appreciation to you and your "small band of liberals" for your attempt to educate both the American public and the Congress of the United States on the matter of our offshore oil.

Even if you maintain that you are not filibustering (which frankly I do not take too seriously) your talkathon has made headlines and thereby accomplished, in part, your end of getting across to the people.

I, for one, can view this attempt on the part of your former party and certain coastal States as nothing better than a legalized Teapot Dome. An attempt to rob the people of the United States, and it is just that, should not go unpunished. Your efforts deserve the thanks of all the people.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOTT AUERBACH.

BAY SHORE, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our thanks for the magnificent fight you are making against the tidelands-oil grab.

We hope that your display of courage, energy, and unselfish public devotion will arouse the people of the country to an awareness of the magnitude of this steal of public resources. We feel that the continuance of your fight may bring such a public outcry as will throw the oil-lobby steamroller into reverse gear.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. MORRIS A. FEUERSTEIN.

RIDGEFIELD, CONN., April 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on the fine stand you are taking down there in the Senate.

That independence of yours may be catching—keep it up.

Very cordially,

ROBERT FAWCETT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just read of your record demonstration against the pending offshore oil bill and want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for your rare integrity and courage in this matter.

I hope that the attendant publicity that your dramatic performance elicited will be effective in arousing an otherwise indifferent electorate to respond and prevent this nefarious measure from being made a law.

I followed your comments during the last campaign with the utmost interest and admiration. What this country needs is more people with your political philosophy, independence of thought, and just the goal of furthering the common good as opposed to that of specialized groups.

May your effort be effective and may you be granted physical health and stamina to continue your very great work.

Sincerely yours,

MISS ROMOLA ETTINGER.

BAYSIDE, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,

April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for your efforts in opposing the tidelands oil bill.

I am certain the majority of the public, if made cognizant of the issue, would support you and your colleagues in your fight for national over individual interest.

Very truly yours,

ARLENE FINKERNAGEL.

WINTHROP, MASS., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please allow me to extend my sincerest thanks for your efforts in the public interests. I too do not feel that the oil in these United States are here simply to enrich a few oil corporations.

I am writing to my own Senators asking them to support your grand efforts.

Please do not take the trouble of any of your staff to acknowledge this letter as all your efforts will be best spent fighting for the public interests.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID EDVITZ.

HADDONFIELD, N. J., April 26, 1953.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Though I am not one of your constituents, I have often desired to take up residence in the great State of Oregon, knowing that I would be represented by you.

You won my admiration when you explained your lengthy speech concerning the Taft-Hartley bill to the students of the University of Colorado in late 1947.

And now, you and a handful of colleagues stand between the greed of 4 States and the people of all 48 States. I only hope that your 22½-hour speech is made available to all the people you have so ably placed above party politics. In your own words "you have principle because you have never compromised your principles." The hope you have given me as well as inspiration serves as a bulwark in my own mind against the ever so mounting forces of reaction.

May the Good Lord keep you in the healthiest of physical well-being, for civil rights will come to pass as long as you continue to champion the rights of all.

Of what service, Senator, can I be to the common cause of fair play and justice to all peoples of all lands?

Yours sincerely,

MARVIN PERLMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have just finished reading your speech of April 24 and 25. It is a great pity that the American press did not see fit to report the contents of the speech. It was excellent.

Sincerely,

ISADORE G. ALK.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL,

New Haven, Conn., April 26, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to thank you and your colleagues for the stubborn

fight you are making against the enactment of the offshore oil bill. It is difficult for me to see what justice or sense of responsibility for and to the Nation as a whole is present in the position of those who want to give away a public trust in this fashion. I hope you can stave off the enactment of this bill until the long view has had time to make itself effective in the minds of American citizens.

In any case, a hearty thank you.

Sincerely yours,

H. RICHARD NIEBUHR.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on the splendid effort regarding the offshore oil bill. Regardless of the outcome, I shall always appreciate what you have done.

Sincerely,

MATILDA TOBIAS.

URBANA, ILL., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your valiant efforts to keep the so-called tidelands oil bill from passing.

Very sincerely,

JAMES S. AYARS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to express my heartiest congratulations on your historic, record-breaking speech in the Senate.

I am convinced that long after the current Members of the Senate and the present administration leaders are gone and forgotten, thoughtful and grateful Americans will recall your name as the great American who tried so valiantly to protect their interests.

I hope you are successful in arousing public opinion to recognize the dangers implicit in the current tidelands oil bill. I hope, too, that God grants you strength to do everything in your power to block this bill.

For myself, may I report that I have taken a few hours on this beautiful Sunday afternoon to write letters to Senators IVES, FLANDERS, TOBEY, and LANGER.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT K. GOLDEN.

NEW YORK CITY, April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: Congratulations on your wonderful performance and great feat of endurance in the filibuster against the oil land grab. When the Southern Senators were filibustering the civil rights bill were they forced to stand as you were? Did the strict Senate laws really apply to them? Please advise me on this as I have to settle an argument on this score.

Please continue your great fight for Americanism on and off the floor of the Senate. Please appear on the program (TV) Youth Wants To Know. I know of several hundred of such requests being made on this program to invite you as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

WALLACE S. HAYES.

THE DALLES, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My heartiest congratulations to you on your long, splendid oratory against the tidelands bill. I only wish there were more Senators in Congress who had the foresight and wisdom that you possess.

As a registered voter of The Dalles, Oreg., I strongly urge you to influence others to vote

against the big oil business influenced tidelands bill.

Hoping, along with you, I am sure, that the tidelands bill goes down to a disgraceful defeat, I remain

One of your sincerest fans,

MRS. CRAIG DUDLEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your splendid stand against the tidelands oil bill. Keep up the good work!

Very truly yours,

ROBERT H. HOYT.

BRONXVILLE, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for what I believe is a real public service.

C. L. HARRISS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953.

Office of Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my congratulations on the fine job which you are doing to bring the tidelands issue to the American people. You may count on my support in your next campaign.

J. C. BOYLE.

BUFFALO, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

MY DEAR SIR: On the British Broadcasting Station and on all the Canadian stations I listen in on (because I receive information not given on American stations).

Your dramatic feat was played up and emphasis on the fact you have done a wonderful job.

I salute you.

WILLIAM L. HELLER.

P. S.—76 years old—with grandfather born in 1776 who died in 1878—102 years old. I was born in 1877. Our 2 lives cover American history. As Chinese say—"Upstart young country."

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We appreciate your courage and effort in striving to retain our natural resources for all Americans. We are sure that your 22-hour speech will focus the attention of the American people on the tidelands oil issue and we congratulate you for your magnificent work.

Best of luck for 1954.

Yours truly,

BENJAMIN M. SHIEBER,

BRUCE GOULD,

Columbia Law School, 1953.

WETHERSFIELD, CONN., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your historical filibuster in the fight to block the submerged lands bill. Your endurance and guts has made this an unheard of feat, unequaled except for Jimmy Stewart's famous filibuster in the wonderful Frank Capra movie, Mr. Smith Goes to Washington, years ago. Your cause, however, is an even more noble and important one—preventing the giveaway of the Nation's priceless rights to offshore oil ownership, and I hope it will wake other citizens, as it has us, to the urgency of the present need. (We are writing our Senators, including FURTEL, supporting your stand.)

The latest battle of yours in the people's war is fully in keeping with the stature you established for yourself in endorsing Stevenson in last fall's campaign. So keep up the good fight. You have at least some citizens who recognize the American people's continuing and increasing indebtedness to you.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBBINS W. BARSTOW, Jr.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A word of thanks and appreciation for your sincere and courageous efforts to defeat the so-called tidelands bill.

I pray that your efforts will be successful and also that the revenues from the offshore oil will be set aside for Federal aid to education, thereby benefiting all the people, and especially the children of our beloved country.

Once again my sincere thanks.

Sincerely,

MABEL COONEY.

CHICAGO, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for your determined defense of the American people against the tidelands oil grab. Trust your fight for the common people will succeed.

Also, we heard you on the Kate Smith radio interview; it was truly refreshing and most enlightening.

Wish there were only more Representatives and Senators in the Halls of Congress with the courage, convictions and caliber as you have so ably displayed.

Very truly yours,

HENRIETTA MITTLACHER,

VICTOR MITTLACHER,

(Mr. and Mrs. Victor Mittlacher).

FORT WORTH, TEX., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your undisputed filibustering championship on the tidelands grab. You are doing generations to come a real service. Keep up the good work. I hope that your representatives of the people who have the real interests of the country at heart will talk this deal to death.

Sincerely,

EUGENE W. SUTHERLAND.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE,

Swarthmore, Pa., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Congratulations on your courageous work. The tidelands-oil issue is finally beginning to receive the proper publicity because of you. I hope that you and the other liberal Senators will be able to succeed in your task.

Yours very truly,

NINA FELBER.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., April 24, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for the efforts you are making to prevent passage of the tidelands bill. I hope you will continue the fight.

My personal feelings about the charge of hypocrisy because of the extended debate now underway is this: I continue to support a change in the rules to permit effective closure. In the absence of such a rule I support unlimited debate of the present bill.

Sincerely,

LAURENCE KASHIDAN.

ARLINGTON, VA., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts to defeat the pending offshore oil bill are greatly appreciated by my husband and myself.

The present administration, most of the Republican and some of the Democratic Members of Congress are hellbent on turning over the resources of the United States to private interests to exploit. This is possible because so many people are not informed. That is why calling this to the attention of all the people is so terribly important.

Many people feel the same way we do. We know that we can never repay you for your great service to our country.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CATHERINE TROTTER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: God bless you in your attempt to publicize the oil grab. I believe you have succeeded in focusing attention on this issue. Pray God all America will unite behind you and the liberal Senators in crushing this bill. Just keep up the good work. Why not have a Nationwide broadcast, so that every American will know what's going on?

Yours,

Miss P. McWILLIAMS.

ARLINGTON, VA., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There must be many, many like my family who feel that you performed a superhuman act in trying to protect this country of ours and its resources from those whose God is greed and the dollar sign. We congratulate you.

Your clear thinking through the last campaign and since, your courageous stands should go down in history. Please keep up your good work, there are so few of you left. I pray that your constituents feel as millions of Americans must about you.

Good luck and good health.

M. Z. COPPER, M. D.

WYOMING LABOR'S LEAGUE FOR
POLITICAL EDUCATION,
Cheyenne, Wyo., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to express appreciation and commendation for your work on the tidelands bill last week.

We are trying to do all we can to get the word to our Wyoming Senators in opposition. We can only hope that the tide of public opinion will rise to express itself.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

ART BUCK.

STANFORD, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In my future career as a teacher of political science I will cite your stand on tidelands oil bill as an example of political integrity of highest caliber.

Respectfully yours,

JAY ZAWOCKY,
Ph. D. candidate, Stanford, Calif.,
Political Science Department.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 23, 1953.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your gallant stand on the tidelands oil bill made in the Senate on last Friday.

We hope that you and your colleagues will continue to oppose passage of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN KOGAN,
SALLY KOGAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courageous stand on the tidelands oil deal.

The newspapers are wrong—you and your associates are arousing public opinion in favor of Federal control.

Keep it up and keep well.

We need men like you in Congress.

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE HASS.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have just read in the Oregon Journal about your 22-hour-and-26-minute speech to dramatize your opposition to the tidelands oil grab. We wish to congratulate you for your stand on this issue. We have been listening to Frank Edwards, Labor News commentator, for some time and heard his explanation of what this tidelands oil grab means to the common people of this country. We only wish that we could be of some help in preventing this larceny from being legalized.

We feel that this is only the beginning of greater giveaway deals. Next to follow will be the great hydroelectric plants and after that our public lands and national forests.

We admire your courage, although many brickbats have been handed to you, we feel that in time criticism will turn to praise when people realize the great service you are doing for the future of our country.

May we again thank you for your stand on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. FAY KERBY.

WHITTIER, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous championship of the rights of the American people as a whole is a thrilling morale booster to those of us who feel downhearted by the great pressures exerted by special interests. Your marathon speech on the subject of tidelands oil was wonderful. It gives new hope to millions. Whatever the result of the vote, there is written into the record a clear, emphatic, and eloquent protest that indicates the undaunted resistance of basic principle against temporary opposition.

Accept the deep gratitude of a staunch Democrat who admires your independence and leadership. I sincerely hope that the almost superhuman ordeal to which you subjected yourself will have no ill effects either on your health or your spirit.

Sincerely,

ELDORA E. McLAUGHLIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ever since you left your party because you sincerely felt Stevenson should be our president, we have wanted to tell you how much we admire you. We are indeed heartened, as are many of our friends, by your courage of not only having the farsighted convictions that you have, but for having the guts to let the world know about them.

In fact we had a warm feeling for you long before that, and hoped the Republicans would soon find more candidates for public office of your high caliber. The Democrats too, for that matter.

But now that you have spoken nearly 24 hours on the tidelands issue, we cannot postpone telling you that we are grateful beyond words for your stamina and your sincerity in representing Oregon as well as States unfortunately represented by political prostitutes.

Although we cannot vote for you, we want you to know that we are cheered by you and cheer you in return. We know that yours is a lonely road. We hope that your strength will endure and give impetus to those who hesitate to fight for democratic principles in which they believe—thinking only of their personal political future and not of the future of the myriads of people for whom they should speak.

Gratefully yours,

JUSTIN and SARAH ROTHSTEIN.

ENDICOTT, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep on with your good fight. You are shaping a party! That oil belongs to all of us—not to three States who would have it theirs to sell. It's our timber, our water, our grazing land, too, and if the oil goes what will be next? God bless you!

Mrs. ROBERT R. HAILEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on the courageous stand you have taken on the tidelands oil issue. The American people have pitifully few champions in Congress today. I feel it important to voice my personal support of men like yourself who have shown refreshing honesty and a strongly principled stand in protecting the rights of the average citizen against the big steal of a big-business administration.

Sincerely,

Dr. S. SCHAFER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., April 26, 1953.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Cheers for your efforts in behalf of retaining tidelands for the public good.

Borrowing a line from Hunt—may your tribe increase.

Very sincerely,

FLORENCE F. WRIGHT.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., April 25, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your wonderful effort to dramatize the seriousness of the proposed oil grab.

Today for the first time some California newspapers gave this issue front-page treatment. The only information about the opposition to this bill that the average person out here has received is a few words on a radio broadcast or from columnists such as Drew Pearson.

I hope that this extra strain on you does not impair your health for you are a real champion of the common people.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. McDONALD.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of my family and myself I would like to express our gratitude for the fight that you have been waging against the tidelands oil bill.

In these days of economic and political stress it is very enheartening to see that the rights of the ordinary people have not been overlooked by all of the men supposedly in Congress to protect them.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. GROISSER, D. D. S.

NORTH JUDSON, IND.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your educational program concerning the tidelands bill. I hope it will be successful.

JAMES HYNDMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 25, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I noticed a piece in the evening paper where you were quoted to the effect that you were disappointed in the lack of response you have felt from the public as a result of your great battle in the public's interest on the tidelands issue.

There must be millions like myself who are grateful to you for your courageous battles in the public's behalf, not only in this vital issue, but in all the others you have waged in our behalf, but who have just never

got around to sitting down and writing. More power to you.

Sincerely,

EDWIN J. HANSEN.

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MD., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I'm writing these few words to express my deep satisfaction over your "lengthy" speech presented to the Senate last week.

I agree with your views pertaining to offshore oil rights, and would deeply appreciate your mailing me a copy of this famous-to-be speech.

I'm certain that if our Senate had more protesting voices, your words of wisdom would have been so much more successful. Best of luck.

Sincerely,

Pvt. LEONARD MAURER.

GREENS FARMS, CONN., April 26, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courage, good sense and stamina in trying to help educate the people on the facts of the offshore oil deal. Let's hope enough Republican and Democratic Senators come to understand in time that the taxpayers and school systems of 45 States would be paying for this indefensible giveaway to a few individuals in Texas, Louisiana and California if the proposed measure were allowed to become law.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O'NEILL.

APRIL 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you from a family of six for the efforts you have made in defeating the infamous Holland bill.

Fortunately there are men like yourself interested and dedicated enough to the cause of improving the interests of the majority of Americans.

Your 22 hours of speechmaking has caused interest and concern in many quarters. We hope that it was to no avail in defeating this legislation, however your efforts no matter what, will be remembered by those who have national pride and not sectional, vested, greed.

Most sincerely,

DAVID KOGEN and BETTY, SAMUEL,
FLORENCE, ROBERT, and NEIL.

GERTLER TOP SOIL Co.,

Miami Beach, Fla., April 25, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As usual, you are fighting the good fight; this time on the tidelands oil bill. But the forces of liberalism have been on a retreat before superior strength for so long now (I would say since the Supreme Court fight of 1937) that I am frankly discouraged. I am like one of those who have been wounded in the battle, lying on the field and watching the victorious enemy rushing the last redoubt held by the last heroic band of fighters for the Lord.

I can cheer loud, but hope is gone, and though I can applaud I cannot see how we will win the battle.

Nevertheless, Senator, please note that here is one American who knows you have always battled for his interest against the powers of privilege.

Maybe some day America will reawaken and honor the good men who fought the good fight when it was hard to do so.

Very truly yours,

J. GERTLER.

PHILADELPHIA, April 27, 1953.

SIR: Do not give up tidelands. You have TAFT scared. Many of us are becoming

"deeply concerned" at the moves to give away national resources.

J. S. IRVING,
W. W. IVET.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:
Congratulations on your fight tidelands oil bill. Our local backs your stand.

ANTHONY SCIMECA,
Coordinator, Local 54, Shoe Workers Union,
CIO.

HOUSTON, TEX., April 28, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Transport Workers Union of America, CIO,
Local No. 260, representing 1,000 men engaged in city transportation in Houston, Tex., congratulate you on your stand against the tidelands oil grab.

C. C. STONE, President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Our membership thanks you for your splendid effort to prevent tidelands steal. Be assured that you have our full support.
UNITED PUBLISHING EMPLOYEES, LIU 1793,
CIO.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:
The Senate:
In behalf of the Barbers and Beauty Culturists Union of America, CIO, we congratulate you on your courageous fight against the tidelands oil "grab" bill. Your progressive leadership has won the admiration of millions of American citizens, keep up the good fight.

BARBERS AND BEAUTY CULTURISTS UNION
OF AMERICA, CIO,
ERNEST HEBERT, National President,
LILYAN MOSCOWITZ, National Secretary-Treasurer.

COLUMBIA, S. C., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courage in opposing the tidelands oil measure so effectively. Thoughtful citizens are thankful for your efforts. I admire your integrity and applaud the high cause you serve.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MERCHANT.

OAK PARK, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for carrying on the fight to reserve the oil resources for all the people of the United States. We do admire your courage and sincerity and are happy to know you are working for all of us in Washington.

Respectfully,

MARY W. MERR.

PATERSON, N. J.

DEAR SIR: That was a wonderful speech you made. I notice the newspapers didn't bother to print what you said. Keep up the good work; there are millions of people who have a lot of respect for your kind of statesmanship.

Yours truly,

JOE CUCCHIARONI.

FAIRLAWN, N. J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your long speech in the tidelands oil matter. We approve of the brave stands you have taken on many political questions and we applaud the answers you have given to your many critics.

We hope enough of your friends will continue to supply the inspiration you need to go on fighting for your beliefs.

Mr. and Mrs. SANFORD COHEN.

BELLE HARBOR, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your vigorous campaign to fight passage of the oil-grab bill.

I hope you and your team of liberal thinkers will succeed.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELEANOR KAPLAN.

EAST PATERSON, N. J.

God bless you for your valiant fight against the tideland oil giveaway. Everyone I speak to agrees when they learn the facts.

S. KLASS.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your great speech in opposition to the tidelands giveaway and your efforts to protect the interests of all the American people.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. MADISON.

DETROIT, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous fight in behalf of the people of the United States, and against the so-called tidelands oil bill. Would we had many more Senators as careful as you of the people's rights. More power to you to keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

ETHEL SILBER.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your courageous stand in behalf of the majority of Americans against the giveaway tidelands oil bill.

More power to you on your every effort to fight for the common people.

Sincerely,

FLORIDA DEMOCRAT.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my sincere thanks for your courageous and righteous fight against the offshore oil giveaway bill. I hope the American people will realize what is at stake in time to demand defeat of this bill.

R. S. ROCHLIN.

NEW LONDON, CONN., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo to you for your courageous fight against the oil steal. Keep up the good work.

Yours sincerely,

H. M. SAWYER.

EATONTOWN, N. J.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work and take care of your health. The country needs men like you. God bless you.

Yours,

FRANK SAVANNAH.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. Keep up your fight against giving the oil away. It belongs to all the people, not merely a favored few.

DAVID FISCH.

DETROIT, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR: From the bottom of my heart thanks for dramatizing the offshore-oil debate with your marathon speech.

That gargantuan effort was perhaps the first indication for most people that something significant was taking place in the Senate. The press and radio previously did a thorough job in burying news of the debate.

Sincerely,

EDWARD TONAT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your efforts to save the tideland oil for all the people of the United States.

Best regards,

DAVID A. WELLS.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., April 27, 1953.

Congratulations on a fine public-spirited job. Can you keep it up till the giveaway becomes impossible?

Yours with admiration,

EDITH L. HUSSEY.

BALTIMORE, MD., April 26, 1953.

SENATOR MORSE: You are right in protesting giving the resources off our coast to the States.

FLOYD THIEL.

DETROIT, MICH., April 25, 1953.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:
DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on great work done by you this date against oil giveaway. May God bless you.

EMMET and MARIE MARKEY.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

SIR: Congratulations on your defense of American heritage.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL J. RESNICK.

BROXN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the tremendous fight you are putting up for the best interests of all the people. I hope more Senators put principle before party as you have done so often.

Sincerely,

ETHEL STEIN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your efforts to prevent the passage of the tidelands oil bill. I have been hoping against hope that President Eisenhower would not choose to continue his stand; but, unfortunately, he intends to keep this election promise.

It makes me proud that some of our legislative body are as courageous as you to prevent our natural resources from being given away. I have no doubt that in spite of your efforts the bill will be passed, but with the help of Rhode Island and other States it may be declared unconstitutional for the fourth and last time by the Supreme Court. I am sure many people are made aware of what is happening in the Government through your efforts on the floor of the Senate. I again offer you my support and encouragement.

Sincerely yours,

THEO GOLDSTON.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE,

Reading, Pa., April 27, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The good fight against giving the tidelands oil revenue to the States which lie near the oil delights me. Good luck.

EDITH B. DOUDS.

This requires no answer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Just a few lines to express my appreciation of your sincere efforts on behalf of the people of our beloved country.

Would that there were many more honorable gentlemen like yourself in the Senate.

Very respectfully yours,

MEYER SHEPARD.

PATERSON, N. J., April 22, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been thrilled by your heroic and patriotic struggle to vin-

dicate the national rights involved in the pending tidelands oil bill. I do not have before me the numerous arguments which you presented recently. It occurs to me, however, that what the administration is attempting to do is to reverse the policy of our country even preceding the adoption of the present Constitution of our country.

My research on the subject indicates that when the Articles of Confederation were agreed to and submitted to the States in 1777, the victory of the small States in establishing their right to an equal vote was not considered by some of them as sufficient. New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland demanded that the States that had large claims to western lands renounce them in favor of the Confederation. Maryland was the last State to ratify the Articles, holding out until March 1, 1781, when she became satisfied that western claims would become the expected treasure of the whole Nation. This delay caused almost the whole of the American Revolution to be fought under a gentlemen's agreement and one that was by no means favorable to efficient operation either civil or military. Virginia had the most nearly legal claims to the western lands, yet Madison uniformly insisted that they become a part of the public domain.

It seems incredible to me that the wisdom and patriotism of our Founding Fathers is now to be thrown overboard to satisfy the aims of a few selfish interests. I want you to know, however, that the people of our country are watching this performance very closely and that they are in your debt in a measure which only history will record.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. ROEMER.

TRENTON, N. J., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fight against the oil giveaway. I hope you continue your fight and stop a vote this year. The people are waking up, but it takes time. I and my friends have written to both New Jersey Senators.

I don't expect an answer since your time is valuable.

Yours truly,

LISSEL A. POPP.

SPRING CITY, PA., April 26, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to pay my respects to your courageous stand on the so-called tidelands oil debate. Your attitude on this question is admirable, coupled with your sincere devotion to sacred principles. History will record your stand as just and upright.

Respectfully,

ALFRED FINDEISEN.

OXFORD, MICH., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY VERY DEAR SIR: I think it can again be said that seldom before have so many owed so much to so few. Please let me express to you and to the 25 other Senators who are standing up against such odds for the good of the country against the pig interests, the greedy and the stupid, my most humble thanks.

Many millions and not only those who voted for Stevenson are watching you men who are putting up such a gallant fight even though little or nothing is said in the daily papers. May right strengthen mightily your arms.

This administration, as you knew and as many others knew is turning out to be "a grab everything that isn't nailed down" for those who think more of their interests than the interests of the country and we have only you few to stand firm for so many many of us.

If you see fit please extend my sincere thanks to the other men who are fighting the good fight. I wish that the Senators from this State were with you but I rank them with the lightest of lightweights and feel there is no use wasting 3 cents on 'em.

Most sincerely and thankfully yours,
W. E. GRINNELL.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please let me thank you and also congratulate you for your gallant effort to save the Nation's oil for the Nation's people. I hope you and your friends in the Senate can prevail over the selfish interests who seem determined to give away our country's resources.

Yours truly,
LEONARD H. FISHER.

RIVERDALE, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have our full admiration for the feat that you performed in the Senate. You couldn't have picked a more worthwhile issue. Move to New York, we need a man like you here.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. O. L. BECKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Congratulations on your fight against States' ownership of tidelands oil. Keep it up.

GEORGE YOUNG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Accept our congratulations for the truly great job you did in the Senate today—and our best wishes for a good night's rest.

You deserve the commendation of all Americans for your bold stand in preventing the giveaway tidelands oil bill from being perpetrated on the people. We are with you and Senator LEHMAN and your colleagues 100 percent. Keep up the good work.

Very sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT WEISS.

DES MOINES, IOWA, April 26, 1953.

"What builds a nation's pillars high
And its foundation strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that 'round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make
A nation great and strong;
Men, who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long!"

(Author unknown). But as one with a "grandstand" section seat, in the organized labor division at the Teapot Dome affair, the lines represent our sentiments as of now. More power to you.

Sincerely,
H. P. FAGAN.

HARTFORD, CONN., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to congratulate and thank you for your courageous and energetic stand you took on the tideland oil grab.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. M. GUNNER.

EAST HARTFORD, CONN., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please don't bother to answer this.

I just want to say I appreciate your efforts to preserve Federal title to the offshore resources.

I only wish we could have kept Benton there to help you.

Sincerely,
FRANK P. LOCKARD.

NAMPA, IDAHO.

Congratulations, Senator.

Your long talk has served two purposes:

1. To focus attention on this vicious steal of the people's property.
2. To perhaps bring to a head the wrongness of the filibuster.

Power to you! I'll bet it is lots more fun to be an Independent, than to wear the harness of either set of bosses.

RAY TUTTLE.

LORAIN, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: Many thanks for endeavoring to safeguard the peoples' interest concerning tidelands. You are a great American.

ROY F. FLORES.

NEW YORK CITY, April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Your very great effort on behalf of the people is greatly appreciated.

Mrs. PRISCILLA BARTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your efforts on behalf of the great majority of the people of this country will not soon be forgotten.

I want to commend you for your sincere belief in the liberal ideals which have made this country great, and for your courage in fighting actively for those beliefs, when so many others have so conveniently surrendered to the forces of reaction.

It was this courage which led you to support Stevenson, to vote for good legislation, and now to go through more than 22 hours of grueling speech to prevent the great oil theft.

I want to thank you, Senator LEHMAN, Senator HUMPHREY, and the too few other outstanding Senators who have stood fast in defense of the people. I only hope that I shall have the opportunity and the honor of voting for you for President of these United States in the near future.

God bless you.

Respectfully,

HAROLD LEINWAND.

BAYSIDE, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I offer my sincere thanks to you for your courageous effort to dramatize the struggle being made by you and your colleagues to resist the tidelands oil bill. It is most regrettable that so many of the Nation's papers have chosen to ignore the issues involved in this legislation. Whether by accident or design, the stage is set for a crucial piece of legislation to be slammed through without any proper airing of the implications involved. The people of this Nation owe you a debt of gratitude for your devotion to their general welfare.

It is my honest wish that you will persevere and continue to fight for good government and sound policies, regardless of party label. Our country needs many more men of your caliber. Good luck and keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. DENT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office:

District 3, United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, CIO, congratulation you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and

exposure of the tidelands-oil steal. We realize now that this gigantic steal makes the Teapot Dome affair petty. We pledge you our full support in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

JACK CURRAN,
Regional Director, District 3.

SCRANTON, PA., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Truly you are a hero and deserving of so much credit. You believed in your stand, and you were willing to sacrifice yourself in standing up for it.

How much more admirable is this than absenting oneself from sessions when a vote is to be taken and is so often the case.

Congratulations, honorable sir.

Sincerely,

MARY C. FLEMING.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Whether you win or lose in your great fight against the cohesive power of public plunder, you have rendered an invaluable public service in awakening the country to the threatened danger of the loss of its uncalculable assets.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS J. BARNUM.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work. The Federal Government must retain control of the offshore oil lands. I voted for Ike, but I disagree with him on this issue.

VINCENT LUDWIG.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

HON. WAYNE MORSE:
Well spoken, old boy.

PEISSE O'REILLY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Just a word to tell you that my views on the tidelands issue coincide with those of yours. Your unselfish devotion to your country moves me not a little. You are truly a United States Senator in the full meaning of the word, placing country first.

BILL SHIM,

Student at the Ohio State University.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Hope you succeed in saving our glorious heritage for all of our people. Congratulations, too, on the good with which the Lord has apparently endowed you.

All good wishes for success.

Sincerely,

MISS E. SINGER.

PEEKSHILL, N. Y., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Re tidelands oil. Congratulations on your unflinching stand on the tidelands oil grab. It's a pity there are so few Senators who have the interest of the American public as a whole in mind. Although we are not your constituents, we wish to express our appreciation of your fight on behalf of all Americans.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. PHILIP GREENBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: May I congratulate you on your heroic effort to bring the tidelands oil

bill to public attention, as well as your devoted efforts on several other issues. I think you are doing a marvelous job.

Very sincerely,

ADRIANA B. GOLDBERG,
Mrs. Clarence Goldberg.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,

Storrs, Conn., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: What this country needs is 95 more Senators like you. Keep up the good work and remember that you have millions of us behind you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. MEAD, Jr.

SUFFERN, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. Nice to know someone in Washington is concerned with the interests of the many. Appreciatively,

Mrs. A. ALLAN PERLMAN.

MONGOLIA, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While I am doubtful of the wisdom of filibustering, even in good causes, I wish to applaud your efforts to prevent the robbery planned in the offshore oil bill.

It is a sad commentary on the bias of the press that they report the filibuster but not the arguments advanced by you and your colleagues.

With respect to the press, I hope you realize that a great many people like myself, who are better informed than the daily paper would make them, approve your efforts to maintain a liberal voice in Congress.

Best wishes for a long and successful career as a congressional gadfly.

Sincerely,

EARL G. JACKSON.

LYNN, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

I wish to congratulate you on your fight for the people's rights, and trying to prevent those rich deposits from falling into the hands of the privileged few.

I realize there are only a few such as you left in Washington, so it makes it all the harder. So good luck to you and those with you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH SAVAGEAN.

P. S.—Don't forget a lot of us little people are watching that famous fight.

EASTON, PA., April 25, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like very much to congratulate you on your courageous stand on the tidelands oil bill issue. It is too bad that there are not more men with your vision.

Keep up the fight. You truly represent the people of the United States.

DANIEL HERTZ.

LA PLATA, MO., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written Senator TAFT to say that his stand on the tidelands oil is going to defeat his party in 1956. It should send it into oblivion for a hundred years. I happen to own many blocks of oil that will be affected by the passage of this bill—but what decent American wants profit at the cost of this brazen "big lie" steal? It is the greatest blot on the Republican escutcheon of all in their not very admirable history.

With deepest appreciation of your fearless and heroic stand from my husband and myself, I am

Yours sincerely,

OLIN McLORN.

WARWICK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: All honor and gratitude to you, and to the little group of other patriotic Senators with whom you are working, for your heroic efforts to thwart the most outrageous grab of public property ever attempted in this country. I am sure there are millions of plain Americans like myself who pray for your success in this good fight.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. BROWNE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want you to know how much my friends and I admire your magnificent and heroic performance in Congress yesterday, and to assure you that you have earned the gratitude of millions in this country who feel that as long as we have men like you in Congress, we do have true spokesmen there (for you know that sometimes we begin to doubt that), even if the result of your efforts and those of a few other Senators should be negative.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Miss IRMGARD LENEL.

P. S.—I have voiced my opposition to the tidelands oil bill previously to a number of key Senators and especially to the California Senators, where my protest fell on deaf ears, of course.

GROTON, MASS., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for the wonderful fight you have made against the offshore oil bill.

In these times, when it is so difficult to be a liberal, when one often wishes that he, too, could forget realities and take the easy course of blindly following the crowd, your courageous and outspoken independence is an inspiration that is badly needed.

Sincerely,

WALLACE P. BISHOP.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your fine effort to educate the American public on the tidelands oil controversy. Much as I deplore filibuster tactics, I am hopeful that you have succeeded by this method in focusing the attention of the citizenry on the dangers to America if this measure is passed.

Sincerely yours,

HELENE P. GANS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your efforts to preserve the benefits of the offshore oil for all the people of the United States of America. Knowing there is someone like you working for our interests makes me less fearful of the future.

Sincerely,

ELISBETH GROVES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to congratulate you on your speech concerning tidelands oil.

Respectfully,

LILLIAN COTE.

Mrs. Louis V. Cote.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 25, 1953.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you from the bottom of my heart for your magnificent speech in defense of the rights of the whole American people to our natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB.

YALE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
New Haven, Conn., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My thanks for your truly courageous effort in opposition to the tidelands oil bill. Let us hope that you and the Senators with you are successful in preventing the enactment of this greatest of all scandals.

Sincerely,

ROGER LESTER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is the first letter I have ever written for or against any man in public office.

I would like for you to know that there are many of us who have for a long time admired your stand on many issues.

Your speech of 22 hours against the offshore oil bill prompts me to tell you that the majority of Americans feel that they still have some patriotic men left in Congress, and who are sincerely concerned with the genuine welfare of all of us in the United States.

Keep up the good fight.

Very sincerely,

ALEX POLLYEA.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and my three children of voting age support your stand in the Senate on tidelands.

It takes courage to do the things that are not popular with most of the Senators.

You can count on our support. God bless you and enjoy good health.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. WASSERMAN.

POTSDAM, N. Y., April 26, 1953.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It's been about 15 years since I wrote a letter to a Senator but I feel that you should be complimented for your guts in attempting to preserve this country's oil resources for the people themselves, and not for the oil interests and those whom they control through campaign contributions. I feel sick reading the goody virtues they attach to State's rights. They forget that there are 48 States involved and not just the few involved in the oil controversy.

When I was an adolescent idealist I would write letters to Senators, Representatives, and to the President as well but after learning the facts of life—and politics—I gave it up as wishful thinking. I usually vote Democratic but when a man like yourself has the courage to break away from the parent organization and subject himself to the vilification and abuse the press heaps upon him, then I feel it my duty to let him know there are people that sincerely appreciate the sacrifice. I wonder whether the folks in your home State realize what it's all about. Maybe your speech in the Senate yesterday will awaken those who think the domestic Republicans, as represented by TAFT and President Eisenhower, offer us the salvation they lavishly promised during their campaign. I feel as though this country still has to get away from the popularity contests they hold every so often and get back to electing men for office that have wisdom and courage—such as yourself.

In today's Sunday Times there was an article about your record speech but most of it referred to you having broken the record, and very little regarding the issues you raised. Now if our Mr. TAFT had made a speech it undoubtedly would have been recorded in a special supplementary issue of the Times. The newspaper article also mentioned you having spoken about bologna, probably in an effort to disparage your speech, but I'm certain that there must be some properties about bologna worthwhile mentioning and I'm glad you brought it to our attention.

When and if you start the Independent Party, you can count on me as one of your members. The Democrats have just about shot their load in giving everything away and the Republicans have done the same in taking it back. We need a new look in politics and you're it. Congratulations once again and best of luck.

Respectfully yours,
MILTON GAULICK.

CHAPEL HILL, N. C., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express appreciation for your gallant stand on tideland oil. You are not without many supporters here in the South who believe along with you that the national interest will be served best by the use of revenues from tidelands oil for education.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. GEORGE S. PARTHEMOS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your stand against the offshore oil grab.

Stand firm. Everybody isn't an oil millionaire.

Very truly yours,
LEONARD S. KANDELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read the account of your filibuster in the Times on Sunday, and I also read the editorial censuring you today, not for the basic issue of tidelands oil, but because you used the filibuster in an effort to bring the issue to the public.

I disagree strongly with the Times editorial and feel that the issue of tidelands oil transcends the issue of the filibuster.

As long as the filibuster is not outlawed and is perfectly legitimate for use by Members of the Senate, the issue resolves itself into a question of moral values on its use.

The moral values of tidelands oil are so basic, and the tangible effects will be so adverse to the public interest, that one moral value far outweighs the other moral value.

The filibuster must go, but until it does, there is no harm in using it as a shield as well as a sword (to invert a legal principle). Perhaps the only way it will be outlawed will be through exposing it as a two-edged sword.

My congratulations to you for your strength, courage, and fearlessness, qualities which are strangely lacking on the Senate floor and which are fast evaporating in a demoralized and desensitized world.

Respectfully,
ROSLYN MYERS
Mrs. Allen Murray Myers.

DETROIT, MICH., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your talkathon against the multibillion-dollar "giveaway" was all to the good. You and the others must keep it

up if you can. Perhaps the American people will wake up and exert some pressure before the bill comes to a vote.

Sincerely,
S. A. DISNER.

DETROIT, MICH., April 25, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: So long as America has men like you fighting for us all, we are truly a good Nation.

God bless you and I hope you win. Thanking you.

Sincerely,
Mrs. H. A. JONES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 26, 1953.
DEAR SIR: We wish to congratulate you on your stand on the offshore oil bill.

We believe that the natural resources belong to all 48 States, and not to the individual States. It should benefit the whole Nation.

Yours respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. ALEX STROBL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1953.
MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my admiration for the work you have done concerning the tidelands oil bill. Many points are not clear to the people and so exhaustive debate is very important.

Respectfully,
MAX FRICK.

NEW YORK, N. Y.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to tell you how much admiration I have for you in regard in particular to the tidelands oil issue and think you did a magnificent job in dramatizing the issue. If there are copies of your speech available, I would certainly like to have one.

Sincerely,
NANCY G. SPRIGGS.

BOSTON, MASS., April 26, 1953.
Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not one of your constituents, may I offer my personal congratulations and thanks for your superb "filibuster."

I heard no report of your magnificent plea either on the radio or in the local newspapers until this day when I read the New York Times. I think this fact in itself is regrettable. But, nonetheless, I was thrilled through and through.

Thank you once again.

Respectfully yours,
ARTHUR G. SHIP.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., April 25, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an individual citizen, I want to thank you for your great efforts in opposing the tidelands oil bill.

Unfortunately, the present administration seems determined to ram the bill through, but in my judgment sentiment against the bill will be overwhelming. I only hope that not too much damage is done while the sentiment builds up.

Your discussions against the bill have done much to awaken the people. I salute you most admirably and respectfully.

Very truly yours,
GLOVER E. TULLY.

PORTLAND, OREG., April 26, 1953
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on the effectiveness of your speech on the tidelands oil bill.

The rage of the people will be more in evidence if you stubbornly fight the bill that would give the States title to the marginal oil lands.

The press have not given the facts to the people. During the last week I have called more than 20 of my friends and asked their opinion on the bill. The results were surprising to me. Not more than 4 of the group had any opinion, but 3 of them were getting worked up about it.

Some men in Congress seem to brag about a saving of a few millions but give away billions with such ease.

More and more people as they get informed will oppose the big giveaway and will fight to save it for all of the people.

The rise of sunken oil and its giveaway will make the Teapot Dome scandal appear as a symbol for the Big Deal.

I am getting myself worked up a bit over this but want you to know that I know you are right in your fight on this issue. It will make the mink scandal just a poor man's fumbling, while the oil scandal will rise to be the big steal.

With hopeful good wishes,
CHARLES L. PAINE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

The New York joint board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America congratulates you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tidelands-oil steal. We realize now that this gigantic steal makes the Teapot Dome affair look petty. We pledge you our full support in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

COAT MAKERS TRADE BOARD, ACWA,
JOSEPH GOLD,
CHARLES DEL GIACCO,
Trade Managers,
SAM LA SCALA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Local 178, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America congratulates you wholeheartedly on your gallant fight and exposure of the tidelands-oil steal. We realize now that this gigantic steal makes the Teapot Dome affair look petty. We pledge you our full support in your fight for the best interests of the American people.

HARRY KAUFF,
Business Agent, Local 178, ACWA.

HOMEWOOD, ILL., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Proud of your fight on oil bill. Keep going.
KARL and MARGARET SCHMIDT.

BEAVERTON, OREG., April 28, 1953.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We are backing you in your fight against tideland oil bill.

Mr. and Mrs. ALBERT NIVA.
Mr. and Mrs. E. A. COOK.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., April 27, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you for the interest you have shown in the people of the whole United States. If one cared to trade principle for a few votes I have an idea it would have been easier to have followed another course. But from your actions in the past I believe you think of principles first and votes later. Thanking you for your showing of courage.

Yours truly,
EDWARD CONYERS.

GALWAY, N. Y., April 26, 1953.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very grateful to you for your effort to defeat the tidelands oil bill. I hope that your work will at least

make future larceny of this kind more difficult.

W. M. SCHWARZ.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. We both appreciate your stand against giving the tidelands to the individual States involved. They belong to all the people.

We also admired your honesty in switching to Stevenson in the late presidential election.

We just hope the good people of Oregon appreciate an honest man and do reelect you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE S. ANOLICK.

GRANVILLE, OHIO, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are with you in your stand on the offshore oil bill. We are wishing you and your liberal colleagues the greatest success in preserving the offshore oils for the entire United States to whom they rightfully belong. It is quite evident that the Nation needs many more men like you and your loyal associates in the Senate. Keep up the fine work.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR WRIGHT.

WILLIAM MALCOMSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PERSISTENT SENATOR: We all admire you out here for fighting to preserve our oil-rich submerged lands for the entire United States.

Don't give up the fight.

ELIZABETH K. LIVERMORE.

SOUTH WEYMOUTH, MASS., April 27, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept deep, sincere thanks for the long hard fight you have made—and I hope will continue to make—to save tidelands oil control for the Federal Government.

Our natural resources belong to all of the citizens.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MAUDE H. WEBSTER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I would like to commend you on the efforts you are making to defeat the tidelands bill. I have written to my Senators from Ohio and am getting my friends to do.

Respectfully,

ARCHIE FINE, M. D.

RICHMOND HEIGHTS, MO., April 26, 1953.

HONORABLE SIR: Please accept my heartfelt thanks for your courageous opposition to the so-called tidelands oil giveaway. Your fine and loyal example should be an inspiration to all true Americans. Please continue your fight to prevent the exploitation of the people of this great country for the benefit of the few. I pray that your efforts may not be in vain.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM C. WILKINSON.

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 25, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let me tender congratulations on your performance in opposition to the tidelands bill. I cannot help but feel that

if people understand the implications of this bill there would be a groundswell of disapproval. You have done a magnificent job in giving the issue publicity.

Sincerely,

FRANCES K. GREASHAM,
Mrs. David T. Greasham.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your marathon speech in the Senate. I appreciate your persistence and endurance on behalf of the American people.

I am very glad to see the opponents of this oil bill so determined to bring this issue fully before the public. We just saw Senator ANDERSON on Meet the Press, and he did an excellent job of clarifying just why this is such a bad bill.

Good luck to you and the other fine Senators who are opposed to the tidelands oil bill.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GLORIA SCHUMACHER.

NEWARK, N. J., April 26, 1953.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God there is someone like you with "guts" and social vision in the United States today.

Inspired by your magnificent filibuster, I have just sent letters against the offshore-oil grab to Senators TAFT, HENDRICKSON, and SMITH. I know this is a small contribution in comparison with your terrific fight. If you have any suggestions for anything else we can do, I hope you'll let us know.

We in education feel keenly about this issue.

Sincerely,

LEO LITZKY.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS., April 26, 1953.

DEAR SIR: Just wanted you to know that there were people in other parts of the country who are applauding your efforts and hope they bring results.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

NETTIE BAUM
Mrs. Sidney J. Baum.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 25, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to tell you that you, and all of the other Senators who are doing such a yeoman job on tidelands oil bill, have our fullest support and thanks.

It has been this lengthy debate that you and Lehman, Douglas, Humphrey, et al., have carried on that has served to inform an apathetic public and awaken many to this vital problem.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JULIUS N. DRAGUIN.

LINDEN, N. J., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to applaud your stand on the tidelands oil bill.

I have just written to my two Senators urging them not to support the present bill.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ESTHER WOLIN.

KENT, OHIO, April 27, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

With great interest in your stand on tidelands oil, for especially the deep tide oil for the use of education for American boys and girls; so many of our States do not have the resources from which to draw revenue from

for schools to give equal chance for their schooling.

I and my family are all for deep tidelands oil for our school system. Use our names for reference.

A friend to schools.

Mrs. C. A. JARRAREL.
Mr. and Mrs. L. A. MUELLER.

DULUTH, MINN., April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just read in the paper that you finished a 22-hour talk. I approve your fight for oil for education. Keep up the good work.

DAVID E. OPIEN.

ATLANTA, GA., April 27, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: A magnificent stand. Please keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

W. LAMAR GAMMON.

WATERTOWN, MASS., April 26, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to congratulate you on your fight against the tidelands oil bill. There are not many left in the Senate, besides yourself, who will stand up and fight against these raids on the national wealth. They said they wouldn't "take it away"; but their first acts are to take everything away: Cut education help, housing, controls, everything.

We need you to carry the standard of honest liberalism, until the forces can rally around again.

Sincerely,

L. D. SMULLIN.

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1953.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you and congratulate you for the nice fight that you have made against the tidelands oil bill. It is good to know that we have a few loyal Americans like you and Senators DOUGLAS of Illinois, and HUMPHREY of Minnesota.

It's very bad, that big business is trying to take over everything, lock, stock, and barrel, but keep up the good fight, the American people are already beginning to realize that they made a terrible mistake last November.

Your talkathon obviously had some good effect, regardless of what Senator HOLLAND thinks about it. We need several more Senators like you—maybe we'll get them in the next election. But take care of your health.

Yours very sincerely,

J. L. WYATT.

P. S.—I am also writing Senator HOLLAND of Florida, and TAFT of Ohio. They're exactly 100 percent wrong when they say that your efforts to convince the American people against the tidelands had little effects. The Detroit Times dated April 25 quoted Senator HOLLAND as making that statement.

OBERLIN, OHIO, April 26, 1953.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are impressed by your courageous fight on the tidelands oil issue. You are indeed bringing it to the attention of the public. It is tragic to see private interests again attempting to make inroads on the public domain. We feel that they should be stopped at almost any cost. You have our wholehearted backing and best wishes.

Sincerely,

WHITNEY S. SLATER.
CHARLES Y. MANSFIELD.

GAINESVILLE, TEX., April 27, 1953.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1953. I feel that it is obligatory upon me to express my support for your position taken on Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Though this unfortunate measure be passed, the people of the United States will not soon forget your very real contribution to the debate.

I remain,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. CARROLL.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., April 27, 1953.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: By this letter I want to do two things:

1. Congratulate you for standing so firm on what you believe to be right; and

2. Thank you for defending longly and strongly what I believe to be right.

I refer, of course, to your speech against the so-called tidelands oil bill.

More power to you especially in view of the petty childlike attempts to relieve you of the floor by Senator TAFT and his following.

I have today sent a wire to Senator TAFT, urging defeat of the bill in question. I hope I have not waited too long.

Thanking you again, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

LAURA S. FERNANDEZ.

P. S.—An added attraction to the wire: It was signed by me jointly with Mrs. Edith R. Rubinstein who also sends her congratulations and thanks.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators who wish to submit matters which normally are in order during the usual morning hour, be permitted to do so, provided the time required for that purpose shall not exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Alabama Public Service Commission, protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation outlawing the Communist Party in the United States and making membership therein unlawful

"Whereas the great majority of the people of the United States are united and deter-

mined to maintain the American way of life; and

"Whereas the people have become deeply concerned and view with alarm the encroachment of communism upon the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the people of America are particularly alarmed over learning of the vast numbers of persons who are known Communists or with communistic leanings employed in positions of trust in the service of the Government of our country on all levels; and

"Whereas the doctrine upon which our country is built and upon which it has prospered and grown great, is tolerance for all races and creeds; and

"Whereas it is appreciated by the General Assembly of South Carolina that the American doctrine of tolerance cannot and must not extend to those sworn enemies of our form of government, a part of whose doctrine is the destruction of our Government by force and violence; and

"Whereas this situation threatens the welfare of our Nation and the security of our country, as the Communists advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence; and

"Whereas the general assembly believes that for our own security the Communist Party should be outlawed and membership in the party should be made unlawful: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact, without delay, suitable legislation looking to the outlawing of the Communist Party in America and making membership in such party unlawful; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States."

SMALL BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SUBCONTRACTS—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 206)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report on small business and defense subcontracts, and ask that it be printed.

The report sets forth the results of an 8 months' survey of defense subcontracting recently completed by the committee. During the course of the survey, the committee conferred with 29 of the Nation's largest military prime contractors.

The report includes an analysis of small business policies of the major prime contractors and sets forth a number of suggestions offered by the large manufacturers for the benefit of small concerns interested in defense work.

On the basis of your committee's survey, it would appear that there are opportunities for small concerns as subcontractors in major defense production programs. It is apparent, however, that full development of those opportunities will require close cooperation between the military departments, major military prime contractors, and small concerns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1784. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Mobile Harbor, Ala., in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1785. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1786. A bill for the relief of Sonia Roller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1787. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pertaining to the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, and to place the position of char employee working part time in the appropriate grade of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1788. A bill for the relief of Parsegh Simidian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1789. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain private hospitals, clinics, and medical facilities acquired by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1790. A bill for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1791. A bill for the relief of Leong Walk Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1792. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1793. A bill to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1794. A bill to reimburse the South Dakota State Hospital for the insane for the care of Indian patients; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1795. A bill for the relief of Fred and Bernice Ehlers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 1796. A bill to incorporate the Board of Fundamental Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1797. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill and, in connection therewith, to make a statement which may take me 4 or 5 minutes. The statement is in explanation of the bill, and I should like to make the statement at this time. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has just agreed, by unanimous consent, upon the request of the Senator from Ohio, that Senators may proceed to submit routine matters for not to exceed 2 minutes in the case of any one matter. Does the Senator from New Jersey wish to proceed under that agreement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I can cover what I have to say in that length of time; but if I am unable to finish within that limit, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement be printed in the RECORD, in connection with the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the statement the Senator from New Jersey wishes to make will require more than 2 minutes to deliver, the remainder of the Senator's statement can be printed in the RECORD, by handing it to the Official Reporter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Very well, Mr. President.

I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. President, in the course of the hearings before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on amendments to the National Labor Relations Act—the Taft-Hartley Act—we have been faced with a very special problem that involves conflict between Federal and State jurisdictions. There has been some confusion, both because of the language of the law and because of its interpretation by the National Labor Relations Board, as to where the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board ends and where that of the States begins.

It has been felt by many of us that the National Labor Relations Board has, by its interpretation of the law, unduly extended its jurisdiction, and that a good deal of the confusion and delay in dealing with labor disputes could be prevented if a proper limitation were placed on the kind of cases which Federal legislation should cover.

The purpose of the bill, in the nature of an amendment, which I have introduced is to reverse the trend which today is away from the States, and to restore to the States some of their authority to regulate labor relations in obviously local situations. Furthermore, in this measure I have endeavored to curtail in some degree the excessive coverage of labor cases that has been taken over by the National Labor Relations Board. Furthermore, I have tried to eliminate the legal No Man's Land which the Labor Board has created by its refusal to assert jurisdiction in some cases, while at the same time prohibiting the States from taking jurisdiction.

To clarify this twilight zone between the Federal Government and the States

and to meet some of the criticisms that we have received with regard to the operation of the act, this measure is introduced in order to modify the existing law in the following respects:

First. It repeals the exemption for Federal Reserve banks.

Second. It exempts from the Taft-Hartley Act's coverage (a) employers of less than 10 employees; (b) "public utilities," as defined, which are primarily local; and (c) employers primarily engaged in the building and construction industry.

Third. It excludes from the Taft-Hartley Act's coverage employers whose annual interstate business does not exceed certain specified minima in terms of dollars and cents.

Fourth. It requires the Labor Board to assert jurisdiction with respect to all employers, unless they are specifically exempted, or whose interstate activities fall below the specified minima.

Fifth. It deprives the Labor Board of authority to cede jurisdiction to the States, an authority never exercised under the Taft-Hartley Act. This authority is made unnecessary by my bill.

The consequences of these changes will be both substantial and beneficial. Considerable criticism has been directed at the Labor Board, particularly by labor, because of the inordinate delays in the processing of its cases. This bill, by substantially reducing the Board's caseload, will enable it to speed up its handling of those remaining cases.

The Federal Reserve banks, even though they perform certain useful functions in behalf of the Federal Government, are, nevertheless, private institutions, operated for the profit of private parties. Hence, it was felt that there was no justification for depriving the employees of such institutions of the rights guaranteed employees by the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore, the bill removes their exemption.

In the vast majority of cases, employers with less than 10 employees carry on operations whose impact on interstate commerce is so small or remote as to furnish no justification for Federal intervention or regulation. This bill exempts them from the Federal act.

Strikes and lockouts in public utilities, primarily local in character, have resulted in particular localities in conditions similar to those Congress sought to prevent on a national scale by enacting the national emergency provisions in title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. This bill, by specifically exempting local public utilities from the act, leaves the States free to regulate such emergency situations in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their own citizens.

The building and construction industry also is largely local in character. The overwhelming majority of employers in the industry are small employers, with very few employees, doing a small annual business in a local area. For these reasons, no cases involving the building and construction industry were processed under the Wagner Act. Congress, in amending the Wagner Act, did not intend to modify that policy. This bill is thus designed to carry out that congressional intent.

After many years of experience, the National Labor Relations Board itself, in October 1950, established certain criteria to guide it in the assertion of its jurisdiction. These criteria consist of certain specified dollar amounts of interstate commerce below which the Board would not assert jurisdiction. Because of the soundness of these criteria in establishing a line of demarcation between what is regarded as interstate and what is properly deemed local in nature, and because of their clarity and the ease with which they can be applied in each specific case, they are included in the bill in accordance with the policy of depriving the Board of discretion in the matter of jurisdiction.

I am introducing the bill and am making this brief explanation on the floor because I hope that by publicizing these suggested changes the committee will have the benefit of reactions, pro or con, from Members of Congress, from labor and management, and from the general public. We shall soon be in the process of writing amendments to the act, and it would be helpful to us to ascertain whether amendments such as the ones provided by this bill will be acceptable to the parties chiefly concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1785) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (2) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization, or any employer the number of whose employees does not exceed 9, or any 'public utility' subject to regulation by the State in which such 'public utility' is located if the annual dollar volume of the goods or services sold by such 'public utility' wholly within such State is not less than 75 percent of the total dollar volume of the goods and services sold annually by such 'public utility,' or any employer primarily engaged in the building and construction industry: *Provided,* That any employer not otherwise excluded from the definition of 'employer' herein shall not be an 'employer' within the meaning of the definition contained in this subsection unless such employer (A) ships, or produces or sells goods destined for direct shipment, to points outside the State in which such employer is doing business, or performs services outside such State, if such goods or services are valued at not less than

\$25,000 per annum; or (B) sells or furnishes goods or services valued at not less than \$50,000 per annum, directly to persons engaged in commerce within the meaning of this act, and not excluded from the jurisdiction thereof by the provisions of this subsection; or (C) purchases or receives directly from points outside the State in which such employer is doing business, goods or services valued at not less than \$500,000 per annum; or (D) purchases or receives goods, valued at not less than \$1 million per annum, if such goods originate at points outside the State in which such employer is doing business."

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(14) The term 'public utility' means an employer engaged in the business of furnishing water, light, heat, gas, electric power, sanitation, passenger transportation, or communications services to the public or of operating a gas pipeline or a toll bridge, road, or tunnel."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 10 of such act is amended by striking out the words "is empowered" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall," by striking out the word "to" where it appears after the second comma in the first sentence of such subsection, by striking out the word "power" where it first appears in the second sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the word "duty", and by striking out the proviso at the end of such subsection.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GREEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MONRONEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; and

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive T, 82d Congress, 2d session, an agreement relating to the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, signed at Lon-

don on June 19, 1951; with an understanding (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive U, 82d Congress, 2d session, an agreement relating to the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, signed at Ottawa on September 20, 1951 (Ex. Rept. No. 1); and

Executive B, 83d Congress, 1st session, a protocol on the status of international military headquarters set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on August 28, 1952 (Ex. Rept. No. 1).

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

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

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on the subject of American foreign policy, at the annual meeting of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, in Atlantic City, N. J., April 27, 1953.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on April 28.

Address delivered by the Secretary of the Navy R. B. Anderson before the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce on April 22, 1953.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Article on the subject of tidelands oil, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 28, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway Is No Road to Economy," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on April 26, 1953; and editorial entitled "No More Dream Lands," advocating the sale of the TVA to private industry, published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick on April 21, 1953.

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITIES AND THEIR FACULTIES—STATEMENT BY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 30, 1952, I inserted in the RECORD a statement of the Princeton Chapter of the American Association of University Professors with regard to the much-discussed subject of freedom of speech. I did this at the request of a friend of mine on the Princeton faculty, without any intention on my part of endorsing the position taken by the Princeton chapter.

I have recently had it called to my attention that the Princeton chapter in trying to convince its readers ran overboard with a characteristic statement that overlooked two or three important elements in the picture. Friends of mine in Princeton advise me that they are trying to convince their academic brethren that the case for freedom of speech has been damaged in the past few years by the neglect of some college professors to recognize, in connection with their claims to freedom, the peculiar responsibilities that accrue therefrom. When the academic brethren felt it necessary to shout about academic freedom, they have tended at times to overlook the other side of the shield.

I have just received from Princeton University a formal statement by the Association of American Universities entitled "The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties." This is signed by an eminent group of college presidents. In order to clarify this issue and to bring out clearly the position taken by some of our best thinkers on this important subject, I ask unanimous consent to print in the body of the RECORD the statement in question, together with the names of the signers.

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

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITIES AND THEIR FACULTIES

I. ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN AMERICAN LIFE

For 300 years higher education has played a leading role in the advancement of American civilization. No country in history so early perceived the importance of that role and none has derived such widespread benefits from it. Colleges moved westward with the frontier and carried with them the seeds of learning. When the university idea was transplanted from Europe, it spread across the Nation with extraordinary speed. Today our universities are the standard bearers of our whole system of education. They are the mainstays of the professions. They are the prime source of our competence in science and the arts. The names of their graduates crowd the honor rolls of two world wars and of the Nation's peacetime affairs. By every test of war and peace they have proved themselves indispensable instruments of cultural progress and national welfare.

In the United States there is a greater degree of equality of opportunity in higher education than anywhere else in the world. A larger proportion of Americans study in universities and colleges than any other people. These universities have shown and continue to show greater responsiveness to the needs of our society than their European counterparts. They have equipped our people with the varied skills and sciences essential to the development of a pioneer country. They have imparted the shape and coherence of the American nation to formless immigrant groups. American ideals have been strengthened, the great cultural tradition of the West has been broadened, and enriched by their teaching and example.

Modern knowledge of ourselves and of our universe has been nurtured in the universities. The scientific, technological, medical, and surgical advances of our time were born in them. They have supplied intellectual capital as essential to our society as financial capital is to our industrial enterprise. They have more than justified the faith of the public in our distinctive system of higher education. They have proved themselves dynamic forces of American progress.

II. THE NATURE OF A UNIVERSITY

A university is the institutional embodiment of an urge for knowledge that is basic in human nature and as old as the human race. It is inherent in every individual. The search that it inspires is an individual affair. Men vary in the intensity of their passion for the search for knowledge as well as in their competence to pursue it. History therefore presents us with a series of scholarly pioneers who advanced our knowledge from age to age and increased our ability to discover new knowledge. Great scholars and teachers drew students to them, and in the Middle Ages a few such groups organized themselves into the first universities.

The modern university which evolved from these is a unique type of organization. For many reasons it must differ from a corporation created for the purpose of producing a salable article for profit. Its internal

structure, procedures, and discipline are properly quite different from those of business organizations. It is not so closely integrated and there is no such hierarchy of authority as is appropriate to a business concern; the permanent members of a university are essentially equals.

Like its medieval prototype, the modern American university is an association of individual scholars. Their effectiveness, both as scholars and as teachers, requires the capitalizing of their individual passion for knowledge and their individual competence to pursue it and communicate it to others. They are united in loyalty to the ideal of learning, to the moral code, to the country, and to its form of government. They represent diversified fields of knowledge, they express many points of view. Even within the same department of instruction there are not only specialists in various phases of the subject, but men with widely different interests and outlook.

Free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress. A university must therefore be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the surest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism, and presentation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence. This is the real meaning of "academic" freedom. It is essential to the achievement of its ends that the faculty of a university be guaranteed this freedom by its governing board, and that the reasons for the guaranty be understood by the public. To enjoin uniformity of outlook upon a university faculty would put a stop to learning at the source.

For these reasons a university does not take an official position of its own either on disputed questions of scholarship or on political questions or matters of public policy. It refrains from so doing not only in its own but in the public interest, to capitalize the search for knowledge for the benefit of society, to give the individuals pursuing that search the freest possible scope and the greatest possible encouragement in their efforts to preserve the learning of the past and advance learning in the present. The scholar who pursues the search on these terms does so at maximum advantage to society. So does the student. To the scholar lie open new discoveries in the whole field of knowledge, to his student the opportunity of sharing in those discoveries and at the same time developing his powers of rational thought, intelligent judgment, and an understanding use of acquired knowledge. Thus essential qualities of learning are combined with essential qualities of citizenship in a free society.

To fulfill their function the members of university faculties must continue to analyze, test, criticize, and reassess existing institutions and beliefs, approving when the evidence supports them and disapproving when the weight of evidence is on the other side. Such investigations cannot be confined to the physical world. The acknowledged fact that moral, social, and political progress have not kept pace with mastery of the physical world shows the need for more intensified research, fresh insights, vigorous criticism, and inventiveness. The scholar's mission requires the study and examination of unpopular ideas, of ideas considered abhorrent and even dangerous. For, just as in the case of deadly disease or the military potential of an enemy, it is only by intense study and research that the nature and extent of the danger can be understood and defenses against it perfected.

Timidity must not lead the scholar to stand silent when he ought to speak, particularly in the field of his competence. In matters of conscience and when he has truth to proclaim the scholar has no obligation to be silent in the face of popular disapproval. Some of the great passages in the history of truth have involved the open challenge

of popular prejudice in times of tension such as those in which we live.

What applies to research applies equally to teaching. So long as an instructor's observations are scholarly and germane to his subject, his freedom of expression in his classroom should not be curbed. The university student should be exposed to competing opinions and beliefs in every field, so that he may learn to weigh them and gain maturity of judgment. Honest and skillful exposition of such opinions and beliefs is the duty of every instructor; and it is equally his privilege to express his own critical opinion and the reasons for holding it. In teaching, as in research, he is limited by the requirements of citizenship, of professional competence and good taste. Having met those standards, he is entitled to all the protection the full resources of the university can provide.

Whatever criticism is occasioned by these practices, the universities are committed to them by their very nature. To curb them, in the hope of avoiding criticism, would mean distorting the true process of learning and depriving society of its benefits. It would invite the fate of the German and Italian universities under fascism and the Russian universities under communism. It would deny our society one of its most fruitful sources of strength and welfare and represent a sinister change in our ideal of government.

III. THE OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

We must recognize the fact that honest men hold differing opinions. This fundamental truth underlies the assertion and definition of individual rights and freedom in our Bill of Rights. How does it apply to universities? In the eyes of the law, the university scholar has no more and no less freedom than his fellow citizens outside a university. Nonetheless, because of the vital importance of the university to civilization, membership in its society of scholars enhances the prestige of persons admitted to its fellowship after probation and upon the basis of achievement in research and teaching. The university supplies a distinctive forum and, in so doing, strengthens the scholar's voice. When his opinions challenge existing orthodox points of view, his freedom may be more in need of defense than that of men in other professions. The guarantee of tenure to professors of mature and proven scholarship is one such defense. As in the case of judges, tenure protects the scholar against undue economic or political pressures and ensures the continuity of the scholarly process.

There is a line at which "freedom" or "privilege" begins to be qualified by legal "duty" and "obligation." The determination of the line is the function of the legislature and the courts. The ultimate interpretation and application of the First and Fourteenth Amendments are the function of the United States Supreme Court; but every public official is bound by his oath of office to respect and preserve the liberties guaranteed therein. These are not to be determined arbitrarily or by public outcry. The line thus drawn can be changed by legislative and judicial action; it has varied in the past because of prevailing anxieties as well as by reason of "clear and present" danger. Its location is subject to, and should receive, criticism both popular and judicial. However much the location of the line may be criticized, it cannot be disregarded with impunity. Any member of a university who crosses the duly established line is not excused by the fact that he believes the line ill-drawn. When the speech, writing, or other actions of a member of a faculty exceed lawful limits, he is subject to the same penalties as other persons. In addition, he may lose his university status.

Historically the word "university" is a guaranty of standards. It implies endorse-

ment not of its members' views but of their capability and integrity. Every scholar has an obligation to maintain this reputation. By ill-advised, though not illegal, public acts or utterances he may do serious harm to his profession, his university, to education, and to the general welfare. He bears a heavy responsibility to weigh the validity of his opinions and the manner in which they are expressed. His effectiveness, both as scholar and teacher, is not reduced but enhanced if he has the humility and the wisdom to recognize the fallibility of his own judgment. He should remember that he is as much a layman as anyone else in all fields except those in which he has special competence. Others, both within and without the university, are as free to criticize his opinions as he is free to express them.

As in all acts of association, the professor accepts conventions which become morally binding. Above all, he owes his colleagues in the university complete candor and perfect integrity, precluding any kind of clandestine or conspiratorial activities. He owes equal candor to the public. If he is called upon to answer for his convictions it is his duty as a citizen to speak out. It is even more definitely his duty as a professor. Refusal to do so, on whatever legal grounds, cannot fail to reflect upon a profession that claims for itself the fullest freedom to speak and the maximum protection of that freedom available in our society. In this respect, invocation of the fifth amendment places upon a professor a heavy burden of proof of his fitness to hold a teaching position and lays upon his university an obligation to reexamine his qualifications for membership in its society.

In all universities, faculties exercise wide authority in internal affairs. The greater their autonomy, the greater their share of responsibility to the public. They must maintain the highest standards and exercise the utmost wisdom in appointments and promotions. They must accept their share of responsibility for the discipline of those who fall short in the discharge of their academic trust.

The universities owe their existence to legislative acts and public charters. A State university exists by constitutional and legislative acts, an endowed university enjoys its independence by franchise from the State and by custom. The State university is supported by public funds. The privately sustained university is benefited by tax exemptions. Such benefits are conferred upon the universities not as favors but in furtherance of the public interest. They carry with them public obligation of direct concern to the faculties of the universities as well as to the governing boards.

Legislative bodies from time to time may scrutinize these benefits and privileges. It is clearly the duty of universities and their members to cooperate in official inquiries directed to those ends. When the powers of legislative inquiry are abused, the remedy does not lie in noncooperation or defiance; it is to be sought through the normal channels of informed public opinion.

IV. THE PRESENT DANGER

We have set forth the nature and function of the university. We have outlined its rights and responsibilities and those of its faculties. What are the implications of current anxiety over Russian communism and the subversive activities connected with it?

We condemn Russian communism as we condemn every form of totalitarianism. We share the profound concern of the American people at the existence of an international conspiracy whose goal is the destruction of our cherished institutions. The police state would be the death of our universities, as of our Government. Three of its principles in particular are abhorrent to us: The fomenting of worldwide revolution as a step to seizing power; the use of falsehood and deceit as normal means of persuasion; thought con-

trol—the dictation of doctrines which must be accepted and taught by all party members. Under these principles, no scholar could adequately disseminate knowledge or pursue investigations in the effort to make further progress toward truth.

Appointment to a university position and retention after appointment require not only professional competence but involve the affirmative obligation of being diligent and loyal in citizenship. Above all, a scholar must have integrity and independence. This renders impossible adherence to such a regime as that of Russia and its satellites. No person who accepts or advocates such principles and methods has any place in a university. Since present membership in the Communist Party requires the acceptance of these principles and methods, such membership extinguishes the right to a university position. Moreover, if an instructor follows communistic practice by becoming a propagandist for one opinion, adopting a "party line," silencing criticism or impairing freedom of thought and expression in his classroom, he forfeits not only all university support but his right to membership in the university.

"Academic freedom" is not a shield for those who break the law. Universities must cooperate fully with law-enforcement officers whose duty requires them to prosecute those charged with offenses. Under a well-established American principle their innocence is to be assumed until they have been convicted, under due process, in a court of proper jurisdiction.

Unless a faculty member violates a law, however, his discipline or discharge is a university responsibility and should not be assumed by political authority. Discipline on the basis of irresponsible accusations or suspicion can never be condoned. It is as damaging to the public welfare as it is to academic integrity. The university is competent to establish a tribunal to determine the facts and fairly judge the nature and degree of any trespass upon academic integrity, as well as to determine the penalty such trespass merits.

As the professor is entitled to no special privileges in law, so also he should be subject to no special discrimination. Universities are bound to deprecate special loyalty tests which are applied to their faculties but to which others are not subjected. Such discrimination does harm to the individual and even greater harm to his university and the whole cause of education by destroying faith in the ideals of university scholarship.

V. CONCLUSION

Finally, we assert that freedom of thought and speech is vital to the maintenance of the American system and is essential to the general welfare. Condemnation of communism and its protagonists is not to be interpreted as readiness to curb social, political, or economic investigation and research. To insist upon conformity to current beliefs and practices would do infinite harm to the principle of freedom, which is the greatest, the central, American doctrine. Fidelity to that principle has made it possible for the universities of America to confer great benefits upon our society and our country. Adherence to that principle is the only guarantee that the Nation may continue to enjoy those benefits.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Brown University, Providence, R. I.: Henry M. Wriston, president.

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.: Lee A. DuBridge, president; Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.: Patrick J. McCormick, rector; Clark University, Worcester, Mass.: Howard B. Jefferson, president; Columbia University, New York, N. Y.: Grayson Kirk, president; Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.: Deane W. Malott, president.

Duke University, Durham, N. C.: A. Hollis Edens, president.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.: Paul H. Buck, chairman, administrative committee.

Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.: Herman B. Wells, president.

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.: D. W. Bronk, president.

McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada: F. Cyril James, principal; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.: J. R. Killian, Jr., president.

Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.: J. Roscoe Miller, president.

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio: Howard L. Bevis, president.

Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.: Harold W. Dodds, president.

Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.: John E. W. Sterling, president; State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa: Virgil M. Hancher, president.

University of California, Berkeley, Calif.: Robert G. Sproul, president; University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.: Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor; University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.: George D. Stoddard, president; University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.: Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Harlan H. Hatcher, president; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.: J. L. Morrill, president; University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.: F. A. Middlebush, president; University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.: R. G. Gustavson, chancellor.

New York University, New York, N. Y.: Henry T. Heald, chancellor.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.: Gordon Gray, president; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.: William H. DuBarry, acting president; University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.: C. W. de Kiewiet, president; University of Texas, Austin, Tex.: James P. Hart, chancellor; University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Sidney E. Smith, president.

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.: Bennett Harvie Branscomb, chancellor.

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.: Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president; University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.: Edwin B. Fred, president; Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.: Arthur H. Compton, chancellor; University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.: Henry B. Schmitz, president.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.: A. Whitney Griswold, president.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes, on the subject of European refugees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey that he be permitted, by unanimous consent, to speak for not to exceed 2 minutes? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was unable to be present last week when the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] introduced, in line with President Eisenhower's request, S. 1746, a bill to assist in alleviating the current immigration and refugee problem by providing for the issuance of 240,000 special immigrant visas during fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

Ever since I first visited the displaced persons camps in 1947, I have been keenly aware of the deep yearning of many people in the satellite countries of eastern Europe for freedom and independence. Their courage in leaving their homes and all their possessions to seek freedom, and in rejecting the false security offered by Russian communism—which they knew would be slavery—has been a real challenge to us all. We can do no less than help solve this difficult problem and relieve the population pressures on western Europe, by being willing to cooperate with other peoples to find homes and a new start in life for these twentieth century patriots who, like our ancestors, are saying "Give us liberty or give us death."

I am making this statement today because I wish to associate myself with this proposal of President Eisenhower's and with my colleagues in introducing the appropriate bill to carry out the President's proposal. I appreciated the action yesterday of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in asking that I be permitted to be listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

I join with my colleagues in their commendable efforts to alleviate the suffering of these refugees, many of whom have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain.

THE VISA FUNCTION UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADDRESS BY FRANK L. AUERBACH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in an address before the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, on April 16, 1953, Mr. Frank L. Auerbach, Foreign Affairs officer of the Visa Office, Department of State, so very clearly portrayed many of the most important provisions of the new Immigration and Nationality Act, that I ask unanimous consent to have his address, entitled "The Visa Function Under the Immigration and Nationality Act," printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

THE VISA FUNCTION UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

I am glad to be here today and to review with you some of the more important changes the Immigration and Nationality Act has brought about in relation to the visa function of the Department of State.

The new law, commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act, became effective on December 24, 1952, and thus has been in operation for less than 4 months, a rather brief period to assess its effect in any thorough fashion. But compared with the old law, the new act has brought about certain changes in our immigration laws and consequently in implementing regulations, the effect of which can already clearly be recognized in the day-by-day operations. I should like to discuss with you some of these changes.

One of the most important changes, if not the most important change, brought about by the new law, is that it eliminates racial discrimination from naturalization and makes aliens of all races eligible for immigration into the United States.

Before the new act became operative on December 24, 1952, the Immigration Act of

February 5, 1917, provided for the so-called Asiatic barred zone, natives of which with few exceptions could not come to the United States as immigrants. In addition, the Immigration Act of 1924 made ineligible for immigration all persons who under our nationality laws were barred from naturalization. These provisions of the 1924 act made ineligible for immigration, among others, natives of Korea and Japan. In recent years this resulted in many unfortunate situations, particularly in the case of American servicemen who married Japanese or Korean girls only to discover that under the then applicable immigration laws they could not bring their wives into the United States.

In providing for the immigration of persons of Asian ancestry, the Immigration and Nationality Act follows, generally speaking, the pattern set up in 1943 when the Congress, upon the urging of President Roosevelt, repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act and set up a quota for Chinese persons. Different from the case of other immigrants whose quota is determined by place of birth, the law provided in the case of Chinese persons that ancestry rather than place of birth was to be the determining factor in establishing an alien's quota. A similar formula was allowed in 1946 when Congress set up a quota for East Indians.

As stated already, the new law follows in general the formula of the 1943 act as to the determination of quota chargeability of Asian peoples with some very significant liberalizing exceptions. Under the old law the East Indian husband, wife or child, and the Chinese husband and child of an American citizen could enter the United States only as quota immigrants, which mostly meant many years of waiting due to the smallness of, and the heavy demand on, these quotas. The new law accords non-quota status to any child, wife, and husband of an American citizen, regardless of their ancestry or race.

The salutary effect of this liberalization can be observed in the day by day work in the Visa Office of the Department of State.

The quota chargeability of an Asian immigrant who is not entitled to nonquota status is determined by his place of birth if he is born within the so-called Asia-Pacific Triangle, covering roughly all Asian countries from India to Japan and all Pacific Islands north of Australia and New Zealand. In other words, a Japanese person born in Korea is chargeable to the Korean quota while an East Indian born in Japan is chargeable to the Japanese quota. If an immigrant who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific Triangle is born outside of the Triangle his quota is determined by his ancestry rather than by his place of birth. Due to specific statutory provisions Chinese persons who are quota immigrants are always chargeable to the Chinese quota regardless of whether they are born within or without the Asia-Pacific Triangle.

Apart from the provisions relating to the immigration of Asian peoples the national origins system in allocating immigration quotas has by and large been continued in the new act from the Immigration Act of 1924.

A new provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act places a ceiling of 100 on the number of quota visas which may be issued to natives of colonies and dependencies who are chargeable to the quota of the governing country. For example, natives of Malta, Hong Kong, Bermuda, or Trinidad who are chargeable to the quota of Great Britain may not be issued in any one year more than 100 visas each of the total quota of Great Britain. This new provision has particular significance in the Portuguese and Spanish quotas where the colonies may absorb all of the mother country's quota.

In order to facilitate the administration of this provision of the law the Department

of State has established by regulation so-called subquotas of 100 each. The term sub-quota designates that portion of the quota of a governing country which may be made available, subject to a limitation of 100 annually, to quota immigrants born in any colony or other component or dependent areas overseas from the governing country. Chargeable to such subquotas is, as a rule, any quota immigrant born in a colony, component, or dependent area. The Department has determined that there are at present a total of 78 subquotas of 8 countries: the quota for Great Britain and Northern Ireland has 44 subquotas; France, 16 subquotas; Portugal, 8 subquotas; Spain and the Netherlands, 3 subquotas each; India, 2 subquotas; and Belgium and Denmark 1 sub-quota each. Nine of the 44 subquotas of Great Britain are allocated to British colonies and dependent areas in the Western Hemisphere. They are the Bahamas, Barbadoes, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad, and Windward Islands.

Another significant change brought about by the new law is the system of preferences within quotas. Under the old law the first 50 percent of a quota was available to parents, and to husbands by marriages since January 1, 1948, of American citizens, and in the case of quotas over 300, to so-called skilled agriculturists. The next 50 percent of the quota was available to the wives and children of permanent resident aliens. Those portions of a quota not used by either preference group was available to all other immigrants sometimes referred to as new seed immigrants, because they had no close ties in the United States.

Under the new law relative preferences have been expanded and in addition a system of selective immigration has been introduced. The first 50 percent of each quota is first available to so-called skilled aliens whose services are needed urgently in the United States because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. The next 30 percent of each quota is available to parents of American citizens and the remaining 20 percent to spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Any portion not used by any of these three preference groups is first available to aliens in any of the other preference groups and if not required by them becomes available to nonpreference quota immigrants. Twenty-five percent of this portion of the quota not used by the first 3 preference groups, however, is made available to a so-called fourth preference quota group consisting of brothers and sisters of American citizens, and to the sons and daughters of American citizens who do not qualify for nonquota status because they are married or over 21 years of age.

Up to this time the number of aliens who have been found qualified for the so-called first preference quota has been rather small, probably due to the fact that this new preference for skilled aliens, which it is expected will eventually benefit American economy and industry, has not yet become well known. There has been a considerable demand for fourth preference quota visas particularly by brothers and sisters of American citizens who through this new preference find their cases considered ahead of those aliens without such close family ties in the United States.

The introduction of the system of selective immigration was accompanied by another significant change in our immigration law. The new law did not reenact the so-called contract labor provisions but has substituted provisions designed to safeguard American labor more effectively and more flexibly. The contract labor provisions of the old law, with few exceptions, excluded from admission into the United States aliens who were promised or had a contract for labor in the United

States which was predominantly manual in character. The purpose of this provision was to protect American labor from competition of immigrant labor. The new law approaches this problem differently.

Immigrants who seek to enter the United States to perform skilled or unskilled labor are barred from admission only if the Secretary of Labor certifies to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General a sufficiency of workers in the United States who are able, willing, and qualified to perform at the place to which the alien is destined such skilled or unskilled labor as the alien is seeking to perform, or that the employment of certain immigrants will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. In the absence of such certification by the Secretary of Labor this provision is inoperative. So far, the Secretary of Labor has not made a certification as contemplated by the law. The scope of this potential ground for exclusion is limited. Even after the Secretary of Labor has made a certification as to the sufficiency of labor in a given locality, the resulting excluding provision applies only to nonpreference quota immigrants and immigrants entitled to nonquota status as natives of the Western Hemisphere or as former American citizens. It does not apply to any of the other nonquota immigrant categories or to preference quota immigrants.

The abolition of the contract labor provisions of the old law has a significance which affects another important requirement of the law. Both under the old and new law an immigrant may be issued a visa only if he can show that he will not become a public charge in the United States. Unless the alien had at his disposal in this country funds of his own, proof that he was not likely to become a public charge under the old law usually was presented by the submission of a so-called affidavit of support from a relative or close friend in the United States who expressed his willingness and showed his ability to take care of the alien in such way that he would not become a public charge. The presentation of a work contract in this connection was unacceptable unless the alien's vocation was predominantly mental.

The presentation of a work contract for manual employment not only did not overcome the likelihood of becoming a public charge but led mandatorily to the denial of a visa under the contract labor provisions. Under the new law the presentation of a work contract may in some cases very well be the sole proof required by the consul to satisfy the requirement of the law that the alien not be likely to become a public charge.

The law contains another new provision which permits an immigrant in certain cases to overcome a likelihood of becoming a public charge. In the case of an alien ineligible to receive a visa because he is likely to become a public charge a bond may be posted with the Attorney General. Under the State Department visa regulations the posting of such bond with the Attorney General will be accepted by the consular officer as satisfactory proof that the alien is not likely to become a public charge in the United States.

At this point I should like to comment briefly on the public charge provision of the statute as it is implemented by the regulations of the Department of State. In the language of the statute an alien is ineligible to receive a visa if in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa, the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge. Under the Department's regulations any conclusion that an alien, eligible to receive a visa, is likely to become a public charge must "be predicated upon the existence of facts or circumstances which indicate a reasonable probability that the immigrant will become a charge upon the public after entry into the United States."

Another provision of the new law relating to the issuance of visas to immigrants is of

considerable significance. Since the Alien Registration Act became law in 1940 and until the new law took effect, not only present but also former members of proscribed organizations were excluded from admission into the United States. In other words, under the old law an alien who was a member of the Communist Party some 20 years ago, but had long since terminated his membership, could not be issued an immigration visa even if he had become one of the most outspoken and effective fighters against communism.

For the first time an escape clause for former voluntary members of proscribed organizations is provided by the new act. It contains a defector clause which permits the issuance of an immigrant visa to former voluntary members of proscribed organizations if the alien since the termination of his membership, and for at least 5 years before the date of his visa application, has been actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles and ideology of the proscribed organization to which he belonged. The issuance of a visa to such an alien is conditioned on a finding that his admission into the United States would be in the public interest. Visa regulations of the Department of State provide that in the interest of a coordinated and uniform interpretation of what constitutes the public interest in issuing or refusing visas to political defectors, all such cases will be referred by the field to the Secretary of State for possible consultation with the Attorney General.

Another change in our immigration laws which affects the visa function of the Department of State should be mentioned. The new law eliminates the discrimination between sexes which could be found both in the Immigration Act of February 7, 1917, and in the act of 1924. Under the old law an American citizen could bring to this country his alien wife as a nonquota immigrant; but an American woman could bring her alien husband by marriage since January 1, 1948, only as a preference quota immigrant. An alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence could bring his wife to this country as a preference quota immigrant while an alien woman lawfully admitted to this country could bring her alien husband only as a non-preference quota immigrant which in the case of smaller quotas meant considerable and often indefinite delay. If an immigrant husband and wife were born in two different countries and the wife was chargeable to an oversubscribed quota while the husband was chargeable to an open quota, under the old law the wife could be charged to her husband's quota. But the reverse did not apply. In other words, a husband chargeable to an oversubscribed quota could not be charged to the open quota of his accompanying wife. These and many other provisions of the old law which discriminated against women have all been eliminated under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Wives have been given the same status in all respects as are granted to husbands. In other words, an alien husband of an American woman may be issued a nonquota visa as can the alien wife of an American citizen; and an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence may bring his spouse as preference quota immigrant regardless of whether the preceding spouse is the husband or the wife.

One new feature of the Immigration and Nationality Act which refers both to immigrants and nonimmigrants is the requirement that visa petitions be filed with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the case of aliens coming temporarily to the United States for employment or training and in the case of all preference quota and nonpreference quota immigrants except those who are nonquota immigrants due to their birth in the Western Hemisphere.

The petition procedure in these cases rests exclusively with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Upon the approval of

a petition by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of State is notified and in turn forwards to the consular offices abroad the Attorney General's classification of the alien.

Some questions have arisen as to whether certain nonimmigrant aliens coming to the United States temporarily are to be considered temporary workers requiring petitions, or visitors for business in whose case a nonimmigrant visa may be issued without the prior approval of a petition. Since it was obviously the intent of the law to protect by the petition requirement American labor, the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have agreed that certain classes of nonimmigrant aliens who are coming to the United States temporarily for noncompensatory and noncompetitive employment or instruction may properly be classified as visitors for business. For example, various American firms who have purchased abroad machinery or other equipment and have arranged for expert personnel to install in this country such machinery and to instruct the American personnel in its operation. These aliens, it has been agreed, will be considered visitors for business and may, therefore, be issued visitors' visas without a prior petition if they continue to draw their pay from their foreign employer and receive from the American firm not more than a subsistence allowance and reimbursement for other expenses incidental to their temporary stay in this country.

Another example is that of a group of ministers of religion, who for years have been coming from England in exchange with American ministers going to England during the summer months. These ministers coming from England continue to draw their salary in England, and are the guests in this country of the American church at which they serve or of its members. Here again it has been held that a visitor for business visa may properly be issued rather than a visa requiring a visa petition.

A third group of aliens is considered qualified for classification as visitors for business rather than as temporary workers. These are aliens brought to the United States temporarily by American exporters who are selling American goods abroad and who bring these aliens to this country in order to familiarize them with the manufacture, service, or sales methods of the American product. The Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State have agreed that these aliens may be classified visitors for business if the nature of their instruction is predominantly mental; if securing this instruction benefits the American national interest; and if these aliens continue to draw their pay from their foreign employer who may be a foreign branch of an American firm, and receive from the American firm not more than a subsistence allowance and reimbursement for other expenses incidental to their temporary stay.

In view of the concern sometimes expressed about the allegedly unlimited power of consular officers in refusing visas, I should like to discuss, as a final point, the administrative procedures surrounding the refusal and revocation of immigrant visas.

When an immigrant visa is refused by a consular officer a memorandum of refusal is prepared and retained in the consular file. The action of refusing an immigrant visa by a consular officer has to be reviewed by the consular officer in charge of visa work at the foreign post. If this superior officer concurs in the refusal, he has to countersign the memorandum of refusal. If he does not concur in the refusal, the case is referred to the Department for an advisory opinion.

Once an immigrant visa is issued it may be revoked only under the following circumstances: (1) The consular officer knows, or after investigation is satisfied, that the visa was procured by fraud, willingly false or misleading representation, the willful

concealment of a material fact, or other unlawful means; or (2) the consular officer obtains information establishing the alien was otherwise ineligible to receive the particular visa at the time it was issued.

Notice of revocation, if practicable, is to be given to the alien at his last known address before his departure for the United States. Whenever circumstances permit, the alien will also be given opportunity to show why he believes revocation to be, or to have been, unwarranted.

Once an immigrant visa has been revoked a full report concerning the revocation has to be submitted to the Department of State for transmission to the Attorney General. If it was not practicable to give the alien notice of revocation before his departure for the United States, the report submitted to the Department of State has to explain all the pertinent circumstances in the case.

In addition to this procedure prescribed by regulations it has long been the administrative practice of the Visa Office to entertain inquiries by attorneys and other interested persons in the United States concerning the disposition of visa cases. If there is no case record in the Department on the case in which an inquiry is received a request for a report on the case will be directed to the field. If on the basis of the facts available in the Department or upon the report received from the field it is found that the handling of the case by the consular officer is not consistent with the Department's interpretation of law and regulations and appropriate advisory opinion will be dispatched to the consular officer having jurisdiction in the case.

In this connection, I should like to refer to the provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act which establishes that determination and ruling by the Attorney General with respect to all questions of law are controlling for all agencies entrusted with the administration of this law. Therefore, the interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act by the Department of State is not only guided by pertinent court decisions but also by rulings and requested opinions of the Attorney General.

These are some of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which have been given little, if any, publicity, but which are of considerable importance to those administering the law and particularly to those who are affected by the law, the immigrant, the nonimmigrant and their sponsors and representatives in this country.

Of course, it is unavoidable that a new law dealing with a subject matter as complicated as that of immigration will raise problems, many of which cannot be recognized until the law has been in operation for some time. As far as the first 4 months of the law's operations are concerned, it has not presented any serious operational difficulties in the visa field which could not be resolved by reasonable interpretation or adjustment of administrative procedures.

The Visa Office of the Department of State, by the issuance of instructions and advisory opinions, is doing all in its power to assist consular officers throughout the world to achieve as uniform an interpretation of the law as is possible. And we shall continue our efforts to interpret the visa provisions of the law reasonably and fairly and consistent with the intent of Congress as this intent is reflected in the language of the law and its legislative history.

TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS IN COMMUNIST PORTS — ARTICLE FROM THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' JOURNAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the March issue of the International Transport Workers' Journal, published monthly by the International Transport Workers' Federation,

which has its head office in London. This magazine is printed in the Netherlands.

This particular issue contains an article on the treatment of seafarers in Communist ports, which I believe my colleagues will find extremely interesting, especially in view of the many false charges which have been made, by those who are seeking to overthrow our immigration laws, respecting alleged hardships suffered by alien seamen coming to our shores.

Here is a magazine published by a workers' organization, for workers in the transport industry, including seamen; and the particular article to which I have referred reports what happened to some French seamen who had to enter ports in a satellite country, a country behind the Iron Curtain.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS IN COMMUNIST PORTS

From Air-Terre-Mer, the monthly journal published by the ITF Mediterranean vigilance committee, we reproduce the following pertinent comments on the reception given to foreign seafarers visiting the ports of Iron Curtain countries:

"We have one request to make to all those who have registered protests, which have often been out of proportion to the facts themselves, in regard to the application of the McCarran Act to the crews of foreign ships arriving in American ports; and to all those who find nothing to say against the conditions imposed on crews which have to enter ports in the satellite countries of Eastern Germany and Poland. Let them consider carefully the remarks just made to us by some seamen returning from precisely those happy shores.

"We spoke at length with these French sailors, who were members of the crew on the SS. *Bastia* returning from Gdansk (Danzig) and Gdynia (Poland).

"Without hesitation they told about their voyage and their troubles, the gist of which is as follows:

"After unloading our cargo at the port of Aarhus, in Denmark, we headed for Gdansk and got in there one night this winter. The moment we arrived, our ship was literally invaded by a horde of armed police. All of us wondered what we had done and what was going on, but nobody could tell us.

"The policemen, many of whom were fairly young boys, were arrogant, and they were obviously carrying out what was to them a routine job of control and supervision.

"They suddenly decided that the entire crew was to be detained and herded us into the wardroom, where we stayed from 7 o'clock that evening until 5 the next morning. We were guarded all night by two sentinels with submachine guns, who stood at the door, evidently ready to shoot down the first person who gave signs of moving.

"During this time the policemen, accompanied by only one of our ship's officers, conducted a thorough search of the ship. The crew's quarters were gone through without the presence of a single member of the personnel.

"The day after our arrival, each sailor received a landing permit. This, however, was refused to eight members of the crew without rhyme or reason. Among these were the boatswain, the second-class petty officer and an officer, who were never given any explanation for this refusal.

"Though we had a certain amount of painting to do along the sides while we were there, the boatswain who had been refused a landing permit was not even allowed to go down to supervise his men's work.

"After loading, the ship left for Gdynia, where we were to stay for some time and take on the rest of our cargo.

"There one of our nonadmitted seamen, who was suffering from a phlegmon, had to wait many days before he could get authorization to go to a hospital, even accompanied and under guard, for the necessary treatment.

"One of us had a small stock of coffee which he had picked up during a stop in the Philippines. When he went ashore, he had the idea of swapping his precious coffee for merchandise, but the police arrested him, jailed him for the night, and fined him \$50. Since the seaman did not have that much money, the captain of the ship had to settle the fine for him."

"Here is one amusing incident which occurred among many grimmer ones:

"While we were in the Gdansk roadstead, there was an Italian ship next to us. Its cat came on board our ship to explore, and we set out for Gdynia without having returned the animal to our southern neighbors. When the Italians reached Gdynia, they entered a formal claim for their cat. Pussy's return was like a vaudeville act. It took place on the pier halfway between the two ships. Each of the two sailors—the Frenchman and the Italian—had a special pass, and the whole operation was carried out under heavy police supervision.

"There is not much to say about the few chances we had to visit the streets of Gdynia. What could we learn? It was difficult to find out anything, for we felt that we were being constantly followed and spied on.

"The basic Polish monetary unit, the zloty, had no great value, being worth approximately 100 francs. But a half-pint bottle of vodka now costs 24 zlotys (2,500 francs). In the shop windows we saw men's suits priced between 3,000 and 4,000 zlotys, and a kilogram of coffee at 400 zlotys (40,000 francs). One of us who was wearing a silk scarf that had cost 2,000 francs in France was approached by a laborer who offered him 100 zlotys (10,000 francs) for it.

"We had nothing to sell and found nothing to buy in this country of fearful, unhappy people who seem to live under the shadow of an indefinable terror.

"When the day of our departure finally came, the whole crew was again assembled in the wardroom and kept under guard from noon until 6 o'clock, as a Gdansk. This time there were a number of women members of the armed police who went all over the ship, visiting the freight holds, the coal bunkers, the storerooms, the crew's quarters, and even the water ballast. Finally, after this delightful group had left, we were allowed to get underway."

"There is nothing debatable about the strictness, the brutality, and the bestial and stupid measures applied to foreign crews in the popular democracies. Both French and Italian seafarers who visit these ports are constantly exposed to them.

"However, those political figures, journalists, and more or less well-intentioned people who protest against the controls exercised by the American Immigration Service are the same ones who either approve the savage intransigence of the popular democracies or find nothing to say against it. The surprising thing is that they can find other innocents to go along with them."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further unanimous-consent requests, or other similar matters, the transaction of morning business is concluded.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate heard an excellent address by the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TATE], in support of the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13. Last night the Senate heard a reply thereto by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I rise to express the hope that all Members of the Senate will read those two addresses. They present the basic issues which are before the Senate in this controversy.

As stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], his contention, and the contention of the Supreme Court in its 3 recent opinions, is that the Federal Government has inherent powers of external sovereignty not given to it by the Constitution of the United States, and that those inherent powers of external sovereignty should be applied in the present domestic dispute within the borders of the United States.

So that there may be no mistake about it, the lands within the 3-mile and 3-league boundaries are within the Nation and within the States. They are within the United States the same as any of the dry land of the continent. That is the theory of the State Department; and when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] argues that inherent sovereignty in external affairs, based upon the dictum in the Curtiss-Wright case, should apply to lands within the borders of this country, he is trying to apply international law and external sovereignty to the domestic affairs of the Nation.

The Secretary of State sent a representative, Mr. Tate, to appear before our committee. He testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the area referred to, within our territorial waters, is a part of our Nation, just as all the other territory within our boundaries. His testimony will be found at page 1074 of the hearings. I questioned Mr. Tate, and he replied as follows:

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Tate, right along the line that Senator Long was questioning you about as to the lands within our territorial waters, using your theory of the 3-mile limit for the purpose of this question, as I understand it this country recognizes that that area is part of the United States.

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. The same as its land territory.

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. And domestic law applies.

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. As Wheaton said in his book on Elements of International Law in 1836, "Within these limits," that is, out to the limit of the territorial waters, "a country's rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute and exclude those of other nations." Is that correct?

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. That is the view of this Nation?

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Mr. President, this view was further expressed by the United States at The Hague Convention in 1930, at which this Nation agreed that—

The seabottom and subsoil covered by the territorial waters, including fish and minerals, are the property of the United States or of the individual States where they border.

In other words, Mr. President, it is clear that as to the area within the boundaries of the States 3 miles from shore and 3 leagues in the case of Florida and Texas, recognized by Mr. Tate later in his testimony, the lands are within our country, and domestic law should apply. But what would the Senator from Minnesota have us apply? Contrary to the majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota would apply, not the Constitution or domestic law but external law and international law on the basis of the dictum in the Curtiss-Wright case. The Senator from Minnesota argues that the States were never sovereign; that the proprietary rights of the Crown passed to the Nation instead of the individual States.

Mr. President, many Court decisions rendered in the past which applied domestic law to controversies between the Federal Government and the States as to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. In order not to take the time of the Senate unnecessarily, I shall ask unanimous consent that I may have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks quotations from several Supreme Court decisions, which hold that all rights and property of the Crown passed, on July 4, 1776, not to a national sovereign, not to the United States, but to the 13 States as separate and independent States. Each State succeeded to all rights and properties of the Crown within its own jurisdiction and territory.

Mr. President, last night the Senator from Minnesota argued that the States were never sovereign.

The issue is drawn now as to whether we want to go along with him or with our history and other Court decisions that the original States were independent and sovereign, as was set forth in the Treaty of Paris, and in the Articles of Confederation. It is an argument which has been waging since Justice Sutherland's dictum in the Curtiss-Wright case, to which Senator HUMPHREY adheres. But when we come to apply the question to domestic law, even Justice Sutherland said the Constitution should control. On that basis the Supreme Court has said that proprietary rights of the King passed to the individual States. It seems to me that the former decisions of the Supreme Court are entitled to some weight, and that three recent decisions contrary to the belief expressed in all former decisions of the Court should not be allowed to prevail for the future on the part of those who believe in States' rights as we understand them in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain quotations, which fully support the views of the majority

leader, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. A few of the leading Supreme Court cases holding that the States, independently, succeeded to all rights of the Crown are:

Martin v. Waddell (16 Pet. 367, 410 (1842)): "For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the general government."

Shively v. Bowlby (152 U. S. 1, 14-16 (1894)):

"And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several States, subject to the rights surrendered to the national Government by the Constitution of the United States."

Appleby v. City of New York (271 U. S. 364, 381 (1926)):

"Upon the American Revolution, all the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament, in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewater vested in the several States, subject to the powers surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States."

County of St. Clair v. Lovington (90 U. S. 46, at 68 (1874)):

"By the American Revolution the people of each State, in their sovereign character, acquired the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soil under them. The shores of navigable waters and the soil under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

Massachusetts v. New York (271 U. S. 65, 85-86 (1926)):

"The English possessions in America were claimed by right of discovery. The rights of property and dominion in the lands discovered by those acting under royal authority were held to vest in the Crown, which under the principles of the British Constitution was deemed to hold them as a part of the public domain for the benefit of the Nation. Upon these principles rest the various English royal charters and grants of territory on the continent of North America (*Johnson v. McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543, 577 et seq. 595)). As a result of the Revolution, the people of each State became sovereign and in that capacity acquired the rights of the Crown in the public domain (*Martin v. Waddell* (16 Peters 367, 410))."

Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Minnesota is predicated on the theory that the Federal Government may, solely by virtue of its powers over external affairs, appropriate to its own use real and personal property within State boundaries. This is certainly contrary to the law as we understood it to be prior to the recent court decisions. Such a theory, if allowed to prevail, will obliterate the constitutional distinction between governmental powers and proprietary rights in land, and will nullify the constitutional principle that the grant of powers to the Federal Government carries with it no cession or transfer of property rights, a principle which has been long recognized by our courts.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD quotations from three additional cases, which make it clear that the majority leader was right when he

said that under our Constitution the States retained all their properties and rights that were not delegated specifically in the Constitution to the Federal Government, and that they did not cede waters or submerged lands as any part of maritime jurisdiction, commerce, external affairs or other Federal powers.

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

In *United States v. Bevens* (3 Wheat. 386 (1818)), Chief Justice Marshall said—page 388:

"Can the cession of all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction be construed into a cession of the waters in which those cases may arise? This is a question on which the court is incapable of feeling a doubt. The article which describes the jurisdictional power of the United States is not intended for the cession of territory, or of general jurisdiction. It is obviously designed for other purposes. It is in the eighth section of the second article, we are to look for cessations of territory and of exclusive jurisdiction. * * * It is observable that the power of exclusive legislation (which is jurisdiction) is united with cession of territory, which is to be the free act of the States."

In *Corfield v. Coryell* ((C. C. N. J. 1823) 6 Fed. Ed. Cas. No. 3230, pp. 546, 551), Mr. Justice Washington said:

"The grant to Congress to regulate commerce on the navigable waters belonging to the several States, renders those waters public property of the United States for all the purposes of navigation and commercial intercourse, subject only to congressional regulation. But this grant contains no cession, either express or implied, of territory, or of public or of private property."

In *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts* ((1838) 12 Peters 657, 733), the Supreme Court said:

"It follows that when a place is within the boundary, it is a part of the territory of a State; title, jurisdiction, and sovereignty are inseparable incidents, and remain so, till the State makes some cession. The plain language of this Court in *United States v. Bevens* (3 Wheat. 386 et seq.) saves the necessity of any reasoning on this subject. * * * Title, jurisdiction, sovereignty, are, therefore, dependent questions necessarily settled when boundary is ascertained."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have here an article written by Dean Roscoe Pound which fully supports the views of the majority leader and shows the dangers in the views stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. In the article Dean Roscoe Pound says:

If exercise of sovereignty for defense requires that the Government be owner, then there can no longer be private or State ownership of land. Under the conditions of warfare today the argument for national defense would make the United States owner of the whole land as well as of the shore of the sea and the sea adjacent to our territory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD quotations from Dean Pound in the *Baylor Law Review*, volume III, 1951, pages 120 to 125, entitled "Critique on the Texas Tidelands Case." He is referring to Justice Douglas' opinion in *United States against Texas*.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY DEAN ROSCOE POUND ON JUSTICE DOUGLAS' OPINION IN *UNITED STATES AGAINST TEXAS*

Four points, which, however, come down to one, are made in the opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas.

First, he tells us, the national interests, national responsibilities, and national concern, which are the basis of the paramount rights of the National Government in the California and Louisiana cases, are equally applicable to the Texas case. Accordingly, we must at the outset look at the opinion of Mr. Justice Black in *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19), and the opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in *United States v. Louisiana* (337 U. S. 699).

In the California case, Mr. Justice Black holds it an inescapable conclusion that "national interests, responsibilities, and therefore rights, are paramount in lands lying to the seaward of the 3-mile belt."

In the Louisiana case, Mr. Justice Douglas says: "The marginal sea is a national not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national concerns are involved. The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace, focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount there."² But as to such things as are specified, namely commerce with foreign states (e. g., obligations) and conduct of war, are not the rights or powers of the United States paramount also over the whole land? Such rights, incidents of external sovereignty, are not incompatible with ownership, dominion, as distinct from sovereignty. For example, the power of eminent domain of the Federal Government extends for Federal purposes over the whole land. Private land may be used for national defense throughout the whole land. It is not for that reason excluded from private ownership. Private land may be used for national defense throughout the country and is none the less private property because of this.

Section 4 of article IV of the Constitution provides that the United States shall protect each State against invasion. Hence defense on land no less than by sea is a national not a State concern. Hence, according to the reasoning in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, national rights must be paramount there, to the exclusion of ownership by a State or of private ownership. The fallacy lies in the assumption that they must be paramount for all other purposes as well as for the exigencies of defense. State ownership of land within its bounds and private ownership of parcels of such land are perfectly compatible with the paramount power of defense.

In all three of the points made in the opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas the argument gets down to the proposition that, although he concedes, what is universally agreed, that dominion and imperium are normally separable, yet as to the land beneath the marginal sea property is so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty.³ The proposition is not the common law, is not international law, and is not involved in, much less required by, the constitutional power and responsibilities of the United States.

As to the common law, from the time of Sir Matthew Hale's classical treatise *De Portibus Maris*, it has been settled that the title to the soil of the sea below high water mark is in the sovereign except so far as an individual or a corporation has acquired rights in it by express grant or by prescription or usage, and that this *jus privatum* or dominium, as distinct from sovereignty or imperium is subject to public right such as navigation and fishing, but is not excluded thereby.⁴ This was quoted and fortified by a long list of common law decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1894.⁵

While the Crown in Great Britain cannot alienate its sovereignty, it can grant estates in the soil beneath the marginal sea because as to that it has dominium which is separable from its sovereignty.⁶ Common-law lawyers and civilians have been agreed as to the nature of the right of the sovereign with respect to the land and subsoil of the marginal sea. Lord Cranworth said of the proposition that there was a property right, as distinct from sovereignty, "No one doubts that such a right exists."⁷ This was said to be "the result of all the best authorities—Scotch, English, and foreign" in *Lord Advocate v. Trustees of Clyde Navigation* (1891), citing numerous civilians and "judgments with respect inter alia to mineral under the sea."⁸ These cases and the authorities they cite show that dominium as to the foreshore and as to the bed of the marginal sea is exactly the same and quite independent of imperium or sovereignty, although they may coexist. The dominium may be granted. The imperium can be lost by conquest or by cession to another sovereign. It cannot be granted.

As to international law, the distinction has been made from the time of Grotius.⁹

Nor is the proposition that dominium and imperium must be inseparable as to the soil beneath the marginal sea required under our constitutional policy because of the national guaranty of defense and the turning over of responsibility for foreign commerce, for international relations and for making war to the Federal Government.

If sovereignty with responsibility for defense and international relations did necessarily and inseparably involve dominium, that is ownership of land, all private ownership of land would have to be given up.

(a) When defense for practical purposes meant defense from attack by sea within the range of the ordinance of the time, it could have been said that jurisdiction over the marginal sea was required for defense. But now that the whole country is potentially threatened from the air and defense may have to be made from every part of the land, not merely the seacoast but every locality up and down the land may call for defensive activities of the National Government. Today, defense, in a time of long-distance bombing and long-distance invasion by air over the whole territory of a belligerent must involve a power of defense from one end of the land to the other. If exercise of sovereignty for defense requires that the Government be owner, then there can no longer be private or State ownership of land. Under the conditions of warfare today, the argument for national defense would make the United States owner of the whole land as well as of the shore of the sea and the sea adjacent to our territory.

(b) Nor do the duties of the United States Government in international relations require more than sovereignty. They do not require ownership of the land over which the sovereignty extends.

International obligations of the United States extend to what takes place on land as well as to what may go on upon the marginal sea:

(1) The Federal Government is responsible in international law for denial of justice to citizens of other States.¹⁰ Thus the national government is internationally responsible for the subjecting of an accused alien

to unjustified discrimination;¹¹ also for internationally illegal treatment of aliens;¹² also for neglect to prosecute offenses against aliens residing in our limits;¹³ also for the consequences of mob violence to diplomats and other official personages;¹⁴ also for injurious acts of insurgents who do injury to persons or property;¹⁵ also for public bonds of municipalities, States, and the Nation.¹⁶ Under treaties, inheritance laws of the State may be affected by international obligations. Where the Federal Government grants to an alien by treaty the privilege of acquiring and holding property within its domain, it finds itself under a corresponding obligation to make reasonable endeavors to protect the same and to abstain itself through any of its agencies from conduct injurious thereto.¹⁷

The United States has been held liable to Great Britain for violation of a treaty of a state with an Indian tribe made before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, where the Indians became wards of the British Government.¹⁸

All these duties are quite as exacting in respect of the powers of sovereignty as those which bind the United States with respect to the marginal sea. They do not in the latter case any more than in the former case require the Government to own the soil over which it exercises its sovereignty.

State jurisdiction of inheritance, over doing justice to resident aliens, over contracts with them and wrongs done them, over keeping the peace within State borders, and over the State's debts and promises is not thereby excluded or abrogated. The United States has jurisdiction in bankruptcy throughout the land. But State laws as to contracts, debts, and liabilities are not excluded for that reason. Federal jurisdiction, imperium for all Federal purposes, does not exclude State ownership (dominium) of all the places or things with respect to which the imperium obtains.

Thus the argument resting the decision on the sovereignty of the United States and its rights and duties with respect thereto under international law, proves altogether too much.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the National Association of Attorneys General has prepared a booklet entitled "These Men Believed." This association is financed by State funds, and not simply from three States, as was intimated a day or two ago by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It has been in existence for 47 years, financed strictly by State funds, and having no private interests connected with it.

The association prepared this very short booklet. The title is derived from the statement of Mr. Justice Black in the case of *United States against California*, in which Mr. Justice Black clearly indicated that the Court in that opinion, as said by the majority leader yesterday, was writing the law differently from former justices believed it to be. He used these words: "The Court then believed."

Those are the words of the opinion.

So, Mr. President, the booklet is entitled "These Men Believed—That the Lands Within Navigable Waters Within

⁶ *Gammell v. Commissioners of Woods and Forests* (3 Macqueen, 419, 458 (1859)). A number of such alienations by grant are cited with reference to the records in *Duchess of Sutherland v. Watson* (6 Session Cases (Scotland) 199, 203 (1868)).

⁷ *Gammell v. Commissioners of Woods and Forests*, *supra*, at 465.

⁸ 19 Session Cases, 174, 177 (1891).

⁹ II, 2, 13.

¹⁰ Hyde, *International Law*, 2d ed., sec. 281.

¹¹ *Id.*, sec. 285.

¹² *Id.*, sec. 286.

¹³ *Id.*, sec. 389a.

¹⁴ *Id.*, sec. 290.

¹⁵ *Id.*, sec. 399b.

¹⁶ *Id.*, secs. 307-308.

¹⁷ I Hyde, *International Law*, sec. 203, p. 655.

¹⁸ American-British Claims Arbitration, Cayuga Indians' case, Neilsen's Rept. 307 (1926).

¹ *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19, 36).

² *United States v. Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699, 704).

³ *United States v. Texas* (339 U. S. 707, 719).

⁴ Hargrave, *Law Tracts*, 84-85.

⁵ *Shively v. Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 14 (1894)).

the Boundaries of the States Belonged to the States."

That is the full title of the booklet.

As I have said, the idea came from the fact that Mr. Justice Black admitted that the Court previously "used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that the States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable waters, but also owned the soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citations from cases and the names of the Justices who wrote this rule of law be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THESE MEN BELIEVED THAT THE LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE STATES BELONGED TO THE STATES

Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone.

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Associate Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo, Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice George Sutherland, Associate Justice Pierce Butler, Associate Justice James C. McReynolds.

Chief Justice William Howard Taft, Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice Edward Terry Sanford.

Chief Justice Edward Douglas White, Associate Justice Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice William R. Day, Associate Justice Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice John H. Clarke, Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, Associate Justice Horace H. Lurton, Associate Justice Joseph R. Lamar.

Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, Associate Justice David J. Brewer, Associate Justice Rufus W. Peckham, Associate Justice William H. Moody, Associate Justice Henry B. Brown, Associate Justice George Shiras, Associate Justice Stephen J. Field, Associate Justice Horace Gray, Associate Justice Howell E. Jackson, Associate Justice Joseph P. Bradley, Associate Justice Samuel Blatchford, Associate Justice Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Associate Justice Samuel F. Miller.

Chief Justice Morrison R. Waite, Associate Justice Nathan Clifford, Associate Justice Noah H. Swayne, Associate Justice David Davis, Associate Justice William Strong, Associate Justice Ward Hunt.

Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, Associate Justice James M. Wayne, Associate Justice Samuel Nelson, Associate Justice Robert C. Grier.

Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, Associate Justice Joseph Story, Associate Justice John McLean, Associate Justice John McKinley, Associate Justice Peter V. Daniel.

The United States Supreme Court, in its opinion in the case of the *United States v. California*, rendered June 23, 1947, specifically stated that "this Court" had in previous decisions "many times * * * used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

The Supreme Court Justices who held this belief are listed above.

In the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, the Supreme Court, by a divided vote, held that all these Justices were wrong in their belief.

Following are set forth a few excerpts from the decisions of these former Justices showing the language they used to indicate that they believed the States were the owners of

the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries:

1842

"For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government." (Chief Justice Taney in *Martin v. Waddell* (16 Peters 367, 410)).

1845

"First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States but were reserved to the States, respectively. Secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over the subject as the original States" (Mr. Justice McKinley in *Pollard v. Hagan* (3 How. 212, 230)).

1867

"Settled rule of law in this Court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders.

"When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution" (Mr. Justice Clifford in *Mumford v. Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436)).

1873

"All soils under the tidewaters¹ within her limits passed to the State" (Mr. Justice Field in *Weber v. Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 66)).

1876

"In our view of the subject the correct principles were laid down in *Martin v. Waddell* (16 Pet. 367), *Pollard's Lessee v. Hagan* (3 How. 312), and *Goodtitle v. Kibbe* (9 id. 471). These cases related to tidewaters, it is true; but they enunciated principles which are equally applicable to all navigable waters. * * * it (the bed and shore of such waters) properly belongs to the State by their inherent sovereignty" (Mr. Justice Bradley in *Barney v. Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 338)).

1876

"Each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction" (Chief Justice Waite in *McCready v. Virginia*, (94 U. S. 391, 394)).

1891

"The titles acquired by the United States to lands in California under tidewaters, from Mexico, were held in trust for the future State, so that their ownership and right of disposition passed to it upon its admission into the Union" (Mr. Justice Field in *San Francisco v. LeRoy* (138 U. S. 656, 670-671)).

1891

"It is the settled rule of law in this court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction in that behalf as the

original States possess within their respective borders" (Mr. Justice Lamar in *Knight v. United States Land Association* (142 U. S. 161, 183)).

1892

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tide waters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found * * *."

"The same doctrine is in this country held to be applicable to lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes over which is conducted an extended commerce with different States and foreign nations. These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters, and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide. In other respects they are inland seas, and there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over and ownership by the State of lands covered by tide waters that is not equally applicable to its ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these lakes" (Mr. Justice Field in *Illinois Central R. Co. v. Illinois* (146 U. S. 287, 435)).

1894

"The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions" (Mr. Justice Gray in *Shively v. Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 57)).

1903

"When land is conveyed by the United States bounded on a non-navigable lake belonging to it, the grounds for the decision must be quite different from the considerations affecting the conveyance of land bounded on navigable water. In the latter case the land under the water does not belong to the United States, but has passed to the State by its admission to the Union" (Mr. Justice Holmes in *Hardin v. Shedd* (190 U. S. 508, 519)).

1906

"The maritime belt is that part of the sea which, in contradistinction to the open sea, is under the sway of the riparian States, which can exclusively reserve the fishery within their respective maritime belts for their own citizens, whether fish, or pearls, or amber, or other products of the sea" (Chief Justice Fuller in *Louisiana v. Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52)).

1908

"The right of the State to grant lands covered by tidewaters or navigable lakes and the qualifications, as stated in *Shively v. Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 47), are that the State may use or dispose of any portion of the same 'when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in such waters'" (Mr. Justice Holmes in *United States v. Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.* (209 U. S. 447, 451-452)).

1921

"Washington became * * * the owner of the navigable waters within its boundaries and of the land under the same" (Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Port of Seattle v. Oregon & W. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56, 63)).

1926

"Upon the American Revolution, all the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewater vested in the several States, subject to the powers surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States" (Chief Justice Taft in *Appleby v. New York* (271 U. S. 364, 381)).

¹ That the term "tidewaters" includes the water area of the marginal belt is made clear by the statement of the Supreme Court in *Manchester v. Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240, 258 (1891)) that "the minimum limit of the territorial jurisdiction of a nation over tidewaters is a marine league from its coast."

1935

"For that reason, upon the admission of a State to the Union, the title of the United States to lands underlying navigable waters within the States passes to it" (Chief Justice (then Mr. Justice) Stone in *United States v. Oregon* (295 U. S. 1, 14)).

1935

"The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed" (Chief Justice Hughes, in *Boraz Consolidated v. Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15)).

1936

"*Pollard v. Hagan* (3 How. 212), *Shively v. Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1), and *Port of Seattle v. Oregon-Washington R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56) dealt with the title of the States to tidelands and the soil under navigable waters within their borders" (Chief Justice Hughes in *Ashwater v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288, 337)).

For over 100 years the States have relied on the foregoing decisions of the Supreme Court as establishing State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. Titles to real property in every State have been based upon the statements of the Supreme Court above quoted.

The effect of the decisions in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases is to destroy the basis upon which these titles have been predicated.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 and similar bills will restore to the States their traditional property rights.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have here another item which fully supports the views stated by the majority leader yesterday and contradicts the views of the Senator from Minnesota as to the entire subject. It is a joint memorandum signed by 11 of the world's greatest authorities on international law and the law of the sea. It was prepared at my request while I was attorney general of Texas.

Mr. President, I asked these authorities to prepare memorandum for me as to the rights of my State in the marginal belt. I employed them to study the question and write their opinions whether favorable to the State or against the State, because I wanted the benefit of their knowledge and opinion before I argued the matter before the Supreme Court of the United States. Every one of the eminent authorities to whom I submitted the material on the situation of Texas concluded that Texas was correct in its contentions. After the decision was rendered by a 4-to-3 vote against Texas, a decision which denied the State from introducing its evidence, I asked these men to prepare a joint memorandum in support of Texas' motion for rehearing.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Joint Memorandum in Support of Rehearing in United States against Texas, signed by these 11 distinguished lawyers.

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

JOINT MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF REHEARING IN UNITED STATES AGAINST TEXAS

Based upon our individual research and consideration of the pleadings, briefs, and evidentiary materials, each of us has pre-

pared a separate memorandum opinion on the title to the lands and minerals underlying the Gulf of Mexico within the original boundaries of the State of Texas and the rules of international law applicable thereto. These memoranda were written at the request of the attorney general of Texas prior to the request of the attorney general of Texas prior to the Court's decision of June 5, 1950.

Without collaboration, each of us concluded:

1. The Republic of Texas, as an independent nation, had full sovereignty over and ownership of the lands and minerals underlying that portion of the Gulf of Mexico within its original boundaries 3 leagues from shore.¹ Under international law and under the domestic law adopted by the Republic of Texas, the ownership (dominium) of the subjacent soil and minerals was severable from the paramount governmental powers (imperium) employed in the original acquisition and in the regulation and control of commerce, navigation, defense, and international relations.

2. The transfer of national sovereignty and governmental powers relating to interstate and foreign commerce, navigation, defense, and international relations from the Republic of Texas to the United States in 1845 did not effect a transfer or relinquishment of the ownership of the lands and minerals above described. International law, as it existed in 1845, did not imply or require a cession of these proprietary rights with a transfer of national sovereignty.

3. The Republic of Texas, upon annexation, did not cede to the United States the ownership of the controverted 2,608,774 acres of lands and minerals within its original boundaries, but specifically retained this ownership under the terms of the agreement between the Republic of Texas and the United States.

4. A contrary position, first asserted by the United States 103 years after the international agreement of annexation, creates a dispute as to the meaning of the controlling documents. Under such circumstances either litigant should be entitled to present evidence bearing upon the intention of the contracting parties.

5. Available evidence of the status of international law, reflected by the customs, usages, and practices of nations in 1845 and since that date, will support the foregoing conclusions of fact and law.

After studying the majority and dissenting opinions of June 5, 1950, each of us has written a separate memorandum directed to issues raised by the majority opinion which we respectfully submit require a rehearing and judgment for Texas or at least a trial on the evidence. In the interest of brevity, this joint memorandum is submitted as a summary of our individual opinions and of the evidence of relevant customs, usages, and practices of nations which we will develop fully if given the opportunity at a trial of the case on its merits.

I

In the first instance, the majority opinion in its concept of the nature of a nation's sovereignty over and ownership of marginal belt lands and minerals is not in harmony with international law as it existed in 1845 and as it continues to exist at the present time.

The majority has written:

"Once low-water mark is passed, the international domain is reached. Property rights must then be so subordinated to political

¹ The First Congress of the Republic of Texas, on December 19, 1836, fixed the boundaries as follows: " * * * beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande" (1 Laws, Republic of Texas, p. 133; 1 Gammel's Laws of Texas 1193-1194).

rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign."²

There is no accepted authority in international law for this notion of international domain. To the contrary, it may be said that customs, usages, and practices of nations in and since 1845 indicate complete agreement that the territorial-marginal sea and its subjacent soil and resources within its boundaries are under the full sovereignty of the littoral nation, subject only to the accepted rules of innocent passage through the overlying waters.

Under international law as it existed in and since 1845, the international domain did not, and does not now, begin at the low-water mark of a littoral state. Vis-a-vis other nations, the area of a littoral state between low-water mark and the seaward limit of its marginal belt was and is in the same category as its inland waters, uplands, and other territory within its boundaries.³ As said by Wheaton in 1836:

"Within these limits, its rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute and exclude those of every other nation." (Wheaton, *Elements of International Law* (Philadelphia, 1836), 142-143.)

Sala wrote in 1845 that customs and usages of nations have "converted the sea as to this portion thereof into property no different than the lands occupied by them."⁴ Hautefeuille described territorial seas as under littoral state dominion "in the same manner and by the same title as the land."⁵ Many writers term it a continuation of the continental territory. Olivart says "the jurisdiction of the state over its territorial sea is exclusive as it is over its land territory."⁶ Among the jurist and publicists there is almost complete unanimity of opinion on this point.⁷

It is respectfully urged that no matter what the United States may gain in this case by a holding that the Texas marginal sea is "international domain," such gain could be far outweighed by the consequent gratuity to other nations. Implicit in the denomination of the area as "international domain" is the possibility of other nations having rights there in other than innocent passage through the waters. Spain, Mexico, France,

² 70 S. Ct. at 924.

³ The only limitation or exception is that by mutual consent and established practice there exists a right of "innocent passage" for ships of other nations. But as said by the Italian publicist, Scipione Gemma: "The limitations implied by the right of innocent passage of foreign vessels and by certain exemptions applicable to them in matters of civil and criminal local jurisdictions exercised by the coastal nations are not enough to consider the littoral sea as something different from the national territory." Gemma *Appunti di diritto internazionale* (Bologna, 1923) 187.

⁴ Sala, *Sala Mexicana, o sea La Ilustración al Derecho Real de España* (Mexico, 1845, vol. 2, p. 11).

⁵ Hautefeuille, *Des droits et des devoirs des nations neutres en temps de guerre maritime*. (Paris, 1848) 231. He continued: "There is continuous, complete, and absolute possession, as there might be of a river, a lake, or a piece of land territory." (p. 232.)

⁶ Olivart, *Tratado de Derecho Internacional Publico* (Madrid, 1903) 204.

⁷ See "Summary of Available Opinions of Jurists and Publicists—1670-1950," pp. 18-50 of the Appendix to Brief for the State of Texas in Opposition to Motion for Judgment. See especially quotations from Molloy and Pufendorf (p. 18), Vattel (p. 19), Lampredi (p. 20), Rayneval (p. 21), Azuni and Schmalz (p. 22), Wheaton (p. 24), Cussy and Gardner (p. 27), Casanova (p. 29), Field (p. 30), Flore and Martens (p. 31), Pradier-Fodéré (p. 33), Hershey (p. 38), Fenwick and Möller (p. 43), Bustamante (p. 45), Gidel and Baldoni (p. 46).

England, Russia, and other nations can make no reasonable assertion of an interest in the oil and other minerals within the 3-league gulfward boundary of Texas so long as this Court recognizes that the area was removed from international domain when it became a part of the Republic of Texas. This was accomplished by the Republic of Texas in accordance with international law as recognized at the time by the countries named and by all other civilized nations. A contrary conclusion by the United States Supreme Court could well be used by other nations as an opening for claims not now asserted.

The Court's holding in this regard is contrary to the official position of the United States as expressed by the Department of State and by Presidential proclamations. The official view of the United States at the League of Nations Conference at The Hague in 1930 was declared as follows:

"The seabottom and subsoil covered by the territorial waters, including fish and minerals, are the property of the United States or the individual States where they border."⁸

The Continental Shelf proclamations and Executive orders of the President of the United States on September 28, 1945, do not regard the bed of the Continental Shelf as "international domain." On the contrary, the proclamation regards the land and resources below low tide "as an extension of the land-mass of the coastal nation and thus naturally appurtenant to it" and wholly unaffected by "the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation."⁹ The Executive order recognizes that ownership of the subsoil and sea-bed is possible either in the States or the United States.¹⁰

There is no authority in international law for the doctrine that property rights in the marginal sea must be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign. On the contrary, international law in and since 1845, and all domestic law with which we are acquainted, recognizes that political rights (imperium) are separate and severable from property rights (dominium) in the subsoil and minerals of the marginal belt the same as in any other soil and minerals within a nation's territory.¹¹ The use of the soil may be more limited by governmental restrictions and regulations designed to protect public use, innocent passage, and navigation of the waters generally, but restrictions and regulations on property use have not been understood to vest ownership of the property in the governmental power which imposes the restrictions and regulations.

There is no obligation or responsibility of a nation to other nations which requires it, rather than one of its political subdivisions, to own the soil and minerals within its territorial marginal belt, so long as it has governmental powers which guarantee innocent passage for ships of other states. The exercise of this responsibility and all other responsibilities connected with foreign and interstate commerce, defense, and international relations is wholly separate from and does not depend upon the economic use and profits connected with the proprietorship of

this subsoil and minerals any more than it does the subsoil and minerals beneath uplands, inland waters, and all areas of the nation's territory.

Such was the status of international law when the Republic of Texas and the United States entered into their agreement for the annexation of Texas. A transfer of marginal sea lands and minerals was not then implied in a transfer of national sovereignty. An express cession or other clear terms indicating a transfer of these proprietary rights was as necessary then as it would be now to effect such a result. As recently said by one of the coauthors of this memorandum:

"In this day when world governments are being planned it is important that dominium is not confused with or inextricably tied to imperium. . . ."

"Assume that all of this Nation's powers of external sovereignty, international relations, and defense were transferred to a United Nations of the World. This transfer of external sovereignty should not be held to carry with it any proprietary rights theretofore acquired by the United States in the marginal belt of the original States and California in the absence of a cession of the property."

"Such is the situation which existed between Texas and the United States in 1845. Texas transferred its external sovereignty and certain enumerated properties which then pertained to its national defense. It ceded no other property. This is confirmed by a specific reservation of all 'vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits.' The subsoil and minerals remained in the State just as the subsoil and minerals of the California belt would remain in the United States if it should transfer external sovereignty to a larger federation of States without ceding its rights of a proprietary nature beneath the marginal sea of California."¹²

II

Even if the Court believes that the lands and minerals in question would ordinarily pass to the United States with national political rights, this would not be true if the parties made an agreement to the contrary at the time of annexation.

In this case there is an international agreement which contains a specific retention of lands lying within the limits of the Republic of Texas.¹³ It is of the same nature and has the same effect as a treaty or contract between independent nations. Therefore, rules of interpretation applicable to treaties, conventions, and other international agreements apply. The object of the interpretation of an agreement of this nature is to discover the understanding and intention of the parties at the time the contract or agreement was entered into.

Texas has a specific allegation at page 15 of its first amended answer that—

"By these acts on the part of the United States and the Republic of Texas, when construed, as they must be, in the light of the intention of the contracting parties, there was a binding agreement between the two independent sovereigns that upon annexation Texas would not cede to the United States any, but that the newly created State would retain all, of the lands, minerals, and other things lying beneath that part of the Gulf of Mexico within the original boundaries of the Republic, as well as the right to take, use, and develop the lands and minerals, subject only to the dominion and paramount powers of the United States as recognized in section 2, paragraph II above."

If it be found, as alleged by Texas, that the parties intended by the terms of the agree-

ment that the lands and minerals beneath the marginal belt were to be retained by Texas the same as other lands and minerals within its limits, no other provision of the agreement should be permitted to defeat this intention. Thus, a controlling issue in this case is the fact question of whether the parties intended the retention clause to be effective to the extent of the limits of Texas, as the terms imply, or only as far as low-water mark.

The applicable rule in such case is stated in the majority opinion as follows:

"If there were a dispute as to the meaning of documents and the answer was to be found in diplomatic correspondence, contemporary construction, usage, international law, and the like, introduction of evidence and a full hearing would be essential."¹⁴

If this case is not determined in favor of Texas on the law and terms of the documents alone, it should not be determined against Texas without allowing it the opportunity for introduction of evidence and a full hearing. It is our opinion that the answer to the dispute will be found in diplomatic correspondence, contemporary, and subsequent construction, usage, and international law under which the parties were dealing in 1845.

Insofar as international law is concerned, it was possible in 1845 for one nation to join another and retain the lands and minerals underlying the marginal sea within its boundaries.

This was and is possible also insofar as the domestic law of the United States is concerned. Counsel for the United States itself have not contended that ownership of the marginal belt lands and minerals is an inseparable attribute of national sovereignty.¹⁵ In the Government's brief in *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)) it was said:

"We do not argue that the effective exercise of the foregoing powers (national defense, commerce, international relations) granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution would be impossible without ownership of the marginal sea" (p. 89).

The Court in that case also recognized that ownership of this property is not a necessary incident of national sovereignty or essential to the exercise of Federal constitutional powers over the area when it said that the power of Congress to deal with such property "is without limitation."¹⁶

Implicit in the powers of the United States Congress to convey these lands and minerals to the States and good faith claimants and to admit new States is the power to admit Texas to the Union under an agreement that Texas retain the lands and minerals in the first instance.

The Texas Annexation Agreement of March 1, 1845, whether classed as a treaty, act, or joint resolution, was passed by Congress and carried into effect by the President, who is

¹⁴ 70 S. Ct. at 922.

¹⁵ Solicitor General Perlman, in answer to a question by Mr. Justice Reed during the argument on the motion for leave to file the complaint herein, said that if the United States owns the property, it could convey it to the States. His words:

"Oh, yes; Congress could give whatever title it has, whatever rights it has, to the States" (argument, *United States v. Texas*, May 9, 1949, Reporter's Transcript, p. 6).

¹⁶ *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19, 27). Also in stating that valuable improvements made in good faith under State titles are not ground for a different judgment, the Court added: "But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission. See *United States v. Texas* (162 U. S. 1, 89, 90); *Lee Wilson & Co. v. United States* (245 U. S. 24, 32)." Id. at 40.

⁸ Reply of the United States to the Bases of Discussion, March 16, 1929, League of Nations Conference for the Codification of International Law, Bases of Discussion, C. 74, M. 39, 1929, V. p. 128.

⁹ 3 C. F. R., 1945, Supp., Proc. 2667, 13 Dept. Stat. Bull. 484, 485 (1945).

¹⁰ 3 C. F. R., 1945, Supp., E. O. 9633.

¹¹ It is believed that evidence of the practice of nations in 1845 will show that they treated original ownership of the subsoil and minerals of the marginal belt as within the same legal regime and property law as was applicable to other unsold and unappropriated lands within their public boundaries.

¹² Roscoe Pound, *Rights Involved in United States v. Texas*, pp. 10-11, Memoranda and Appendix, Brief for the State of Texas in Opposition to Motion for Judgment.

¹³ 5 Stat. 797; 2 Gammel's Laws of Texas 1225, 1228.

charged with the conduct of international affairs. This agreement provides that—

"Said State, when admitted into the Union . . . shall also retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits."

Thus as to Texas, Congress has acted with regard to the specific question before this Court. The Congress of Texas, and the people in convention assembled, agreed to annexation with this as one of the "conditions" and "guarantees."¹⁷ There is no evidence in the terms of the agreement that the parties meant to retain only those lands lying above low tide on the coast. The retention clause says "lands lying within its limits." Neither is there any evidence in the terms that the parties intended the lands and minerals of the 3-league marginal belt to "coalesce and unite" with the political powers of national sovereignty transferred to the United States. Under the domestic law of the Republic of Texas, these lands and minerals involved rights of property, severable from sovereignty, but originally held by the sovereign in trust for the people.

The constitution of the new State, adopted in accordance with the terms of the annexation agreement and as a part of the annexation procedure, indicates that these property rights were to remain as they were under the laws of the Republic of Texas. It included this provision:

"The rights of property . . . which have been acquired under the Constitution and laws of the Republic of Texas . . . shall remain precisely in the situation which they were before the adoption of this Constitution."¹⁸

This Constitution was laid before the United States Congress and was approved by that body in the final act of admission as being in conformity to the provisions of the annexation resolution (9 Stat. 108).

On the basis of these documents it would appear that Texas retained the lands and minerals in question by the specific agreement and approval of the United States Congress. The only doubt cast on the meaning of the documents is the contention by the United States that the retention clause was not intended to include lands and minerals below low tide and the statement in the majority opinion that an equal footing clause in the annexation resolution of March 1, 1845, effected a relinquishment of the property to the United States.

The equal footing clause in the March 1 resolution for annexation of Texas was contained in section 3, which was an alternative proposal never submitted to, or considered or accepted by, Texas. Sections 1 and 2 contained the proposals, conditions, and guarantees submitted by the President of the United States and accepted by the Congress and the people of Texas. These sections provided that Texas retain its lands and pay its own debts. It is significant that they contained no equal footing clause. Only the unilateral final act of admission referred to equal footing, but it also recited that admission was granted in accordance with the proposals, conditions, and guarantees contained in the first and second sections of the March 1, 1845, annexation resolution. It could not have the effect of taking from Texas lands and minerals which had been specifically retained by the proposals, conditions, and guarantees theretofore agreed upon. Texas pleads that it has evidence which will show that no such meaning or effect was intended by the contracting parties.

If, upon rehearing, judgment is not rendered in favor of the State of Texas on the basis of the terms contained in sections 1 and 2 of the annexation agreement and its failure to cede the lands and minerals, it would indicate that some doubt still exists in the minds of the majority as to the meaning of the annexation agreement and the intention of the parties. In that event, Texas should be entitled to an opportunity to present its evidence. This was requested by Texas in its motion for the appointment of a master and in its brief in opposition to the motion of plaintiff for judgment on the pleadings. We submit that the Court should reconsider its ruling denying Texas this opportunity to develop evidence as to the intention of the parties to this international agreement.

Evidence which can and will be submitted as to the customs, usages, and practices of nations in and since 1845, the nature of the sovereignty over and ownership of marginal belt lands and minerals in international law, and all other relative interpretative matters, will support the contentions of the State of Texas as to the law and facts applicable to this case.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph Walter Bingham, C. John Colombos, Gilbert Gidel, Manley O. Hudson, Charles Cheney Hyde, Hans Kelsen, William E. Masterson, Roscoe Pound, Stefan A. Riesenfeld, Felipe Sanchez Roman.

JULY 14, 1950.

CONCURRENCE

Time has not permitted me to assist in the preparation of this memorandum, but I am fully in accord with the position taken by the State of Texas in its brief and argument in this case. I wholeheartedly concur in the opinion that there should be a rehearing, and a judgment for Texas or at least a trial on the evidence.

WILLIAM W. BISHOP, JR.

JULY 15, 1950.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following the memorandum a short biography of each of the signers of the memorandum, in order that Senators may know their background of experience and knowledge of the subjects about which they have written.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON SIGNERS OF JOINT MEMORANDUM ABOVE

Joseph Walter Bingham: Chairman, the International Law Association Committee on Rights in the Seabed and Its Subsoil, American branch; professor of international law, Stanford University, 1907-44; author, Report on the International Law of Pacific Coastal Fisheries and numerous articles on international law.

William W. Bishop, Jr.: Assistant to legal adviser, Department of State, 1939-47; legal adviser, United States delegation, Council of Foreign Ministers and Paris Peace Conference, 1946; author, *The Exercise of Jurisdiction for Special Purposes in High Sea Areas Beyond the Outer Limit of Territorial Waters*, 1949.

C. John Colombos: King's counsel; Rapporteur, International Law Association's Committee on Neutrality, 1924, 1926, 1928, and 1932; author, *International Law of the Sea*, (1943), a Treatise on the Law of Prize (3d ed., 1949), and other works on international law.

Gilbert Gidel: Member of the Institute of International Law; president of the Curatorium of the Academy of International Law at The Hague; French delegate, 1930 Hague Conference for Codification of the Law of

Territorial Waters; author, *Le Droit International Public de la Mer* (The Public International Law of the Sea) (1932-34), three volumes; fourth volume in preparation.

Manley O. Hudson: Member and first chairman, United Nations International Law Commission; Judge, Permanent Court of International Justice, 1936-46; American adviser, 1930, Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law; Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard University, 1923 to present; author of over 300 articles and publications on international law.

Charles Cheney Hyde: Former Solicitor of the Department of State under Secretaries Hughes and Kellogg; professor of International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University, 1925-45; author, *International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States* (2d rev. ed. 1945), three volumes, and other works on international law; president of the American Society of International Law, 1946-49.

Hans Kelsen: Legal adviser to the Austrian Government and draftsman of the Federal Constitution of Austria, 1919-22; member of the Constitutional Court of Austria, 1921-29; author, *General Theory of International Law* (1934), *General Theory of Law and the State* (1944), and other works on international law and jurisprudence.

William E. Masterson: Department of State consultant, 1944-47; adviser on research in international law, Harvard Law School; author, *Jurisdiction in Marginal Seas* (1929); coauthor, *The International Law of the Future* (1944), and author of numerous articles on international law, constitutional law, and jurisprudence.

Roscoe Pound: Professor of jurisprudence and dean of Harvard Law School, 1910-36; Director of National Conference of Judicial Councils, 1938 to date; author of more than 850 books, articles, and addresses on jurisprudence, international law, constitutional law, etc.

Stefan A. Riesenfeld: Professor of law, University of Minnesota, 1938 to date; special consultant, Board of Economic Warfare, 1942-43; author, *Protection of Coastal Fisheries Under International Law* (1942), and of numerous articles on international and comparative law in German and American legal periodicals.

Felipe Sanchez Roman: Former member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague; member of the Spanish National Academy of Jurisprudence and Legislation; legal adviser to Spanish and Mexican Governments; professor of civil law at the Central University of Madrid, 1916-36.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope these insertions in the RECORD and the remarks which I have made this morning will bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate how clearly the issue has been drawn in this debate as to whether we are going to follow the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and those who say that international law and external sovereignty should apply in domestic affairs, or whether we are going to follow the Constitution of the United States; whether we are going to follow the 3 most recent decisions of the Supreme Court in writing the law for the future, or whether we are going to follow approximately 50 former opinions of the Court in which the belief of the judges was based upon the Constitution and in favor of the States.

We do not ask Congress to overrule the Supreme Court of the United States, although, I think, the Court was incorrect. We can and do accept the decisions of the Court as the interpretation of the law as it exists today, but, by the same token, the Congress of the

¹⁷ 5 Stat. 797; 2 Gammel's Laws of Texas 1225, 1228. The Annexation Resolutions of the two nations are set out at length on pages 58-62 of the Appendix to Brief for the State of Texas in Opposition to Motion for Judgment.

¹⁸ Art. VII, sec. 20, Constitution of 1845; 2 Gammel's Laws of Texas 1293-94.

United States, in placing its interpretation on the Constitution and in deciding the equities can write the law for the future differently from that which the Court has found it to be at this time.

That is what we propose in Senate Joint Resolution 13. We want Congress to write the law for the future exactly as it was understood and believed to be during the first 150 years of the existence of this Nation.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are on the Executive Calendar four nominations. I do not think it is necessary to have the Senate go into executive session in order to consider them. I understand that all four were reported unanimously by the committees to which they were referred. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, as in executive session, these nominations may be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that Mr. Thomas J. Herbert is a former Governor of Ohio, and his qualifications for the position to which he has been nominated are without question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry P. Cain, of Washington, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. Cain is a former Senator from the State of Washington, and I ask that his nomination to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board be confirmed by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Stoddart, Jr., to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern District of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] say a few minutes ago that he accepted the Supreme Court decisions. Of course, I understand his viewpoint quite well, but one thing that has bothered me in the consideration of the pending legislation has been what seemed to me to be a tendency on the part of many persons to ignore completely the Supreme Court decisions. I have noticed very often the use of such words as "confirm" and "restore," which to me seemed to glide over completely the fact that the Supreme Court, on at least three different occasions, has said that the submerged lands, regardless of what our personal views may be as to what ought to be the case, belonged to the United States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for two questions, though one at a time.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wished to propound the questions before the Senator proceeded too far into his speech.

It is not often that I disagree with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but he was quoted in this morning's newspapers as having stated that the opposition to the pending measure was represented by a little band of liberals. In view of the fact that yesterday on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay on the table the Anderson amendment, the vote on which may be considered a test on the joint resolution itself, the negative votes represented not only more than one-third of the Senate membership, but a majority of the Democratic membership. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it would not be more proper to designate the group as a very substantial group rather than as a small band.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly agree with the Senator from Iowa. I should say that the opposition is being carried on by a very substantial number of Senators, and it should not be limited by any term that would restrict it to a small group, because it is a very respectable and a very sizable part of the Senate that has been carrying on the opposition to the measure.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the second question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. GILLETTE. My second question is this: Is it not a fact that the substantial segment to which we refer, which yesterday voted, in effect, against the proposed legislation, comprised not only the three parties represented on the floor of the Senate, but also every section of the Nation, and substantially every area of varied economic and political opinion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator certainly is correct in his analysis of the opposition to the measure in the Senate. Furthermore, I should like to add that I believe the debate on the joint resolution has been a very good one. It has been carried on in an excellent manner. I believe it has been good for the country as a whole. It has been thought provoking. So far as any suggestion of a filibuster is concerned, I submit that this is the first time I have taken the floor to speak on the measure, and I am not prepared to speak at length. I shall make a relatively short speech, setting forth my views on the pending amendments.

I wish very much that I might have had an opportunity during previous days to discuss the Anderson amendment, and the Hill amendment, while they were pending. I believe the Senate yesterday took very unwise action when it buried those amendments in the same grave.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama allow me to impose upon his time once more in order to ask a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. GILLETTE. In view of the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was quoted as having applied the appellation "a little band of liberals," would it not be the opinion of the Senator that, considering the importance of the subject matter before the Senate, the Senators who are supporting the proposed legislation, the proponents, could better be designated as liberals, since they are attempting to be very liberal with the resources of the United States in their attempt to distribute them; and that Senators who are opposing the measure could better be designated as conservatives, because they are trying to conserve the resources of the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa has well stated the point. This is an attempt at deplorable liberality with resources which belong to all the people. I, for one, like to think of myself as being a conservative, interested in conserving the resources of the Nation.

I remember that when I was a boy there was a great surge of the spirit of conservation in the country. The movement began in the days of Teddy Roosevelt, and continued under the leadership of such men as Gifford Pinchot and former President William Howard Taft. At that time the people were made conscious of the fact that it was necessary to conserve the great resources of the United States. Therefore, I regret exceedingly to observe what I believe is a backward step in the conservation program.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I spent last week in Alabama. There I talked to a great many people. I did not at any time make it a point to bring up the subject of the debate which is now in progress in the Senate. However, it was interesting to note how frequently people with whom I would be talking would bring up the subject. I became impressed with the fact that the people are not so indifferent as many

persons have assumed. They are keeping up with the debate, they are interested in it, and they are asking themselves questions.

The question which was asked of me more frequently than any other one pertaining to this subject was: "Just where is it proposed to set the boundaries?"

Mr. President, that is the substance of the Douglas amendment. Of course, I think that the Anderson substitute with the Hill amendment added to it presented the best solution to this problem. But now that those two proposals have been killed by the vote of a majority of the Members of the Senate, certainly we should do our best to perfect the joint resolution in order that the answer to such questions as, "Where does the boundary lie?" may be clear to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have listened to this debate, and have read and reread the statements of the opponents and proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

I agree with those who say that the offshore oil measure proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 13 is one of the most important that has ever come before the Congress of the United States.

Its far-reaching implications cut across every aspect of our lives, both domesticwise and foreignwise. Not since I have served in Congress—and I have been here for 17 years—has a measure been offered that would so unnecessarily and unjustifiably raid the Public Treasury, and give to so few that which belongs to so many.

I agree also that regardless of the outcome now, future events will support the wisdom of those who oppose this "give-away," and who support the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment. The leadership of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and my distinguished colleague [Mr. HILL] in trying to protect the public welfare deserves the commendation of every one of the more than 150 million Americans.

Their courageous stand will rank with that of such great Senators as Norris, of Nebraska, La Follette, of Wisconsin, and others who fought so hard for the public good.

I recognize, Mr. President, that much has been said about the measure before us. Too much cannot be said in opposition to it, and there remain a great many more reasons unsaid as to why the offshore oil should be retained for all the people, and why passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would not only take that which belongs to all the people and give it to a few, but would create serious international complications.

I would not attempt to add to what my colleague [Mr. HILL] and others have said relative to the international implications of any action which might deviate from the traditional support by the United States of the 3-mile limit nor to their other masterly statements of the international aspects of this bill were I not about to quote from another great lawyer, Charles Evans Hughes. He spoke on this question before the Council on Foreign Relations, in 1924, when he was Secretary of State, and this is what he said:

The Government of the United States has repeatedly asserted that the limits of terri-

torial waters extend to 3 marine miles outward from the coastline. This has been asserted by our Government in making claims upon other governments. With respect to Spain's claim of jurisdiction over the waters adjacent to Cuba, Secretary Seward wrote to the Spanish Minister as follows:

"It cannot be admitted, nor indeed is Mr. Tassara understood to claim, that the mere assertion of a sovereign, by an act of legislation, however solemn, can have the effect to establish and fix its external maritime jurisdiction. His right to a jurisdiction of 3 miles is derived, not from his own decrees, but from the law of nations, and exists even though he may never have proclaimed or asserted it by any decree or declaration whatsoever. He cannot, by a mere decree, extend the limit and fix it at 6 miles, because if he could, he could in the same manner, and upon motives of interest, ambition, or even upon caprice, fix it at 10 or 20 or 50 miles, without the consent or acquiescence of other powers which have a common right with himself in the freedom of all the oceans. Such a pretension could never be successfully or rightfully maintained. . . ."

"In view of the considerations and facts which have been thus presented, the undersigned is obliged to state that the Government of the United States is not prepared to admit that the jurisdiction of Spain in the waters which surround the island of Cuba lawfully and rightfully extends beyond the customary limit of 3 miles."

Secretary Fish, writing to the British Minister in 1875, said:

"We have always understood and asserted that, pursuant to public law, no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast."

And Secretary Evarts, in a communication to the Minister of Spain, concerning the visitation and firing upon certain American vessels near Cuba in 1880, said:

"The Government must adhere to the 3-mile rule as the jurisdictional limit, and the cases of visitation without that line seem not to be excused or excusable under that rule."

The general principle was thus stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent case of the *Cunard Steamship Co. v. Mellon* (262 U. S. 100, 122):

"It now is settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays, and other inclosed arms of the sea along its coast, and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league, or 3 geographic miles."

In the Bering Sea Arbitration it was held that the United States had no jurisdiction in the Bering Sea fisheries beyond the 3-mile limit and in the case of the British schooner *Sagward* the United States was required to compensate Great Britain for interfering with its sealing operations outside the 3-mile limit. The American-British Claims Arbitration Tribunal in December 1920, awarded damages against the United States on account of the interference by officers with the British vessel *Coquiltam* because of transfer of cargo off the Pacific coast outside the 3-mile limit.

Secretary of State Hughes concluded this portion of his remarks with the observation that it was important that the United States itself recognize the 3-mile limit where its own shores were involved.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago I stated that the question was frequently put to me while I was at home, "Just what are the boundaries that are set by this measure?" In all frankness I had to say that I did not know, and that I had not found any Member of the Senate who could give an answer in exact dis-

tances. In fact, I have heard the question asked here many times. There are some places where it can be said definitely that it is 3 miles. There are other places where it is claimed to be $9\frac{1}{2}$ or 10 miles. With respect to most areas, no one is able to draw a line and say, "This is it."

I have carefully read section 4 of the joint resolution, which defines seaward boundaries. I am unable to find an answer in that section as to just where the line is drawn. The section is not very long. I should like to read it at this point:

Sec. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line.

Down to that point it is definite; but that applies only to those coastal States which were included in the original States which formed the Union. Continuing the paragraph:

Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

Mr. President, with the exception of the original States, I submit there is no certain boundary set forth in that section. If I understand correctly the amendment which is now pending, it would set a definite boundary to which we could point and say, "This is it." It would be a boundary, by the way, which would be in accord with our Government's views from the time of the first precedent down to today.

The representative of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State who appeared before the committee considering this bill testified that the United States supported the 3-mile limit at the 1930 Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law. I do not believe that the Senators would gather from that simple statement just how determined and emphatic our support was. The representative of the United States at that conference was Mr. Hunter Miller, of the Department of State.

At that time Herbert Hoover was the President and Henry L. Stimson was the Secretary of State so that it can hardly be said that Mr. Hunter Miller was expressing a Democratic view as to international law. Incidentally, it may be of some interest to the Senate to realize that Mr. Hunter Miller was the author of the book entitled "Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States," which the distinguished Senator from Texas has cited to support his position that the proper limit of the territorial

waters of the United States off the coast of Texas is 10½ miles. Mr. Hunter Miller would, I am sure, have been surprised to hear that he was quoted for this proposition because he was the strongest supporter of the 3-mile limit at the 1930 Hague Conference. In the very first session of the Conference he came out unequivocally in support of it. This is what he said:

In the bases of discussion before us there are only two matters to which I shall refer. The first is the breadth of the coastal sea. As regards this matter, the position of the United States of America is definitely fixed. I cannot state it better than by a paraphrase of an extract from some of the recent treaties of the United States of America in which it is said that it is the firm intention of the United States of America to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outward and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters. That clause states definitely the position of my Government.

Mr. Miller did not change his mind as the Conference went on. I would like to read you what he said during the 13th meeting:

I will read one sentence which is contained in various existing treaties of the United States: "The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outwards and measured from low-water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters."

The various countries with whom we had treaties of this kind supported this position at the convention. It was opposed by the Soviet Union at this conference. I think we should stand by our pledged word to our friends. I do not believe we should back down in the face of pressure from the Soviet Union.

The attempts of the Soviet Union to establish territorial control of the air and the sea would go a long way beyond the claims which we think are right and just and permissible under international law. Although their paper claims go only to 12 miles, their outrageous action shows that if the United States were to back down in any way, they would seize on this as an excuse to turn the Baltic Sea into a Russian lake, and to extend their control of the high seas and the air above the high seas to wherever they saw fit. This is not the first time that the U. S. S. R. has tried this. They have tried this before and a brave ally, Great Britain, made them back down. I would hate to have it said that this time it was the United States which gave in.

As has been pointed out, even in the days of the czars, Russia had tried to close off the high seas. They tried it once in 1821. The United States and other countries objected and they backed down. Around the turn of the century the Russian Government seized 3 American sealing vessels which were 10 miles from Russian shores. The United States protested. It forced Russia to arbitration and obtained a decision that Russia had no right to do this and that Russia had to return the ships and pay damages.

When the Communists took over Russia and established their reign of tyranny, one of their first acts was to assert that their territorial waters extended

out to 12 miles. With characteristic disregard for the rights of others, they did not consider that this was a violation of international law. They did not care about international law.

(At this point Mr. SPARKMAN yielded to Mr. JOHNSON of Texas for the purpose of making a statement on the subject San Jacinto—The Legacy of Freedom, which appears in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. SPARKMAN's speech.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Russians just said: "Twelve miles is our limit." They attempted—it will be noted that I said "attempted"—to back this up with force. The Russians tried to make their 12-mile limit stick, but they did not get away with it, because one of our brave allies, Great Britain, had the foresight and the courage to stand up for what is right and just under international law.

In 1922 the Soviets began to arrest British vessels, mostly fishing boats, which were fishing outside the 3-mile limit. At first the British protested through diplomatic channels, as any civilized nation would do. But then the captains of these boats were turned over to the not-so-tender mercies of the People's Courts. In 1922 Captain Leighton, of the British trawler *St. Hubert*, was convicted by the People's Court of Murmansk for fishing 10½ miles off of Cape Filiberka.

Finally, on the 7th of May, 1923, a Soviet gunboat captured the British trawler *Lord Astor*, while the *Lord Astor* was fishing 10 miles off the coast in the Murmansk region. The British Parliament was in an uproar. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs instructed the British diplomatic agent in Moscow to enter a strong protest and to demand the immediate and unconditional release of the vessel and the crew.

This is not all that was done. A British warship was sent into the region. Her orders were to prevent interference with British vessels outside the 3-mile limit. She was instructed to do so by force, if necessary. There were no more seizures of British fishing vessels outside the 3-mile limit. The British seamen were released. The vessels were either returned or paid for. The incident was closed. The freedom of the high seas had been upheld.

It was in 1924, just a year after this incident, that the United States and the United Kingdom entered into the treaty in which they both pledged their support for the principle of freedom of the seas. I should like to read again what the treaty provides:

The High Contracting Parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that 3 marine miles extending from the coastline outward and measured from the low watermark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

By this treaty the British Government and the United States Government agreed that they would stand shoulder to shoulder in fighting off any attempts to encroach on the principle of the freedom of the seas. Our two Governments pledged their word that they would support the principle that, under international law, 3 miles off the coast is as far as any country has a right to assert jurisdiction, in claiming that the seas ad-

jacent to its shores are part of its territories.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator from Alabama is pointing out, is it not true that if the United States were to sanction a claim beyond the 3-mile limit, it might well be that Canada, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia might extend their claims beyond the 3-mile limit; and inasmuch as the Continental Shelf stretching from their shores is the area in which the fishing fleets of New England conduct their operations, might not such action threaten an industry which is of great importance to our Nation as a whole?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has stated not only a real problem but a very practical one, and one that is of considerable concern to his section of the country, where so many of the people engage in the extensive and long-time fishing industry.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not true that once our boundaries were extended beyond the 3-mile limit, there would be no real justification for not going all the way to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, as Chile, El Salvador, and other countries are now claiming—in short, a distance of possibly 200 miles?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the able Senator from Massachusetts was not on the floor a few minutes ago when I read from a speech made by former Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, who not only was a great Secretary of State but also was one of the finest constitutional lawyers our country has ever produced, I believe. In a speech which he made in 1924, Secretary of State Hughes quoted Secretary of State Seward, who made exactly that point in protesting against an attempt by Spain to extend her territorial dominion more than 3 miles off the coasts of Cuba; and he made exactly the point that if we permit our jurisdiction to extend for more than 3 miles off the coast, there is no reason why we should stop at 10 miles, 20 miles, 50 miles, or even 100 miles. In fact, he used practically those figures.

Of course, the Senator from Massachusetts is exactly correct in the statement he makes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the Senator from Alabama realizes that the fishing industry on both the east coast and west coast is greatly concerned about the point the Senator from Alabama is discussing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Not only are the fishermen on the east coast and the west coast greatly concerned, but I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts is also aware of the concern which exists in the gulf area, particularly in the case of the shrimp fisheries and the operators of shrimp boats in the various coastal States which now are so eager to obtain control beyond the 3-mile limit.

At this time, so far as I know—I do not believe the controversy has been settled—we are in dispute with Mexico over that very question.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, when we consider how recently the government of Great Britain had stood out alone against the attempts of the Soviet Union to wipe out the freedom of the seas, who among us in this body can deny that the two governments, ours and that of Great Britain, agreed to stand shoulder to shoulder against encroachment from the very source from which it is now threatened, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics?

Great Britain and the United States stand shoulder to shoulder on many matters. The two great countries are linked by bonds of treaties and common understanding and friendship. By the North Atlantic Treaty, the two great countries stand shoulder to shoulder against aggression. The strength and integrity of this common bond are of the greatest importance to the peace of the world and to the security of America. I would not want to weaken it in any way. I would not want in any way to cast doubt upon the sanctity of the pledged word of the United States when it promises to stand shoulder to shoulder with an ally against attempted violations of international law.

During the summer of 1952 the security aspects of the 3-mile limit were given most detailed consideration by the Secretary of the Navy. That was in connection with a bill which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative YORRY, of California. The bill had to do with the manner of drawing base-lines, rather than the actual width of territorial waters; but the principles were the same. On June 20, 1952, the Secretary of the Navy wrote to the Secretary of State a letter which I should like to read to the Senate. It is set forth on page 556 of the hearings:

JUNE 20, 1952.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The letter of March 28, 1952, from the Deputy Under Secretary of State to the Secretary of Defense, requesting information on certain matters related to the extension of the territorial waters of the United States as proposed by House Joint Resolution 373, which was introduced by Representative Samuel A. Yorty, of California, on February 11, 1952, has been referred to this Department for reply.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 373 is to extend the territorial waters around the coast of the United States and Alaska as far as is permissible under the rules of international law set forth in the judgment rendered by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case on December 18, 1951. Under the joint resolution the United States would establish as the seaward boundary of its inland or internal waters a series of straight lines running between the headlands of all indentations on the mainland and, where there are offlying islands, rocks, or reefs, a series of straight lines running around the outer edges of the farthest offlying islands, rocks, and reefs.

Information is requested as to any benefits which might be derived from the extension of the territorial waters of the United States as proposed by House Joint Resolution 373; the detriments which might be suffered by the United States if other nations adopted similar legislation; and specific water areas

of other countries deemed important in this regard.

No benefits would be obtained by the United States from the extension of its territorial waters as proposed by House Joint Resolution 373. From a security standpoint there would be no advantage. Should there be sensitive points requiring more expansive areas of the sea for security purposes than are afforded by the system used by the United States for delimiting territorial waters, there are available the devices of defensive sea areas and maritime control areas, which are well recognized in international law, and which the United States would expect to be able to enforce; also, as it is well recognized that a special jurisdiction may be asserted over areas of the high seas for specific purposes, such as fishery conservation and exploitation of the resources of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf, without extending sovereign waters, there would be no additional economic advantage resulting to the United States. Both from a military and commercial viewpoint, therefore, no benefits not otherwise obtainable would accrue to the United States were House Joint Resolution 373 adopted.

Were the United States to extend its territorial waters as proposed by House Joint Resolution 373, other nations could be expected to assert claims to large water areas off their coasts. Many nations have already asserted these claims and those nations could be expected to treat such action by the United States as a recognition of the validity of their previously asserted claims. Any action by other nations which would restrict the range of warships and commercial vessels and military and commercial aircraft would be clearly disadvantageous to a great maritime power such as the United States. Any action which tends to restrict free navigation of the high seas by recognizing sovereignty over territorial waters in excess of 3 miles is contrary to United States security interest. At the present stage of international relations adoption of House Joint Resolution 373 would, it is believed, serve no useful purpose not realizable by other means and could lead to embarrassing and burdensome consequences to the United States.

With regard to the effect which similar legislation would have on the jurisdictional claims of other nations, a study has been made of only a few charts randomly selected, enclosures (1) through (4), covering the coastal areas of Venezuela, Greece, Sumatra, and the Netherlands East Indies. This study reveals that the possible effects of a broad interpretation of the decision of the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case could seriously affect the free navigation of the seas in areas such as the Aegean Sea, the coast of Sumatra between the chain of islands from Enggano and Simeuloe, the seas in the vicinity of the Netherlands East Indies, the coastal area of Venezuela between Farallon Centinela and Morro de Robledar and between Pta Ballena and Morro de Chacopata. In other areas not mentioned similar restrictions to free navigation would likewise apply.

A report on House Joint Resolution 373, expressing the opposition of the Department of Defense to the enactment of this measure, has recently been submitted to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives. A copy of that report is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL.

I emphasize that in this letter the Secretary of the Navy asserted that any action which had the effect of recognizing sovereignty over territorial waters in excess of 3 miles is contrary to United States security interests.

It will be pointed out, I am sure, that this statement was made by the Secretary of Navy in the recent administra-

tion. I answer by saying that Dan Kimball, of the great State of California, was not speaking as a Democrat or as a Republican, and not as a Californian but as an American. He was expressing the views which have been held by the Navy in every administration. He was expressing views which are soundly based in a concern for the security interests of our country. What he said has not been denied by his successor. No representative of President Eisenhower has come forward to say, "We do not care about freedom of the seas or about freedom of the air over the high seas." They have taken quite the opposite view. A representative of President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, testifying before the committee on Senate Joint Resolution 13, said:

The purpose of this Government has been, and still is, to give effect to its traditional policy of freedom of the seas. Such freedom is essential to its national interests. It is a time-honored concept of defense that the greater the freedom and range of its warships and aircraft the better protected are its security interests.

If the Congress of the United States were to take any action which might lead to the establishment of a 10½-mile limit, we would be striking a mortal blow at the principle of freedom of the seas, which has been considered an essential principle for United States security since the foundation of the Republic. I am shocked and amazed that such a possibility is being considered against the advice of the representatives of President Eisenhower. I am shocked and amazed that such a possibility is being considered without hearing directly from representatives of our Navy or of our Air Force. I am shocked and amazed that such a possibility is being considered without having given the National Security Council a chance to consider the far-reaching implications of such a step on the security interests of our country. I am shocked and amazed that the proponents of the pending measure have not once told the American people that what they are trying to do is to break down a precedent of freedom of the seas and of the air over the high seas, a precedent which has been sustained by every President from George Washington to Dwight Eisenhower, and by every Secretary of State from Thomas Jefferson to John Foster Dulles.

I should like to read to the Senate the note which was recently delivered in Moscow to the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. It protests the illegal attempts of the Soviet Union to extend its territorial boundaries in violation of international law. It was delivered on November 24, and reads as follows:

Moscow, November 12, 1952.

No. 438.

His Excellency JACOB MALIK,

Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs,

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Moscow.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America has noted with increasing concern the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of asserting territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control. My Government has also noted that in pursuing this

policy the Soviet Union is permitting its authorities to violate the rights of nationals of other states in what are generally recognized as international waters by ordering the seizure and detention of foreign-flag vessels between 3 and 12 nautical miles off the coasts and otherwise denying them access to that area.

It is the view of my Government that the Soviet Union, in thus attempting to appropriate to its exclusive use and control a portion of the high seas, has manifested a willingness to deprive other states, without their consent, of rights under international law. Such conclusion is inescapable in the face of a territorial-waters policy whereunder the Soviet Union would supplant free and untrammelled navigation by all vessels and aircraft over water areas comprising a part of the high seas with such controls as that Government might apply. The Government of the United States of America is not aware of any principle of international law which would support and justify such a policy. In the circumstances, my Government finds it necessary to reiterate that it cannot recognize the action of any government which is calculated to assimilate adjacent high seas to its territory.

The Government of the United States of America therefore protests the Soviet Union's closure of a 12-mile belt of waters contiguous to its coasts and to the coasts under its control, and reserves all its rights and interests of whatever nature in the high seas outside 3 nautical miles from those coasts.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

I have read the letter, Mr. President, because I think every single sentence of it is important in connection with the renewal of the historic position this country has taken from 1793 in favor of the open seas and in support of the 3-mile limitation of its territorial waters, territorial jurisdiction, territorial ownership, or whatever we may want to call it.

Let us suppose, Mr. President, that the United States has extended its territorial waters out 10½ miles into the Gulf of Mexico. That is what will be done if Texas and Florida extend their territorial boundaries 10½ miles on the claim of historic boundaries.

It is my understanding, from statements which have been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], that that is definitely the claim of Texas throughout the extent of its shoreline. I think I have understood correctly from the distinguished and able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is sponsoring the proposed legislation and who, I know, believes sincerely in the position he has taken, that the 10½-mile limit applies to the western shore of Florida and not to the eastern shore. But, certainly, Mr. President, in those cases the seaward boundaries as described by the joint resolution would extend 10½ miles, and in other cases, as I interpret the joint resolution, it might be possible to extend them farther. As a matter of fact, I have been thinking, and I asked a question on the floor one day in regard to it, What in the world may we expect to be the boundaries of Hawaii if she is admitted as our 49th State? Some of the objections to the admission of Hawaii relate to the fact that the Hawaiian Islands are extended for I do not know how far; I believe it has been said that it is 1,500 miles.

Certainly it is several hundred miles from the northernmost island to the last

island on the south. I assume, under the terms of the pending joint resolution, they have no historic boundary. If I correctly understand, if Hawaii is given the right to establish a boundary, it will become its historic boundary.

Mr. President, I was never more sincere in my life in saying that one of the most dangerous things about this measure is the fact that the limit is left wide open except so far as the original States are concerned. In two instances it is exactly contrary to what we have been contending for before the whole world—a proper limitation on territorial waters.

I read the memorandum which was handed to the Russian Government on November 24, 1952. I believe the question is still open with Russia. If I am incorrect, perhaps some Senator can correct me, but my understanding is that we are still contending that the distance of 3 miles is as far out as they can claim. But here is the Congress of the United States attempting to place the United States in the contradictory and inconsistent position of standing at the bar of the world and contending that other nations have not the right to extend their boundaries more than 3 miles, while we claim our boundaries go out a greater distance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator not recognize that not only is the Russian situation open as to boundaries, but that the argument with Saudi Arabia, Chile, Peru, and dozens of other nations is still wide open?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I am glad the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has asked me that question. This country owes a tremendous debt to him for the fine leadership he has manifested in bringing the issues to the Senate and to the country. I appreciate the fine contribution he has made.

I know those cases are open, and there is another one a little bit closer to our country. I speak of Mexico. Our shrimp boats are being molested outside the 3-mile limit off the coast of Mexico, and the United States Government is protesting against it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator not recognize the fact that the Canadian Government has been considering the extension of its territorial rights in connection with the fishing industry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. A few minutes ago, while the Senator from New Mexico was unavoidably absent from the floor, the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who certainly is alert on that subject, because many of his constituents are gravely concerned over the matter, asked me a similar question. It is a matter of concern not only with Russia, not only with Mexico, and with our neighbor to the north, Canada, but with many other nations. It could become a very complex and em-

barrassing problem in many parts of the world. It places us in a position which makes it almost impossible to maintain our treaties.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that a few moments ago I quoted from a recent treaty which we have with the United Kingdom with reference to the 3-mile limit. In The Hague conference and in all the international conference which have been held on the question, where the matter of territorial waters has been considered, we have, without exception, argued for a 3-mile limitation and agreed with other nations on it.

Mr. President, I mentioned a few minutes ago what would result under the joint resolution without the Douglas amendments. It is to the Douglas amendments that I am addressing myself; I did not have an opportunity to speak on the Anderson amendment. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I stated in the early part of my remarks that had I been present last week I certainly would have sought an opportunity to speak on the substitute which he offered. I supported in the last Congress the O'Mahoney substitute. I have of course supported the Hill amendment in both sessions, and I am sorry the Senate did not have an opportunity to vote on the Hill amendment separately and apart from the Anderson substitute in order that we might have had a real test on that important measure.

But under the joint resolution, even though most of the boundaries are so uncertain that I was not able to answer the question propounded to me by my constituents while I was at home last week, namely, "Just what are the boundaries that are set by the joint resolution?" We do know that, in at least two instances, they go beyond the 3-mile limit, and the invitation is there, opening wide, almost to the extent of opening the gates, giving notice that the opportunity will come later, to permit still further extension.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico wishes to make a unanimous-consent request. If I may have unanimous consent to yield for that purpose to the Senator from New Mexico, without prejudicing my right to the floor, I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

(At this point Mr. SPARKMAN yielded to Mr. ANDERSON, who suggested a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 13, and, following debate, such an agreement proposed by Mr. TAFT was entered. Mr. SPARKMAN yielded also for action on Senate bill 1767, to extend the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951. These matters appear in the RECORD following Mr. SPARKMAN's speech.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have been discussing the international

problems which would be created by extending our territorial jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit. I take the opportunity of the pendency of the pending amendments to make these remarks, because the Douglas amendments seek to draw a line at the historic 3-mile limit. I have contended, and I believe I have cited sufficient instances to show, that, all along, our Government has stood fast for the 3-mile limit. Every President from George Washington to President Eisenhower, every Secretary of State from Thomas Jefferson to John Foster Dulles—each of them, without exception—has insisted on the 3-mile limit; and our country has opposed efforts on the part of any other nation to extend its limits beyond 3 miles.

As a matter of fact, at this very time we are engaged in protests against attempts to extend territorial limits beyond 3 miles; we are protesting Russia's attempt to extend her jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit, and we are contesting similar claims on the part of Mexico and other nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I wish to ask a very serious question: Who is to be the owner of the valuable land under the sea beyond the 3-mile limit—such lands, for instance, as the ones which I understand occur in numerous areas in the Gulf of Mexico? Under the 3-mile-limit theory, whose land is that, and how can it be acquired?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Tate, who was representing the Secretary of State and the Department of State in the presentation before the committee, discussed that matter and called attention to the fact that the Government of the United States had made a claim for the resources out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Colorado remembers when that claim was made not so long ago. But Mr. Tate differentiates between our right to take those resources and the right of ownership. As a matter of fact, although I have not studied this question too closely, I believe that was basically the idea Attorney General Brownell was trying to impress upon the committee when he suggested that we not give fee simple title to the States, but give them the right to explore and develop the resources within that area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thought that was what Mr. Brownell was driving at, although it was not very clearly stated.

But it seemed to me that he was offering some sort of solution to a problem that is very serious and very important to our Nation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, and I think there was real substance in what the Attorney General was proposing. I believe the line he was drawing was that, whereas the Congress could give to the States

the right to explore and develop and even to enjoy the benefits of those resources, yet the Government of the United States does not have the right to cede beyond the 3-mile limit, because of the fact that that area affixes to the National Government as a part of national sovereignty.

The question of the area beyond the 3-mile limit, out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, is different, and yet I think it is somewhat analogous to the other; and I believe Mr. Tate tried to make that differentiation in the statement he made to the committee, pointing out that whereas we recognize that the seas are free from the 3-mile limit on out, and although we do not claim title to the land in that area, yet we claim we have a right to develop those resources—in very much the way, I assume, that fisheries are developed, although I must say that I have not studied that particular subject sufficiently to feel competent to discuss it.

I have studied the question of the extension of the territorial jurisdiction, and I have cited many instances in which the United States has contended with other nations in connection with that matter, and one instance in which Britain actually sent a warship to Russia, not so many years ago—in 1924, as I recall—in order to insist on the right of freedom of the seas outside of the 3-mile limit. I have pointed out that at this very time we are contending with Mexico on that subject. We are now contending with Mexico over the seizure of certain American shrimp boats outside the 3-mile limit. Also, the question is to some extent a matter of consideration with Canada, in connection with fisheries within the great New England area, and also, I believe, on the northwestern coast.

Now let us suppose that the United States has extended its territorial waters out to 10½ miles into the Gulf of Mexico. This is what we will do if we let Texas and Florida extend their territorial boundaries 10½ miles on the claim of historic boundaries. There can be no mistake about that. Representatives of President Eisenhower's Department of State have made this perfectly clear. At page 1053 of the hearings, they testified as follows:

The Department is concerned with such provisions of proposed legislation as would recognize or permit the extension of the seaward boundaries of certain States beyond the 3-mile limit. In international relations, the territorial claims of the United States and of the Nation are indivisible. The claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. If the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broader claim could force abandonment of its traditional position. At the same time it would renounce grounds of protest against claims of foreign States to greater breadths of territorial waters.

If the United States were to recognize this claimed extension of its territorial waters into the Gulf of Mexico on these alleged historic boundaries what would we have to do to our protest to the Soviet Union. We would have to write it this way. Let us look at the first sen-

tence of the memorandum delivered to the Soviet Union on November 24, 1952.

That sentence reads:

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America has noted with increasing concern the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of asserting territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control.

The United States has no right to express concern if territorial jurisdiction is being asserted on the basis of a claim of historic boundaries if we are doing the same thing ourselves. This sentence would have to be changed to read as follows:

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America has noted the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of asserting territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control. This policy has been noted with increasing concern except to the extent that territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control is asserted on the basis of an historical claim, whether or not recognized by other countries, over this belt.

Let us now look at the second sentence:

My Government has also noted that in pursuing this policy the Soviet Union is permitting its authorities to violate the rights of nationals of other states in what are generally recognized as international waters by ordering the seizure and detention of foreign flag vessels between 3 and 12 nautical miles off the coasts and otherwise denying them access to that area.

The United States certainly cannot make a point of the 3-mile limit if it is asserting a 10½-mile limit; so the best that could possibly be done with this sentence would be to change it to read as follows:

My Government has also noted that in pursuing this policy the Soviet Union is permitting its authorities to violate the rights of nationals of other states in what are generally recognized as international waters, unless the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asserts that they are within its historic boundaries, by ordering the seizure and detention of foreign flag vessels between 10½ and 12 miles off the coasts and otherwise denying them access to that area.

I think we can deal with the second paragraph as a unit. It reads:

It is the view of my Government that the Soviet Union, in thus attempting to appropriate to its exclusive use and control a portion of the high seas, has manifested a willingness to deprive other states, without their consent, of rights under international law. Such conclusion is inescapable in the face of a territorial waters policy whereunder the Soviet Union would supplant free and untrammelled navigation by all vessels and aircraft over water areas comprising a part of the high seas with such controls as that Government might apply. The Government of the United States of America is not aware of any principle of international law which would support and justify such a policy. In the circumstances, my Government finds it necessary to reiterate that it cannot recognize the action of any government which is calculated to assimilate adjacent high seas to its territory.

If we adopt this new position, this paragraph contains some obvious errors. It will have to read as follows:

It is the view of my Government that the Soviet Union in thus attempting to appropriate to its exclusive use and control a portion of the high seas, has, except to the extent that such action is based on a claim of historic boundaries, manifested a willingness to deprive other states, without their consent, of rights under international law. If the Soviet Union asserts any rights which are not based on a claim to historic boundaries, such a conclusion would become inescapable in the face of a territorial waters policy whereunder the Soviet Union would supplant free and untrammelled navigation by all vessels and aircraft over water areas comprising a part of the high seas as that Government might apply. The Government of the United States is not aware of any principle of international law which would support and justify such a policy except the principle that a country may extend its territorial waters to the extent that it alleges claims of historic boundaries. In the circumstances, my Government finds it necessary to reiterate that it cannot recognize the action of any government which is calculated to assimilate adjacent high seas to its territory, unless this action is based on a claim of historic boundaries.

The last paragraph reads as follows:

The Government of the United States of America therefore protests the Soviet Union's closure of a 12-mile belt of waters contiguous to its coasts and to the coasts under its control, and reserves all rights and interests of whatever nature in the high seas outside 3 nautical miles from those coasts.

This paragraph would clearly have to be changed. It would have to read:

The Government of the United States of America therefore protests the Soviet Union's closure of a 12-mile belt of waters contiguous to its coasts and to the coasts under its control, except to the extent that such action is based on a claim of historic boundaries, and, to the extent that such action is not based on a claim of historic boundaries, the United States reserves all its rights and interests of whatever nature in the high seas outside of 10½ miles from those coasts.

Now let us read the note as a whole as it would have to be rewritten, if we should extend our boundaries to 10½ miles into the gulf on the basis of these alleged claims of historic boundaries:

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America has noted the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of asserting territorial jurisdiction over a belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control. This policy has been noted with increasing concern except to the extent that territorial jurisdiction over the belt of waters 12 nautical miles in breadth along its coasts and coasts under its control is asserted on the basis of a historical claim, whether or not recognized by other countries, over this belt.

My Government has also noted that in pursuing this policy the Soviet Union is permitting its authorities to violate the rights of nationals of other states in what are generally recognized as international waters, unless the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asserts that they are within its historic boundaries, by ordering the seizure and detention of foreign-flag vessels between 10½ and 12 miles of the coasts and otherwise denying them access to that area.

It is the view of my Government that the Soviet Union, in thus attempting to appropriate to its exclusive use and control a

portion of the high seas, has, except to the extent that such action is based on a claim of historic boundaries, manifested a willingness to deprive other states, without their consent, of rights under international law. If the Soviet Union asserts any rights which are not based on a claim to historic boundaries, such a conclusion would become inescapable in the face of a territorial waters policy whereunder the Soviet Union would supplant free and untrammelled navigation by all vessels and aircraft over water areas comprising a part of the high seas as that government might apply. The Government of the United States is not aware of any principle of international law which would support and justify such a policy except the principle that a country may extend its territorial waters to the extent that it alleges claims of historic boundaries. In the circumstances, my Government finds it necessary to reiterate that it cannot recognize the action of any government which is calculated to assimilate adjacent high seas to its territory, unless this action is based on a claim of historic boundaries.

The Government of the United States of America therefore protests the Soviet Union's closure of a 12-mile belt of waters contiguous to its coasts and to the coasts under its control, except to the extent that such action is based on a claim of historic boundaries, and, to the extent that such action is not based on a claim of historic boundaries, the United States reserves all its rights and interests of whatever nature in the high seas outside of 10½ miles from those coasts.

What sort of protest would this be? What would the captain of the British warship who backed up his government's position with guns in 1923 think of an ally that would do that?

What would the countries to whom we have pledged our word that we will support the 3-mile limit think our word is worth after such an action? How will we explain it to the families of the airmen who have died supporting the principle that the Soviet Union has no right to close off the high seas or the air above the high seas? We could not explain it. And for my part I think it is a shame that we are even contemplating the possibility.

Mr. President, we have been told by some Senators who favor the proposal to give away the offshore oil that the rights of individual States to the open ocean bordering their shores extend back to the time before the Revolutionary War.

A good answer to that claim is given in an article I came across a few days ago. I wish to quote from this article resolutions and actions that occurred even prior to the adoption of the Constitution. From an article entitled "Who Owned the Ocean in 1776?" written by Irving Brant, and published in the New Republic magazine of April 20, 1953, beginning on page 12, I read:

Here is a resolution adopted by the Continental Congress on March 23, 1776, 1 year after the Revolutionary War broke out and 3 months before the Declaration of Independence was adopted:

"That all vessels . . . and cargoes belonging to the inhabitants of Great Britain . . . which shall happen to be taken near the shores of any of these colonies, by the people of the country, or detachments from the army, shall be deemed lawful prize, and the court of admiralty within the said colony is required, on condemnation thereof [to divide the prize money equally]."

That resolution and others like it had the force of national law, as anybody knows who has read Marshall's opinion in the *Olmstead Case*. It contains one possible loophole for the oil-grabbers. The Atlantic Ocean is 3,000 miles wide. Perhaps "near the shores" meant more than 3 miles out, though it is hard to see how "detachments of the army" could wade that far. That question was answered on April 2, 1776, when Congress adopted a commission for privateers, authorizing them to capture ships "on the high seas, or between high- and low-water marks." The identical scope of these actions was made plainer in a supplemental resolution adopted by the Continental Congress on July 24, 1776:

"Resolved, That all the resolutions of this Congress, passed on the 23d day of March last [and later] . . . relating to [British ships] . . . taken on the high seas, or between high- and low-water mark, be extended to all ships [owned by nonrevolting colonists]."

So, in the month in which the United States came into existence, Congress asserted national jurisdiction over the seashore between high and low tide. What men sponsored this spoliation of the sacred rights of the 20-day-old States? John Adams, of Massachusetts; Benjamin Harrison, of Virginia; and Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, were the villains who drafted it.

Surely the infant States rebelled at this series of Federal laws, by which Congress thrust its long nose into the baby carriage of State sovereignty. Alas no. Read the resolution adopted by the Virginia Committee of Safety on May 10, 1776:

"Pursuant to powers received from the honorable the Continental Congress, the Committee of Safety are ready to grant commissions for making reprisals upon the property of the people of Great Britain at sea, or in the rivers below high-water mark, to any persons who shall apply for them and comply with the terms mentioned by Congress."

Federal maritime jurisdiction, as Virginia saw it in 1776, extended above the present site of Washington, D. C., on the Potomac, and up to Fredericksburg on the Rappahannock—as far inland as the tides were felt.

In the ensuing war years, some Continental privateersmen grew so enthusiastic that they went ashore in regions occupied by the British, and carried off cows and chickens belonging to American farmers. This was too much for Governor Clinton, of New York, and too much for Congress. On Clinton's complaint, a congressional committee on October 11, 1781, brought in this resolve:

"That whereas . . . citizens of these United States . . . have been plundered of their property above high-water mark under the pretence of legal authority . . . therefore resolved, that no goods taken on land above high-water mark shall be deemed legal prize within the United States."

There you have it. National sovereignty over ocean waters, in the days of the Founding Fathers, did not extend above high tide. The man who wrote this, Samuel Livermore, of New Hampshire, knew his salt water. He resigned from Congress a few months later to become a judge of the Court of Appeals in Cases of Capture.

James Madison, who later had something to do with writing the Constitution, was in the Continental Congress at this time. Nobody was more zealous in defending the "historic rights of the States" to the ocean above high tide. In a new ordinance regulating captures, he wrote to Edmund Pendleton on January 8, 1782, a clause was inserted authorizing the capture of British merchandise, owned by neutrals, "if coming into these States, and within three leagues of the coast."

"Congress," he added, "has now recommended to the States to subject them to

seizure, during the war, if found on land within their respective limits." There you have the Father of the Constitution dividing State and Federal spheres. State sovereignty was to be exercised on land, Federal sovereignty from the water's edge to 9 miles out.

But suppose a ship ran aground. Who had jurisdiction in that case? Well, that question was before Congress at the time Madison wrote. The British captured a vessel in coastal waters and ran it onto a bar. Deserted by its prize crew, did it belong to its owners or to the armed squad of Americans that went aboard. A committee of Congress undertook to settle it with this amendment to the ordinance Madison was talking about:

"And it is further ordained, that where vessels . . . sailing or being within the body of a county, or within any river arm of the sea, or within cannon shot of the shore of any of the States . . . shall be captured by the enemy, and shall be recaptured below high-water mark . . . [salvage only shall be paid]."

Mr. President, all in all, this is a very interesting article from which I have quoted rather at length. Certainly it goes beyond anything we are now contending. I think we all subscribe to the views laid down in the Pollard case, and in many subsequent cases, that on inland waters that part of the land above low tide belongs to the States, but certainly some of those who preceded us felt that the Federal Government owned much more than we contend today it owns. We often hear the question of States' rights raised in connection with the ownership of these lands. I was in the House of Representatives when I had my first contact with a bill of this nature. That was before the Supreme Court has acted on any of these cases. At that time one of my colleagues from Alabama was Representative Sam Hobbs, who was one of the finest constitutional lawyers, I believe, who ever served in the House of Representatives. He was a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee of the House. I can say that there never was a man who was a more ardent States' rights advocate than was Representative Hobbs, of Alabama. But from the time the bill first came before the House he consistently argued, and continued so to argue as long as he lived, not only that the Federal Government had jurisdiction over the 3-mile strip, but it had rights even beyond what I am willing to claim for it or to admit; his argument being that the Federal Government had the right to exercise its jurisdiction in defense of its security, its life, and its sovereignty.

I thought it was rather significant that when the Supreme Court decided the California case the decision was based in large part upon the very views which had been expressed by Representative Hobbs, although the Supreme Court did not go as far as he would have advocated.

I may say that my good friend and esteemed colleague of those days, Representative Hobbs, felt so strongly on the subject that he voluntarily associated himself with the case when it came before the Supreme Court, in the position of amicus curiae and argued the case before the Court.

Mr. President, the spokesman for the State Department, Jack B. Tate, in his

testimony on March 3 of this year before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, points out the continuity of the position taken by the Continental Congress and that later held by the United States itself from its early days on down to the present.

The State Department spokesman said:

As early as 1793, this Government had to face the question of the breadth of territorial waters. At that time Jefferson, while reserving a final decision, took the position that the United States should consider territorial waters "as restrained for the present to the distance of one sea league of three geographical miles" from the seashore. This position has never been changed. The United States supported the 3-mile limit at the 1930 Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law. And in the last few years, this Government has on a number of occasions reaffirmed this position and protested the claims of other States to limits broader than 3 miles, including the claim of the Soviet Union to 12 miles. . . . The purpose of this Government has been, and still is, to give effect to its traditional policy of freedom of the seas. Such freedom is essential to its national interest. It is a time-honored concept of defense that the greater the freedom and range of its warships and aircraft, the better protected are its security interests. Likewise, the maintenance of free lanes and air routes is vital to the success of its shipping and air transport. And it is becoming evident that its fishing interest depends in large part upon fishing resources in seas adjacent to foreign states.

The maintenance of the traditional position of the United States is vital at a time when a number of foreign states show a tendency unilaterally to break down the principle of freedom of the seas by attempted extensions of sovereignty over high seas. A change of the traditional position of this Government would be seized upon by other states as justification for broad and extravagant claims over adjacent seas. This is precisely what happened when this Government issued its proclamation of 1945 regarding jurisdiction and control over resources of the Continental Shelf. It precipitated a chain reaction of claims, going beyond the terms of the United States proclamation, including claims to sovereignty extending as much as 200 miles from shore.

The Department is concerned with such provisions of proposed legislation as would recognize or permit the extension of the seaward boundaries of certain States beyond the 3-mile limit. In international relations, the territorial claims of the States and of the Nation are indivisible. The claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. If the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broader claim would force abandonment of its traditional position. At the same time it would renounce grounds of protest against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters.

All this, and many comments heretofore, show that this Nation has historically for its own good—to protect our own people's interest—insisted on the sovereign rights of the Nation, not the individual States, on beyond the open shores.

Mr. President, are we, for the sake of two or three States, to become embroiled in all the international complexities the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 would be certain to cause? Are we, for the selfish benefit of a small handful, to

jeopardize, even destroy, the rights of the tens of thousands who depend upon fishing for a livelihood?

Not many days ago there appeared in the Washington Evening Star a column written by Mr. Lowell Mellett, entitled, "Shrimps Enter Fight Over Oil." That column discusses one of the problems which I have been trying to point out this morning. It is the problem which arises when we try to extend our territorial limit beyond that which we have always recognized, namely, 3 miles, particularly if the Government of the United States is placed in the inconsistent position by the enactment by the legislative body of a measure which would extend our 3-mile boundary, while, at the same time, the same Government, through its executive department, is contending that other nations have no right to extend their boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit. Since Mr. Mellett's column is so much in accordance with these views, I should like to impose upon the time of the Senate to read it. The headline is:

"Shrimps Enter Fight Over Oil. Big Gulf Industry Opposes Claim of Mexican Government to Jurisdiction Over Waters Beyond Three-Mile Limit."

By the way, speaking of the term "big gulf industry," it is a big gulf industry. It is an industry whose vessels ply the waters off our coasts around the gulf.

When I see the statements that sometimes appear in the press, indicating that we are trying to give away something belonging to the States, and when we see Mexico in the open sea, beyond the 3-mile limit, seizing our ships engaged in shrimping and making a living for many people along the Gulf-Coast States, I reflect that we would be giving away something that belongs to all our people, that is, a right which has been theirs ever since 1793—yes; and even before that, since the days of the Continental Congress—the right to enjoy the benefits of the open sea.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the shrimping industry is quite an industry on the Gulf Coast? Cities such as Coden, Miss., and Bayou La Batre, Ala., depend almost entirely upon the shrimping industry. We may say that their economy is subject to the shrimping industry. Is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it is correct. One of the delights which I enjoy so much on the Riviera of the Gulf Coast in our area is to sit in the sunshine, watch the waves lap upon the shore, and to see the shrimp boats going out and coming in. It is a pleasant sight, and it is very important to realize what it means to the economy of our people. Of course, some of the finest shrimp in the world come from that region. The shrimp boats bring them in because they have a right to range over the whole area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I was about to ask the Senator if at least part of his delight and delectation over being on the Gulf

Coast is not derived from buying and enjoying some of those shrimps as well as from seeing the boats bring them in.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Naturally; it certainly is.

Mr. President, I have no intention of discussing the pending joint resolution from a selfish standpoint; in fact, earlier in the day I agreed with the statement made by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] that we who are fighting on this side of the question are really conservatives, because we are trying to conserve what belongs to all the people of the Nation. But if I were measuring the question purely from the selfish standpoint, I would say that shrimping means a great deal more to Alabama than do any prospects of oil that have appeared on the horizon.

I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that I do not know whether that statement would apply to Texas. I do not believe Texas has found very much oil out at sea as yet. In fact, I have been told that one of the great disappointments over the enactment of the pending measure will be the small amount of oil which will be received by Texas, unless the prospecting can push out well beyond the 10½-mile limit. I do not make this as a factual statement; I have simply heard it. However, I am certain that the shrimping industry today means a great deal more to Texas than do any proceeds or revenues from oil anywhere off the coast of Texas.

Likewise, I am certain that the shrimping industry means a great deal to Florida. I do not believe Florida has found any oil off her coasts as yet. I believe Louisiana has found some oil. Yet I know that Louisiana is one of the great shrimping States. The same is true of Mississippi, which is one of the greatest.

So, without at all posing as an authority, my guess would be that if we considered the region from the tip of Florida and went around the shores of the gulf, taking the whole area, State by State, we would find that economically the shrimping industry means a great deal more to that region than does anything that has yet appeared relating to offshore oil.

Therefore I believe Lowell Mellett's column about shrimps is one of great interest to several of the States which are greatly concerned with the proposed legislation. I do not know whether or not any shrimps are found in California waters, but certainly every Gulf State enjoys a fine shrimping industry, which contributes greatly to the prosperity of the whole area. So I feel it is quite appropriate that I should call the attention of Senators at this time to Mr. Mellett's column, which reads as follows:

SHRIMPS ENTER FIGHT OVER OIL—BIG GULF INDUSTRY OPPOSES CLAIM OF MEXICAN GOVERNMENT TO JURISDICTION OVER WATERS BEYOND 3-MILE LIMIT

(By Lowell Mellett)

A new element of confusion has been introduced into the dispute over the offshore oil lands. Shrimps. The big shrimp industry of Louisiana, Texas, and Florida is asserting a point of view, involving its own profitable enterprise, and it is a point of view that conflicts in an important way with that presented officially by the three States.

I wish Mr. Mellett had included Alabama and Mississippi, because those States certainly have a large shrimping industry.

Seems that one of the finest and most extensive shrimp-fishing areas anywhere is in the waters off the coast of Mexico. The very fattest, most succulent shrimps, it is said, can be gathered in a belt between 3 and 10 miles out from shore, and our shrimp tycoons have been gathering them there. But they run into constant trouble with Mexican shrimpers and the Mexican Government. The Mexican Government claims jurisdiction as far out as 10 miles. Our own Government has heretofore backed the contention of our own shrimpers that Mexican jurisdiction extends only 3 miles.

Not so long ago a Mexican patrol boat seized an American shrimp boat, fishing within the 10-mile limit, and it required some stubborn diplomatic palaver by our State Department to obtain the boat's release. The Department stuck to the historic 3-mile-limit theory then, as it did later in discussing the general jurisdictional question with the Senate Interior Committee. Regardless of any decision by Congress as to whether the States or the Federal Government shall own the offshore land, the Department insists that neither can claim it for a distance of more than 3 miles. Beyond that point the waters become international, the Department was compelled to tell the Senators, just as it had told the Mexican Government.

This is proving embarrassing to the States and oil companies involved, since the richest oil deposits in the Gulf of Mexico are now considered to be beyond the 3-mile limit, and since they have been demanding that the States be given title many miles beyond.

Ironically, the States might find support for their contention in a quarter where they would not wish to seek it. The Russian Government has asserted that her territorial waters extend 12 miles from her coastline. This claim was made in 1950 in defending the shooting down of an unarmed Navy patrol plane in the Baltic Sea. Our Government's insistence on the 3-mile limit has continued, however, applying it to the air as well as the sea. The weather-observation plane that exchanged shots with a Soviet plane last week was 25 miles off the coast of Kamchatka, but a spokesman for the United States Air Force asserted the right under international law to fly within 3 miles, even though there is no desire to exercise that right.

The wealth beneath the troubled waters of the gulf is still a matter of widely varying estimates. At the outset of the present argument the proponents of the Federal Government's claim used the figure of \$40 billion. Since then some estimates of the value of the oil and gas have gone as high as \$250 billion. Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who, like several other Senators, is now taking this issue by radio and letter to the people of his own State, noted the new and higher estimate in a broadcast Sunday. It almost equals the national debt, he pointed out.

Some geologists are convinced that much of great value beside gas and oil may be found in the gulf's wide Continental Shelf. There may be vast sulfur deposits, they say. There's money in sulfur these days. A Texan, scarcely known outside his own community, was said to be worth a quarter of a billion dollars when he died a few weeks ago. His fortune had come chiefly from the sulfur industry.

Mr. President, I do not care to hold the Senate unduly long with my discussion of this question, but inasmuch as I was unable to be present last week and discuss some other points in connection

with the joint resolution, particularly the amendment which has been so ably sponsored and presented, both last year and this year, by my colleague [Mr. HILL], I wish to take occasion to say a few words about that amendment, because, if I correctly understand, it is embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Any proceeds taken by the Federal Government would be distributed in the form of Federal aid for education.

I have supported Federal aid for education ever since I first entered public office. I remember that when I first ran for the House of Representatives back in 1936 I published a little card. It had about six or eight very brief statements on it of the things in which I believed. One of them I remember very well was a very brief slogan:

Federal aid for education without Federal control.

I have stood for that principle as long as I have been in Congress, and I have worked for it on every occasion.

I know what it means to come from what might be described as an economically depressed area. It was my good fortune a couple of years ago to serve as a delegate to the United Nations. I was assigned to the Economic Committee. I started talking about underdeveloped areas. I found that the representatives of some countries took offense at my use of the term "underdeveloped." They preferred that we talk about "less accelerated prosperity," or some such term. However, I found any other term than "underdeveloped" quite awkward. One day I was making a speech before the Economic Committee, and I started by saying, "I understand some people do not like the term 'underdeveloped,' but I am speaking to you as one who came from an underdeveloped area. The South has had a terrific struggle. I am not going to review it. It has had a terrific struggle since the days of the War Between the States and the reconstruction era which followed. One of the things we struggled hard to accomplish in the South has been the building of a public-school system which would enable all our boys and girls to obtain a good education. It has been a terrific struggle."

Last week when I was in Alabama some of the people whom I saw were school teachers and others interested in schools. They are very much concerned about the hard times which our schools are undergoing at present. My colleague [Mr. HILL] had the foresight to offer his proposal several years ago. My distinguished colleague, with the aid of the distinguished majority leader at that time, and other Members of the Senate, drafted and pushed through the Senate a very fine bill to provide Federal aid for education. I regret exceedingly that it was not accepted by the House, and did not become the law of the land. In any event, he had the vision and foresight to propose a very wise use of the assets which the Federal Government might obtain from its part of the submerged oil lands.

There can be no dispute, it seems to me, of the fact that our schools are the very foundation of our way of life. If we

continue to neglect our public-school system, that foundation will eventually crumble.

I recognize the fact that some of my distinguished colleagues have already very ably discussed the present school situation and told of the plight of our schools and the immeasurable value which the Hill amendment would be to them. I shall not discuss the point at length from a national point of view. The plight of the schools in my own State—in fact, in all the southern States and all the low-income States outside the South, is typical. Indeed, there is no State in which the school system is not in need of improvement. It seems to me that no State can afford to lose the millions of dollars which would accrue to it should the Hill amendment, as embodied in the Douglas amendments, be adopted.

DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE UNDER NATIONAL
OIL AND GAS LEASING ACT

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I suppose the distinguished Senator from Alabama understands that from 1920, when the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was enacted to provide a method of granting permits for prospecting for oil and gas on public lands, the revenue therefrom—12½ percent—was divided 10 percent to the Government, presumably for supervision, 37½ percent to the States wherein the oil and gas leases were located, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund. Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I understand that to be the fact.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator further understand that immediately after the Supreme Court decision holding that the States did not own the submerged lands—seabottom lands—and that the Federal Government had paramount rights—which are interpreted as being the highest title to public lands—the Secretary of the Interior ruled that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act was not applicable to the seabottom lands? Is the distinguished Senator familiar with that ruling?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will not say that I am familiar with it. I understand that was the general effect.

Mr. MALONE. It was the ruling the Secretary made. If the Senator will yield further, is he familiar with the fact that there were 4 or 5 hundred people interested in 11 applications filed with the Secretary of the Interior under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act for permits to prospect for oil and gas on the seabottom land offshore in California?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am familiar with it only in a general way. I have not studied the subject.

Mr. MALONE. As soon as the Supreme Court ruled that the submerged sea-bottom lands did not belong to the States, and that the Government had the paramount rights, the Secretary

made a ruling which precluded the granting of permits to prospect under those applications. Immediately the applicants under those 11 applications sued the Secretary of the Interior to reverse his decision.

I ask the Senator if he is familiar with the fact that that case has been argued in the Federal court in the District of Columbia, and is ready for decision? It is understood that the decision will be rendered as soon as the Supreme Court either accepts or amends the master's report on the question of the boundary between inland waters and the open sea. Is the distinguished Senator from Alabama familiar with that court case?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only in a general way.

Mr. MALONE. If the decision is favorable to the applicants, which many persons expect it will be, then the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act is applicable to the lands in question, and there will be no question as to where the revenues will go. In other words, 52½ percent of the royalties, 12½ percent or whatever they are, would go into the reclamation fund.

The reclamation fund is also augmented through repayment from projects already constructed. The 17 Western Reclamation States, are in the area which would be affected.

If the decision is unfavorable, I would ask the distinguished Senator whether he would agree that all that would be needed would be an amendment to make the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act applicable to the sea-bottom lands. In other words, it would take only an amendment to remove any technicality cited in refusing to grant such permits in the first instance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I presume that is true.

Mr. MALONE. I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator's argument, that the proceeds of the oil should go to the educational fund. Every State needs additional funds for education. However, for 33 years 52½ percent of the royalties, whatever they may be, have gone to the reclamation fund to develop the arid and semiarid States west of the Mississippi River, which was applied to the public lands States, the arid and semiarid States. Is the distinguished Senator familiar with that principle?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I am familiar with it.

Mr. MALONE. I wanted to make the Record clear on that point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I fully appreciate the Senator's position. Naturally it is a matter which comes to his attention much more clearly than it does to mine, because my State is not within the area that has been affected throughout the years.

Mr. MALONE. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does happen that my State is in an area in which the school situation is not only of great importance, but the schools are very badly in need of help.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator if it would not be a matter for Congress to decide whether they wanted to make a change in the distribution of royalties, and all that would have to be done would be to introduce a bill to transfer the revenues from the reclamation fund to the educational fund. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Assuming that the Court decision is that way; yes.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. Or in any case, even if it were ruled because of some technicality that the sea-bottom lands from low tide seaward to the State boundary did not come under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act, or that that act was not applicable to those lands, it would be merely a technicality, because, after all, they would be public lands. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Congress could certainly dispose of the revenue.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the contribution from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, the mention made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia of the Secretary of the Navy reminded me of the action taken by the Senate in 1937, by which offshore lands were by resolution of the Senate unanimously agreed to belong to the Federal Government, and upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, it was stated that the lands should go into our naval reserve. I thought I had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD open at the place where that point was discussed, but I do not seem to be able to find it at the moment. But, while that resolution was taken up by unanimous consent of the Senate, I checked it a few days ago, and I found it was not considered as a pro forma matter without any Senator taking note of it. As a matter of fact, questions were asked on the floor of the Senate regarding it, and Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, who was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee at the time, stated that the Secretary of the Navy had recommended that the action be taken, and stated the reserves were needed as a part of our naval reserves. As I recall, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy was placed in the RECORD. Earlier in my remarks today, I quoted a letter from Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball with reference to the extension of the 3-mile limit, or the drawing of a line outside the 3-mile limit. The Secretary of the Navy in 1937, was I believe Secretary Swanson, of Virginia, who for a long time was a distinguished Member of this body.

This subject is not a new one. Many Members of the Senate were present in 1937 when the Senate directed the Attorney General to start action to clear up or to make certain that the claim of the United States to the oil reserves under the submerged lands was made definite, and it was done at the request of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, I was just starting to say something about the schools.

The plight of the schools in my own State, is typical of that in all the Southern States, and in fact in all the low-income States outside the South.

Indeed, there is no State in which the school system is not in need of improve-

ment. There is no State which, it seems to me, can afford to lose the tens of millions of dollars that would accrue to them should the Hill amendment be adopted.

Tables have been inserted to show what this loss would amount to in each individual State. A conservative estimate is that Alabama would lose over \$200 million on royalties from oil alone. The figure could be and probably would be a great deal larger. When I think of the need of the schools in Alabama for these hundreds of millions of dollars, I cannot help but believe that it would be a gross injustice, a gross wrong, to the children of Alabama and other States, to give to 2 or 3 States those riches which the Supreme Court, on more than one occasion, has declared belong to all the people of all the States.

I know that the teachers in Alabama greatly need a salary increase. Low salaries produce a big turnover among teachers, who leave each year to find better paying work. Thus, each of our children, the most valuable resource of all, are deprived of many good teachers and of efficiency in teaching.

In 1951-52, the last year for which figures are available, the average salary paid instructional personnel, including teachers, superintendents, and principals, was \$2,537. The average salary paid classroom teachers alone was \$2,487.

How can anyone, and particularly families with children, live on such meager incomes and meet the many community responsibilities that are demanded of all teaching personnel?

In the South alone, five States pay lower teachers' salaries than does Alabama. It seems to me that the following schedule of the average annual salaries of the instructional staff in Southern States and in the United States as a whole should convince anyone that the money from the oil now in dispute could be used to no better advantage than to raise the incomes of our teaching personnel.

Average annual salaries of instructional staff
(Includes teachers, principals, and instructional supervisors)

	1947-48	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52
United States.....	\$2,639	\$3,010	\$3,100	\$3,365
Alabama.....	1,957	2,111	2,179	2,537
Arkansas.....	1,545	1,801	1,804	1,882
Florida.....	2,641	2,958	3,043	3,236
Georgia.....	1,724	1,936	2,123	2,604
Kentucky.....	1,884	1,936	2,054	2,386
Louisiana.....	2,236	2,963	3,062	3,122
Mississippi.....	1,256	1,416	1,587	1,665
North Carolina.....	2,114	2,688	2,959	3,250
South Carolina.....	1,742	1,891	2,004	2,434
Tennessee.....	1,901	2,302	2,357	2,344
Texas.....	2,585	3,122	3,182	3,331
Virginia.....	2,062	2,328	2,461	2,596

Please note that Mississippi and Tennessee pay even lower salaries than does Alabama. It does not seem right to me that three of the States included in this table should be given all these moneys just because of their fortunate location and, thus, be enabled to pay salaries which exceed greatly the salaries paid by other States. Certainly, to have more than one-third of the money as an outright gift, and to have an equal share with other States in the remainder, constitute more than a fair and just share.

Mr. President, recently Mr. Frank L. Grove, secretary of the Alabama Education Association, wrote a guest editorial which appeared in one of the Montgomery newspapers. In the editorial Mr. Grove set forth some very interesting facts and also a table. I ask unanimous consent that his editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AEA SECRETARY GROVE DISCUSSES TEACHER SITUATION IN ALABAMA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This week's guest editorial is written by Frank Grove, the secretary of the Alabama Education Association. In his editorial Mr. Grove discusses the teacher problem in Alabama public schools. This is another in the Examiner's weekly series of columns by outstanding Alabamians.)

In a release to the press last week State Superintendent Terry said that the shortage of qualified teachers in Alabama would worsen in September of this year. At least two causes are expected to contribute to this shortage: the largest group of 6-year-olds on record expected to enter school this fall, and the anticipated exodus of teachers to adjoining States during the summer months.

Back in 1947, 6 years ago, 87,242 babies were born in Alabama, the greatest number of any previous year. These youngsters are now about ready for school and expect to find seats and teachers when the new school year opens in September. Just where this army of boys and girls will find accommodations or who will teach them are questions already beginning to worry school boards throughout the State.

If all the students expected to graduate from the State teacher training institutions this spring were to teach next fall the number available would be well below the number needed to fill vacancies in the elementary schools. However, it is estimated that only about 25 percent of those completing teacher courses actually teach. Instead, they go into other lines of work, due primarily to the low salaries paid teachers as compared with other vocations. To meet

the needs Alabama could well use several hundred teachers from other States. On the contrary, we are expected to lose many teachers to Florida and Georgia because these States pay considerably better salaries.

On this page is the average salary paid instructional personnel (teachers, supervisors, and principals) in 1951-52 in the Southern States. The records from 1952-53 are not available, but would show only slight changes.

It is noted that Alabama's average salary is \$828 less than the average for the Nation, and that of the 12 States listed only 5 pay lower salaries than Alabama. These are Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Two of the States adjoining Alabama, as disclosed in the table, pay higher salaries than does our State. In fact certain cities and counties near the Georgia-Alabama and the Florida-Alabama lines pay considerably more than the indicated salaries. These school systems offer peculiarly alluring opportunities for underpaid Alabama teachers.

It is frequently remarked that Alabama has increased teacher salaries considerably in recent years. This is true. In 1939-40, for example, the average salary paid teachers here was \$744. In 1951-52 it was \$2,537, an increase of \$1,793 or 241 percent. However, inflation has reduced this salary to \$1,470, which yields a gain of \$1,067, or 73 percent, in terms of 1939-40 dollars.

But that is not all. In 1939-40 teachers were not required to pay income tax. Now they are. When the 1951-52 salary is adjusted for this tax of \$374, and in terms of the 1939-40 dollar, the gain in take-home pay is reduced to \$693, or 47 percent. Of course inflation and income taxes hit other groups as well as teachers, but in considering increases for teachers these two factors cannot be ignored. Salary increases are far from what they seem.

Alabama faces another serious problem in its efforts to finance schools. The causes are not hard to find. Alabama relatively has a much larger child load than most States and less wealth with which to maintain schools. Even so, Alabama citizens have repeatedly increased their tax load to improve their schools. They will do so again when convinced that increases are needed. They will have opportunity to study these needs in detail during the coming months.

Interesting facts on average annual salaries of instructional staff in South

(Includes teachers, principals, and instructional supervisors)

	1929-30	1939-40	1943-44	1947-48	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52
United States.....	\$1,420	\$1,441	\$1,728	\$2,639	\$3,010	\$3,100	\$3,365
Alabama.....	792	744	1,009	1,957	2,111	2,179	2,537
Arkansas.....	673	584	845	1,545	1,801	1,804	1,882
Florida.....	876	1,012	1,390	2,641	2,958	3,043	3,236
Georgia.....	684	770	923	1,724	1,936	2,123	2,604
Kentucky.....	896	826	1,158	1,884	1,936	2,054	2,386
Louisiana.....	941	1,006	1,427	2,236	2,963	3,062	3,122
Mississippi.....	620	559	790	1,256	1,416	1,587	1,665
North Carolina.....	873	946	1,342	2,114	2,688	2,959	3,250
South Carolina.....	788	743	973	1,742	1,891	2,004	2,434
Tennessee.....	902	862	1,062	1,901	2,302	2,357	2,344
Texas.....	924	1,079	1,329	2,585	3,122	3,182	3,331
Virginia.....	861	899	1,308	2,062	2,328	2,461	2,596

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, while we are speaking of low salaries paid to our teachers, let us compare them with the salaries paid to workers in certain other Alabama industries.

The following table shows that the average annual salary paid classroom teachers is, in most cases, less than that earned by other workers—workers who are not paid too much, it is true, but who generally do not have to invest the time and money that a teacher has to invest in order to become qualified for his work:

Alabama classroom teachers' average annual salary compared with average earnings of workers in selected industries in the State

	Annual earnings
Classroom teachers.....	\$2,487
Workers in auto repair services and garages.....	2,412
Workers in trucking and warehousing.....	2,667
Workers in textiles.....	2,623
Workers in building construction.....	2,997
Workers in bituminous coal mining.....	3,372
Workers in telephone and telegraph.....	2,906
Bricklayers.....	6,000

Alabama classroom teachers' average annual salary compared with average earnings of workers in selected industries in the State—Continued

	Annual earnings
Carpenters.....	\$4,480
Electricians.....	5,200
Painters.....	4,500
Plasterers.....	5,040
Plumbers.....	5,300
Building Laborers.....	2,450
Local transit operating employees (beginning).....	3,528
Local transit operating employees (after 1 year).....	3,648

Only workers in auto repair shops and garages made less last year than did teachers.

Let us make one more comparison. Let us see how the salary of the teachers compares with the salaries of other State employees:

Alabama classroom teacher's average annual salary compared with beginning salary for certain Alabama merit system employees

	Annual salary
Classroom teachers.....	\$2,487
Highway patrolmen.....	3,240
Welfare case workers I.....	2,880
Forester I.....	3,528
Bacteriologist.....	2,760
Accountant I.....	3,468
Field auditor.....	3,612
Revenue examiner.....	3,684
Employment interviewer I.....	2,976
Statistician.....	3,696
Civil engineers I.....	3,324
Average salary of all merit system employees.....	2,960

I want again to make clear that it is not my intention to imply that the other employees are paid excessive salaries. Far from it. I simply mean to point out a condition of low salaries that is adversely affecting the quality of instruction which I am reasonably sure exists in other States, and which could be corrected if Congress would only adopt the Hill amendment.

It may have been noticed in the first set of figures from which I quoted that during the past 6 years the salaries of teachers have risen moderately. We should remember, however, that the raise has been more than taken away by the increase in taxes made necessary by our national defenses and foreign-aid programs and by the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar. It would take \$21½ million alone to increase the salaries of Alabama teachers to that of the United States average.

What I have said thus far applies only to the salaries of elementary and high-school teachers. The salaries of the teaching staffs of colleges are just as inadequate. In some cases, the lag in increases has been even greater. In 1951-52, 1,071 were employed as teachers in the State-supported colleges of Alabama. These included professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors. Their average salary was \$3,843. Eleven years earlier, the average salary was \$2,156. Thus, it would seem that during the interval there was a gain of 78 percent. This does not mean, though, that Alabama college salaries have really increased. Actually, after allowances are made for necessary increased taxes and the decreased pur-

chasing power of the dollar, the salaries have decreased by almost 10 percent.

During this time the enrollment in our colleges increased approximately 75 percent. At the time when more and more youngsters are going to college, those who are to train them, to instruct them in our American way of life, are being further and further discouraged from taking on that great responsibility. There is simply no inducement, money-wise, for our young people to enter the teaching profession either in the public schools or at the college level.

There is another aspect of essential school cost that is in great need of additional money. I refer to the cost of transporting school children in Alabama. The annual expenditures per transported pupil enrolled for the United States and for the Southern States are as follows:

Annual transportation expenditures per transported pupil enrolled

State	1945-46	1947-48	1949-50
United States.....	\$25.66	\$30.11	\$30.88
Alabama.....	14.69	17.80	16.82
Arkansas.....	15.87	21.29	19.10
Florida.....	19.69	24.48	19.59
Georgia.....	18.26	24.73	24.91
Kentucky.....	15.82	17.88	21.24
Louisiana.....	22.35	27.64	24.67
Mississippi.....	17.80	25.89	21.66
North Carolina.....	11.97	18.36	15.08
South Carolina.....	23.63	21.87	23.37
Tennessee.....	15.06	18.72	20.35
Texas.....	19.56	18.82	26.91
Virginia.....	16.04	20.27	18.39

Alabama's low cost has been made possible partly through good management. However, much of it is accounted for by insufficient, and in some cases, dangerously inadequate services. In 1951-52, for example, 931 Alabama school buses were overcrowded. There were 904 buses 10 years old or older. Some of these buses were still good, but most of them were unfit for further use. During the same year, 212 buses had wood or composite bodies, which are unsafe.

To replace this obsolete and unsafe equipment would require about \$3½ million. The transportation load is increasing. It is necessary to add buses each school year, and it is obvious that the pupils transported by bus is constantly increasing.

All of us know that during recent years, many bills have been introduced to provide for more adequate school buildings. With the exception of those that apply to defense areas, these bills have generally received little positive attention. The fact, though, that they have been introduced is recognition that the problem is acute. It would take several billion dollars to modernize present buildings and to build needed new buildings to house properly our schoolchildren. It is estimated that in Alabama alone, nearly \$300 million is needed for school facilities. Our share of the oil from the submerged lands would just about do the job.

The following conditions point to the need for more adequate buildings in Alabama. I am sure that many of these conditions are found in my colleagues' States, and could be alleviated if the past

decisions of the Supreme Court relative to ownership of the disputed oil were followed, and if the Congress were to adopt the proposal to use for the schools the proceeds from the disputed oil.

Listen to these conditions discovered by a 1951 survey:

Three thousand eight hundred and one pupils were forced to attend school in multiple shifts.

One hundred and ninety-nine thousand six hundred and three pupils were housed in buildings that were classified as dangerous or otherwise unsuited for use.

Twenty-seven thousand one hundred and fifty-eight pupils attended school where no toilet facilities existed.

Two hundred twenty-two thousand five hundred and nine pupils were forced to use dilapidated toilet facilities that should be abandoned immediately.

Forty-one thousand five hundred and seventy-five pupils attended school where no drinking water was available on the school grounds.

The figures I have just read apply to conditions existing in the State of Alabama. Many other figures might be cited in connection with this point.

Some might say that Alabama herself should raise salaries, spend more for transportation, and construct better buildings. The answer is that Alabama is constantly doing these things, and today she ranks near the top in the effort she is making, compared to her ability, to give her children an adequate education.

The truth is that, relatively speaking, Alabama and many other States are low-income States, with high birth rates, and it is most difficult to provide even the barest minimum of education to all its children.

There are other inadequacies—such as lack of instructional equipment, insufficient funds for vocational education, inadequate care for the deaf and blind—that can be remedied only with increased funds.

These funds are simply not available in sufficient amounts from the State and local levels. They might come from Federal aid, but we know that that possibility is most uncertain.

A sure source, and a fair source of funds to alleviate these conditions is the money from the oil that lies under the submerged lands. A sure source is that which would be provided by the Hill amendment, of which I am one of the sponsors.

If these measures are not accepted by this Congress and if the rightful decisions of the Supreme Court are overridden, it is my belief, whether it is ever conceded by opposing Senators or not, that a grave injustice will have been perpetrated against the schoolchildren of this Nation.

Mr. President, a few days ago my attention was called to an editorial entitled "The Tidelands Oil Dispute," published in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of April 13, 1953. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

THE TIDELANDS OIL DISPUTE

The question of State versus Federal title to offshore oil lands—so-called tidelands

oil—should be settled on the basis of law. Unfortunately the controversy has aroused political passions and they, rather than the legal aspects of the case, have dominated congressional consideration of this greatly important national issue.

As matters now stand, the House has passed what amounts to a quitclaim bill. The measure would waive Federal rights to submerged land extending from the low-tide mark to certain historic offshore boundaries, ranging from 3 miles to 10½ miles in this case. The measure also would specifically grant title to these submerged lands to the adjacent States.

Legislation along similar lines is now before the Senate. Opponents of the bill, among them Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), have slowly been gathering strength, but not enough to defeat it. They have united behind a measure which would reaffirm Federal control of the offshore area and provide that royalties from oil be distributed among all the States to help finance public education. DOUGLAS has estimated that Illinois would receive millions of dollars annually.

Under either the House or the Senate bill, oil royalties would go only to the States which have title to the submerged lands. The States which would benefit principally are Texas, Louisiana, and California.

On three occasions the United States Supreme Court has held that the offshore areas at issue in the present legislation are part of the Federal domain and do not belong to the States. The Sun-Times has consistently supported the Federal claim to the offshore deposits and, although we supported the candidacy of President Eisenhower, we did not and do not subscribe to his belief that the submerged lands should belong to the States.

So long as it acts within the framework of the Constitution Congress can pass any laws it desires, including laws to give away Federal lands. But many legal authorities have serious doubts as to the constitutionality of legislation to convey title to the offshore deposits to the States.

Some of these doubts have been set forth in a brief prepared for opponents of the Senate bill by Urban A. Lavery, Chicago attorney and former editor of the American Bar Association Journal.

Lavery questions whether international law might not impose barriers against a nation's giving individual States title to land under territorial waters. Under long-standing principles of international law, nations rather than their political subdivisions exercise dominion over the territorial waters extending from the low-tide mark to the commonly accepted 3-mile limit.

But a nation's sovereignty over its territorial waters is limited at least to the extent that ships of foreign nations are permitted to travel freely over, and anchor in, such waters for all inoffensive purposes. Are there other limitations which would apply in the case of offshore oil deposits and submerged oil lands lying on the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit?

The Senate should ponder that question carefully before taking precipitate action. It should also adopt the Lavery brief's proposal to make the legislation inoperative until the Supreme Court has ruled, in a declaratory judgment, whether it violates the Constitution—possibly by contravening directly or indirectly international laws to which we, as a nation, have subscribed in the form of treaties or conventions.

If the Court found that the legislation did not violate the Constitution in any way, then there would be no question of Congress' right to give away the submerged land. However, we would still feel that such a step would be morally, though not legally, wrong.

While the Eisenhower administration has modified its original position on the offshore

legislation, the President is apparently committed to signing it when and if it passes Congress. As an Eisenhower supporter, we nevertheless hope he will reconsider his stand.

The prospect of congressional passage of the offshore legislation has already given impetus to other assaults on the public domain. Senator HUNT, Democrat of Wyoming, wants to give his State control of federally owned oil lands which have brought \$153 million in royalties to the Federal Government.

According to Senator BUTLER, Republican of Nebraska, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, sentiment is developing to apply the offshore oil principle to all Federal lands—including public grazing lands and those which have rich mineral deposits. Enactment of the offshore legislation would set a dangerous precedent for such action.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the editorial in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times calls attention to the fact that that newspaper supported President Eisenhower in his campaign for the Presidency, but does not subscribe to his present proposal. I read from the editorial:

Although we supported the candidacy of President Eisenhower, we did not and do not subscribe to his belief that the submerged lands should belong to the States.

While the Eisenhower administration has modified its original position on the offshore legislation, the President is apparently committed to signing it when and if it passes Congress. As an Eisenhower supporter, we nevertheless hope he will reconsider his stand.

Mr. President, I believe it significant to refer to the number of great newspapers in the United States that did support the candidacy of President Eisenhower, but are opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 13. Of course, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Chicago Sun-Times are but three of President Eisenhower's confirmed supporters that have called upon him to reverse the stand he has so far seen fit to take in the present controversy.

Mr. President, regardless of the outcome of the pending joint resolution, I believe the Senate would be doing a wise thing to adopt the Douglas amendments, in order to draw a line. As a matter of fact, I should think that even the supporters of the joint resolution would want the line drawn, in order to strengthen the position of the proponents of the joint resolution. I was about to say that the adoption of the Douglas amendment would be a wise thing, if the joint resolution goes to the Supreme Court. However, I think I should say "when it goes to the Supreme Court," because almost certainly there will be a constitutional test regarding the power of Congress to give away such national sovereignty.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, the Senator from Alabama is aware that there is no question that the case will immediately go to the Supreme Court, be-

cause the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island has, as the Senator from Alabama well knows, already voted unanimously to instruct its attorney general to bring a suit before the Supreme Court testing the constitutionality of the joint resolution, if it is enacted. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that is correct. The General Assembly of the great State of Rhode Island, as I understand, has already instructed the attorney general of that State to prepare whatever papers may be necessary in order to take the case to the Supreme Court as soon as possible after Congress shall have concluded its action on the pending measure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Alabama not think that those who are so greedy as to desire immediately to get the oil from the Continental Shelf, out beyond the 3-mile limit, by their insistence upon getting so much, will find that it is going to prejudice their case and that it will delay the exploitation of the oil resources, since the matter will be tied up through litigation, with the result that the oil resources will not become available to anyone for a very long time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I may say to the able Senator from Tennessee that I have thought very well of the proposal he offered. When he proposed an amendment I told him, I believe, that I would like to join with him in sponsoring it, although I intended first to support the Anderson substitute, with the Hill amendment, and that if it were possible to pass that measure, I would, of course, prefer it. But I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I have discussed the matter with some of the proponents of the pending measure. I have discussed it with the distinguished Senator from Florida, with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and, I believe, with the distinguished Senator from Texas, as well as other Senators. I realize that in one of the Supreme Court decisions, itself, there was pointed out the possibility of certain inequities. The Court undoubtedly recognized the fact that there would be created a certain stalemate in the exploration for oil and the development of the oil resources.

Therefore, I have felt all along that probably the best way in which to solve this problem would be to establish a commission. I would be willing to recommend that there be established a commission, composed of some of the finest oil geologists and some of the finest legal minds of the country, to make a study of the whole subject and to report recommendations. I am not certain whether it is contained in the Senator's proposal, but I would have suggested that the commission be empowered and directed to continue exploration, and, if need be, to make leases or other contracts, so that the exploration of the ocean areas might be continued, development might take place if that

were thought wise, and further that the life of the commission be extended for whatever period of time seemed necessary in order to enable it to reach a conclusion as to a satisfactory adjustment.

I had understood that the O'Mahoney proposal of last year very largely sought to do that very thing, though not in the same identical way. That is, the O'Mahoney bill did not propose to create a commission, but it provided for a 5-year operating plan for the purpose of making it possible for operation and development to proceed.

Yes; Mr. President, undoubtedly—and this I believe as surely as I believe that I am standing here—those who have been so eagerly pressing for speedy enactment of the pending measure are by the very provisions they have written into the joint resolution going to find themselves tied up for a very long time by litigation, and not merely by one suit. Even if the Supreme Court were to rule upon the question of the power of the Congress to dispose of sovereignty, and should decide that the Congress had that power, we should still anticipate the bringing of many lawsuits involving the question of boundaries. That is because the pending measure is so vague as to the location of the boundaries. In fact, the question of boundaries is left so uncertain that I have been unable to tell anyone the location of the boundaries, except in a few instances. I could say that, with respect to the State of Georgia, which was one of the original States, the boundary was 3 miles out, because that is in accordance with my interpretation of section 4.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Florida say that the west coast of Florida extended ten and a half miles seaward; and I am sure I could say that I heard the distinguished Senator from Texas say that Texas claimed at least 3 leagues all along its shoreline. From the statement of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and of the Governor of that State, in the hearings, I confess I have been unable to determine the location of the boundary of Louisiana. I believe I read in the hearings a statement by the Governor of Louisiana to the effect that Louisiana's boundary lay ten and a half miles seaward; that if Texas had such a boundary, Louisiana also had it. I believe he suggested that perhaps Louisiana had not exerted as much influence as had the State of Texas, because Louisiana had not blown so hard, or had not made so much noise over the matter, as had the State of Texas. At another place in my remarks, I have referred to what the Governor of Louisiana said. I believe his statement was that the boundary of Louisiana extended to the furthestmost island, plus a certain distance beyond that. So I cannot tell where the boundaries are.

I am as certain as I can be that there will be numerous lawsuits over the question of the boundaries, even assuming that the Supreme Court will allow the act to stand and I do not believe that the Supreme Court will allow it to stand.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alabama, in which he has expressed himself as being favorable to the proposal to establish a commission, in accordance with the joint resolution I have introduced.

I should like to ask the Senator whether, in the debate on the floor of the Senate, he has observed that dozens and dozens of questions of great importance to the Nation, both with respect to its domestic affairs and also with respect to its international relations, have been raised by the discussion of the Holland joint resolution—questions which were not even discussed in the hearings before the committee when it considered the Holland resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. In reply to the question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say that, regardless of the criticism, which at times may have been directed at the current debate, it has been one of the finest debates I have ever heard. I believe more real information has been brought out on the floor of the Senate in connection with this general subject than at any time heretofore.

I note that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is present. I do not know whether he agrees with me in this, but during the 2 days he held the floor, the interest of Senators was shown by the dozens, perhaps hundreds of questions, which were asked him. I believe the senior Senator from Oregon has come upon the Senate floor since I made my statement a few moments ago about the boundaries. I do not recall having heard him give a definite answer, yet, as to where the boundaries are. The Senator stated they were the historic boundaries, that the boundaries are in existence, whatever they may be; but I do not believe the term "historic boundaries" is to be found within the pending measure. If I am in error about that, I shall be glad to stand corrected. I do not believe that term is contained within the joint resolution; yet, if I remember correctly, the senior Senator from Oregon, who handled the pending measure when it was in committee, gave the answer that the boundaries are the historic boundaries, whatever they are—and that they exist.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment. I shall be happy to get some light on the question. I do not think the Senator from Oregon was present when I made the statement earlier in the day when I was discussing this particular phase of the matter. I may say I spent last week in Alabama, and I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that, contrary to what many people have thought, and contrary to what certain columnists have written, and contrary to what certain newspapers have said, I have found that the people were not indifferent to the pending legislation, but that, on the contrary, they were very well informed concerning it. I found that they were asking questions, and the question that was asked me most frequently—and one that I frankly had to admit I could not answer—was, "What

is the line of demarkation? What is the boundary?" I could not tell them. All I could say in reply was that I had talked with the Senator from Florida about Florida's boundary claims, and I also was frank to say that I knew the extent of the claim made by the State of Texas. The boundaries of those States, of course, are different from those of the original Thirteen States; but, beyond that, I do not know what the respective claims are in regard to the boundaries.

If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] desires to address a question to me, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. I wanted to inquire of the Senator whether, in the discussion of boundaries, he realized that the term "historic boundaries" does not appear in Senate Joint Resolution 13?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I made the statement that I did not believe the term "historic boundaries" was used in the joint resolution. If I was incorrect in my statement, I should be glad to be corrected.

Mr. CORDON. What relevancy has the Senator's discussion if the term is not even applicable to the joint resolution?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may have misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Oregon the 2 days in which he presented the joint resolution. He made a very fine presentation. I think the attention paid to him by the Senators on the floor during those days bore witness to that fact.

I made the statement a few minutes ago that if I remembered correctly, when some of the Senators were trying to get the Senator from Oregon to say what the boundaries were, he used the expression "historic boundaries." My recollection is, and I want to be corrected if I am wrong, that when some Senator asked the Senator from Oregon, "What are the boundaries?" he replied, "They are the historic boundaries. They are there, whatever they may be."

I quoted section 4 of the joint resolution earlier today, in which the term "seaward boundaries" is used. I read the entire section into the RECORD. From it I pointed out the boundaries which I could detect and about which I could tell my constituents.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield in order that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, since a unanimous-consent agreement has been arrived at, I suppose there will be a little relaxation of the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the Senator from Florida making a statement in reply to the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it would be fair to state in the beginning that each of the States has boundaries, according to the laws under which they came into the Union, and, except as changed in the very minor ways mentioned in section 4 of the joint resolution, the boundaries are the actual legal boundaries that are more loosely spoken of as historic boundaries. They have become historic be-

cause they have been for periods of years the legal boundaries of the several States.

If the Senator from Alabama will look at section 4 of the joint resolution I shall try briefly to explain this matter, because it has seemed to give unnecessary concern to some Senators. I think a brief statement would clear up the matter for the Senator from Alabama so that there will be no further concern about it in his mind.

Starting with the statement I have just made, that what we are talking about in the beginning is actual legal boundaries which every State has, some by constitution, some by enabling act, and some by their own statute, let us now examine section 4.

The first sentence of section 4 makes uniform the matter of boundaries for the Thirteen Original States. The Senator from Alabama has already stated that, and he was correct in his statement. The reason for the necessity of such a statement is that while it is true that under Federal law 3 geographical miles has been uniformly regarded as the extent of a State's jurisdiction, except where Congress has granted a greater distance, the Original Thirteen States have done different things since their entering the Union. For instance, the State of Massachusetts has by statute provided that its boundary is 3 geographic miles offshore. Other States by their constitution have so stated. The State of Georgia has stated, I think, by a constitutional measure, that its boundary is 3 English miles offshore, which, as the Senator from Alabama knows, is nearly one-half a mile less than 3 geographic miles. So, in order to make the yardstick applicable to all of them, and to make them extend out to the limit recognized by the Federal Government as the limit of State jurisdiction, even when a State did not have any formal limits in its constitution or in its statutes, the first sentence is placed in the joint resolution to make it perfectly clear that all the Thirteen Original States have limits of 3 miles offshore.

The second sentence of section 4 relates to the States which have been admitted since the formation of the Union, of which a considerable number are coastal States, as the Senator from Alabama recognizes. I now turn to the second sentence, and I hope I may have the attention of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am listening.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second sentence reads as follows:

Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries.

That sentence tries to make applicable to every other State which has either been silent up to this time so far as concerns any formal expression as to where its boundaries are located or, if it has expressed itself and has had a boundary of less than 3 geographic miles laid down, it has the authority, if it has not already done so, to extend the limit to 3 geographic miles.

One State of that sort is the State of California, which has a provision in its constitution setting its boundary at 3 English miles offshore. The provision which I have read would permit the State of California to extend its boundary out to 3 geographic miles. It would apply to a State even in the absence of any constitutional or statutory provision, and it would apply in the exercise of certain kinds of police jurisdiction of the State.

So, Mr. President, I do not think the second sentence of section 4 is subject to any serious question at all. It means that any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so, may extend its boundaries 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline.

The latter part of the sentence relates to international boundaries in the Great Lakes or in any other body of water traversed by such boundaries. There are bodies of water other than the Great Lakes which are traversed by international boundaries, but that second sentence would allow to States which need to take that action the right to do so, if any such cases exist.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I correctly understand, States included in the first two sentences would be limited to 3 geographic miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us go from there.

Mr. HOLLAND. The third sentence approves any effort made heretofore, or which might be hereafter made by States that come within the second classification, to move out to their 3-geographical-mile boundary. It reads as follows:

Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line.

The emphasis in the reading of the third sentence should be upon the words "so to extend"—to extend its boundaries out to the 3 geographical miles boundary permitted under the second sentence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask if that sentence means that the joint resolution recognizes any action taken by a State to extend its boundaries out 3 geographical miles, but does not necessarily recognize its claims beyond that line; that it simply means that it does not prejudice any rights, if any there be, that a State may have beyond that line?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now we are making progress.

Mr. HOLLAND. The third sentence simply provides that in the case of a State which has, prior to this time, endeavored to utilize the 3-geographical-mile limitation, and has taken action, either by Constitution or statutory provision to claim that distance, that action is hereby approved. In other words, the action does not have to be taken afterward, as mentioned in the second sentence, but it may have been taken heretofore. So long as it goes only to the 3-mile mark, or, if it goes beyond that, then only up to that mark, that action is recognized.

I may say to the Senator, before coming to the fourth sentence, which is the sentence applicable to Texas and to the west coast of Florida, that there has been under this measure no extension whatsoever of any boundary line in the case of any State, either Texas or Florida, beyond the 3-geographical-mile limitation.

In the event that Texas and Florida do have a line extending out 3 leagues, which is our contention, and we think we will show that that is a fact, it will not be by reason of any action under the pending joint resolution, but by reason of the fact that such action was taken, and legally taken, in the past. The only provision that can be found in the fourth sentence is a provision that these two States, and any others that might be affected, though there are no others which are affected, will not be prejudiced in their right so to claim under legislation heretofore enacted, or to have their day in court if they are sued by the Federal Government upon claims which they can establish under the fourth sentence, which I shall now read. The fourth sentence reads:

Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

There are two different provisions, as the Senator can see from a reading of the sentence. So far as I know, the first one is applicable only to Texas, and that reads as follows:

Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union.

I have made a considerable study of this matter, and I do not know of any State which even claims to have had such a provision in its constitution or laws prior to its admission to the Union. Neither do I know of any of the after-admitted States who even had separate existence before they were admitted to the Union, as the State of Texas had, it having been an independent republic for some years prior to entering the Federal Union.

With reference to the State of Florida, its claim, which would be saved to it by the fourth sentence, not guaranteed, not affirmed, not confirmed, but simply saved to it, would come under the second part of the last sentence. Without re-reading the first part, I shall simply read the second part:

Or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

It is the contention of Florida, and we believe it is a sound contention, that after our constitution was drawn in 1868, following the War Between the States, so as to have as one of its boundary provisions a clear, affirmative statement that the boundary extends 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico, on the west side of Florida, and when the constitution was reported to Congress, in conformity

with the mandates of Congress under the so-called reconstruction legislation, and when it was approved by Congress in 1868, Congress in effect confirmed to Florida the 3-league limitation.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, because I wish to be completely fair and frank, that I am not claiming as a positive fact that either Texas or Florida would, at long last, after litigation, sustain their claims. I believe both would very clearly do so, but the point I am making is that any claim that Texas or Florida have their limits extended by the joint resolution is not correct, because no such result is attempted or sought to be accomplished by the joint resolution. The joint resolution simply saves, without prejudice, the full right to our two States to rely upon action which we claim was legally taken by Congress at the time of the admission of Texas, in 1845, and in 1868, in the case of the restoration of Florida to her seats in the Congress, to claim the right to stand upon these provisions, for whatever they may be worth. If they are strong enough to support our claim, as we think they are, then we should have that right. We do not believe this Congress or any other Congress can legally take away from the State of Texas or the State of Florida what long ago has been legally granted. We think that is as sound a principle of law as ever could be stated.

In the draft of the joint resolution there is not a single word about the extension of any boundary beyond the 3 geographical-miles limitation. To the contrary, the only reference to that situation—and it is contained in other places in shorter words than these—is that our situation shall be saved to us without questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of our situation. I think that is about as clear as I can state the point.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield, if I may, but I am speaking under the tolerance and consent of the Senator from Alabama, which I appreciate.

There is no question that every State now has a boundary. There is no question that the proposed legislation would very greatly simplify the boundary situation of the various States. As to all States, except Texas and the west coast of Florida, it would permit the speedily making uniform of all boundaries. The only reason why it cannot be so in those two instances is that legislation was passed in this same Congress, in 1845, which admitted Texas to the Union under which Texas which already had a 3-league boundary, retained that boundary and as a State thus acquired legal rights to a boundary 3 leagues off its shore.

Similarly, Congress in 1868 passed legislation which we think accomplished the same result with reference to the west coast of Florida, and our right to stand upon that is simply not prejudiced by the proposed legislation.

So far as boundaries are concerned in the joint resolution, the total effect would be tremendously beneficial and tremendously simplifying. The joint

resolution would be as uniform in its application as it could possibly be, and it would offer simply a background for the operation of the measure, because boundaries are not the principal objectives of the resolution at all. There would simply be offered a background against which the release to the States of assets lying within the boundaries of the States will be determined. Boundaries are wholly incidental to the proposed legislation. It is because of that, incidentally, that the international question, which I shall not deal with now, fades into very minor significance in this matter, because we are having to do here with assets, pure and simple, and not with territorial boundaries, which we say were set legally in 1845 and 1868, and which we are simply saving, in the case of Texas, as of 108 years ago; and in the case of Florida, as of 85 years ago; but in both cases the action took place a long time ago and our rights accrued then, not now.

I thank the Senator very much. It seems to me that the question of boundaries has been unduly confused. I think there is no necessity at all for that result. Anyone who wishes to examine the question and analyze it must realize that boundary question already existing in all our States would be very greatly simplified by the enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Florida for giving us that statement. I must say that it has cleared up some points in my mind. Let me see if I understand it correctly.

So far as the joint resolution is concerned, and so far as the action of the Federal Government is concerned if the joint resolution should become law, it would constitute a recognition by the Federal Government of the 3-mile boundary line with respect to the 13 original States, and of the possibility of such a boundary line in all the other States which may not yet have extended their boundaries to that point, but which may wish to do so. The only difference between the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the joint resolution as it stands would be that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would cut off Texas and Florida from the excess over 3 miles, whereas the joint resolution as it stands has nothing to do with that question. This provision does not recognize the claim; neither does it jeopardize it.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in his statement so far as it goes. Of course there are other great and fundamental differences between the proposed legislation and the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. I was speaking solely of boundaries.

Mr. HOLLAND. With respect to the boundary question, I think the Senator has pretty well stated the situation. Under the joint resolution, as it stands, all States which have not done so would be allowed to go out to 3 geographic miles. In the case of the Texas shore-

line and the west coast of Florida, regarding which affirmative action going beyond the 3-mile line to the 3-league line has been heretofore taken by the Congress, that situation would simply be preserved, without being affected in the slightest one way or the other. We do not ask that such a boundary be confirmed by this measure.

The Senator from Florida has more to gain than any other Senator out of the red-line proposal made by the Attorney General originally, but withdrawn after he saw what a troublemaking situation was involved. We had more to gain than any other State, because such action would have been an affirmative recognition and confirmation of our 3-league limit. If the Senator will read the testimony of Attorney General Brownell, and I am sure he has already done so, he will find that he specifically stated that it would be his intention in drafting the red line to draw it out 3 leagues off the west coast of Florida and off the shore of Texas. But, when we went into the question, we found, and I am sure the Senator will realize why we found it so, that we got into an enormously technical field in which one master of the Supreme Court of the United States had been struggling for more than 5 years to delineate a boundary off some 15½ miles of the coast of California, so far without success, and without completing his task.

So, desiring legislation which would be as little trouble as possible, many members of the committee, if not all members of the committee, came to the conclusion that it would be impossible to draft, with any degree of accuracy, the red line which was first suggested. I believe that was the conclusion of all members of the committee, without exception, although I did not speak to each one privately or personally. I am sure many of them came to that conclusion, because they so stated to me.

Secondly, they concluded that wherever such a line was drawn it would make more trouble than it would cure, and would lead to great technical difficulties, which we, by no means, intend to bring about by this legislation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would address the question to me. If so, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida for the purpose of answering it. I may have to call upon him to help me out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Florida had to say with reference to section 4, particularly lines 17 and 18 on page 17. As I understood him, the Senator from Florida stated that the last sentence of section 4 meant that if States had claimed in their constitutions or in their laws prior to the time they were admitted to the Union that they had a more extensive boundary than 3 miles, the joint resolution would not prejudice their attempt to establish such a contention. The thing that worries me is the last phrase in that sentence, "or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress."

If the word were "and" instead of "or" I think the statement of the Senator from Florida would be more logical. But the word "or" seems to indicate to me that if the Congress hereafter should approve a boundary, say, for the State of Texas, of fifty-odd miles, which is now being claimed, it would be authorized under that sentence in section 4. I think that is particularly true when we refer back to two other sections of the joint resolution.

First, I refer to title I, section 2 (a) (2), which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. When used in this joint resolution—

(a) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" means—

(2) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles—

That is a definition of what is meant by "lands beneath navigable waters." It will be seen that that is a definite statement that if the contention that the boundary extends beyond 3 geographical miles were made at the time the State came into the Union title would be vested in lands beneath the water under section 3 (a).

So the important sections, in my opinion, are section 3 (a) and section 2 (a) (2), which, as I see it, goes out beyond the 3-mile limit when such boundary existed at the time the State became a member of the Union. It also provides for the boundary heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress. If the word "or" were used, so that the extension out to 3 leagues, or 11½ miles in the case of Texas and Florida, would have to be approved later by Congress, that would be a different situation.

However, as I see these two sections, reading them together, they must mean that under the vesting clause of section 3 the State would get its 3 leagues at this time, and such other distance as the Congress may hereafter vest in it.

If that is not the intention, it seems to me that the language certainly would indicate that that is what the joint resolution means. I should like to know what the Senator from Florida thinks about it, if the Senator from Alabama will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I may make a suggestion. I am virtually through. Undoubtedly, the Senator from Florida would like to answer the question with a statement. I can conclude in 2 or 3 minutes and yield the floor. If the Senator from Florida would prefer, I shall try to obtain permission to yield to him for the purpose of answering the question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida be permitted to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee without prejudicing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Duff in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I am not sure that I understood all of the question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], but I did clearly understand a part of it, and that is the part which relates to the "hereafter" approval.

I may say to the Senator from Tennessee—and this has already been discussed at some length by the Senator from Florida on his original appearance—that those of us who were active in the drafting and presentation of the joint resolution felt that two reasons were very clearly applicable for the inclusion of the word "hereafter."

First, nothing this Congress could do could take away from the power of future Congresses to do what they thought was right in this field.

Second, since at least some of us, particularly those of us from Florida and from Texas, do have a very definite, and, I think, we can properly say, selfish interest in the matter, we felt we should not under any circumstance take a position which would look as though we were precluding any proper consideration of claims of other States in the matter.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has no unwillingness whatever to strike out the word "hereafter" in the various places where it occurs. Not in every place, because there is one place certainly where it should be included, in another meaning entirely. However, in the places which the Senator from Tennessee has mentioned the inclusion of the word was simply for the two reasons which the Senator from Florida has stated.

If it is the judgment of the Senate, which is now considering the measure, that it would be better to strike that word, the Senator from Florida would have no objection.

I cannot possibly refrain, however, from calling attention to the fact that complete honesty and complete fairness of approach on his part and on the part of other Senators from Florida and Texas would preclude either giving someone the right to feel that Congress had no power left to deal with this situation in the future—which of course it does—or with giving someone the right to feel that we are unwilling to have others considered on their merits for any case that they may have, for later extension, if there be such a case. I may add that I am not familiar with any such case at this time.

Before I close this statement, I wish to remind all Senators on the floor that the Senator from Florida has consistently taken the position, with reference to areas beyond State boundaries, that he feels the Federal Government is the only one who has any proper, legal claim to the development of the seabed there, and he has never been willing to support any claim of right on the part of States which were affected to have any interest there.

He is willing and has always been willing to have the Federal Government, in

conjunction with the States which adjoin any of these Continental Shelf areas beyond State boundaries, to sit down and consider whether there are values in State laws or in State enforcement machinery or in other facilities which the State can offer which the Federal Government can properly accept in its own interest and in its own service, and in that case to compensate the States, and only compensate them, properly for the use of such State facilities.

The Senator from Florida wanted to be completely clear in the RECORD on that point, because he is not interested at all in any situation which would indicate that any State has a claim of right to go 1 inch beyond its boundary, and in claiming as a matter of right that it, rather than the Federal Government, should be the holder of any proprietary interest out there.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] if he does not feel that by having the word "hereafter" included in the language, as it is now included in the joint resolution, it is an open notice to other nations that it is the intention of the sponsors of the joint resolution, and the intention of the States which are trying to get this vast wealth, at a later time to ask Congress to extend their boundaries out farther; and might that not lead to retaliatory action on their part in a great many instances? If the sponsors of the joint resolution did not have that in mind, I see no reason why the word should have been included. It would seem to me that if that is not the intention of the Senator from Florida, as a sponsor of the joint resolution, he should, on his own motion, move to strike out the word "hereafter," so as to clarify the matter to that extent at least.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a resumption of the statement by me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very glad to do so, under the same condition, that my right to the floor be not prejudiced.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has stated his complete willingness to accomplish that end. However, the joint resolution has been worked up over a period of many years. It has been approved by many committees. It was never approved by an abler committee than the one which handled it for the Senate this year. There are other Senators who have an interest in the legislation, besides the Senator from Florida. He has very freely and frankly stated his own position, and he stated it in open hearing on the floor of the Senate, so that no one could question what it is.

At the same time, when he is supported by 39 cosponsors of the legislation, when the legislation as now drafted has come from a committee so able as the one which has handled it, and when the committee has seen fit to report the joint resolution with the word in it, he does not feel that he should move of his own motion, without consulting with his associates and the committee, to strike out the word.

The Senator from Florida has stated very clearly his position. He would be glad to be governed by the will of the

Senate in that matter. At the same time the Senator from Florida wants to make it clear, and have it abundantly clear, that the word is not an invitation to someone to claim something to which he is not entitled. The Senator from Florida will continue in the future, as he has in the past, to object to and to oppose any effort to claim as a matter of right, on behalf of any State, that it can go beyond its boundary into a domain which is clearly that of the Federal Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield further, I hope the Senator from Florida will support an amendment which I have sent to the desk, to strike out the word "hereafter," because I think it is a very repugnant word and, in my opinion, issues an invitation to other nations, which might lead to retaliatory action.

If the Senator from Alabama will yield further, I should like to ask another question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I hesitate to decline to yield, but I believe I can conserve time by not yielding, because I have about concluded my remarks. Then the Senator from Tennessee may interrogate the Senator from Florida with reference to the amendment. I believe in that way we can save time.

Mr. President, apropos of a part of the discussion which has taken place, I should like to quote one of the recommendations made to the committee considering the legislation by the Attorney General, the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr.

His second recommendation was:

Second. An actual line on a map dividing the two areas of submerged lands should be drawn by Congress in the bill to eliminate much expensive and unnecessary litigation. If the statute merely refers in words to "historic boundaries," or in words describes a line beginning at the edge of the States' inland waters or tries to describe in words bays or other characteristics of the coast, unnecessary litigation will almost surely result. Therefore we make this suggestion of an actual line on a map drawn as part of the bill, which would eliminate also, we think, certain international problems that might otherwise arise if territorial-ownership claims are asserted in the States or Federal Government beyond their historic 3-mile limit.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is an effort to draw that line, to divide the two areas, as the Attorney General suggested.

Certainly, it seems to me that unless something of this sort is done, there is bound to be litigation and there is bound to be raised, and will be raised—in fact, we know it already has been raised—this constitutional question, which apparently the Attorney General is already shying away from. He recognized that it is a point which will have to be decided.

A little while ago I referred to a joint resolution which passed the Senate on August 19, 1937—

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Carolina for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Was not the Attorney General basing his statement upon certain assumptions of fact which do not correctly reflect the language used by the joint resolution? The Attorney General was basing his statement on the assumption that the joint resolution contains the words "historic boundaries." However, I understand that the joint resolution does not use those words. Therefore the statement the Senator from Alabama has just read would not be applicable to the pending joint resolution. It might be applicable to a measure which used the words to which the Attorney General referred; but, since the joint resolution does not use such words, how can the Senator from Alabama say that the statement made by the Attorney General is applicable to the particular provisions of the pending joint resolution?

I think I am correct about the matter. However, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is present. He knows more about this matter than I do, and I know he can enlighten us upon it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I am glad to yield, provided it is understood that in doing so I shall not lose the floor.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from North Carolina, and I am in accord with it.

At this time I ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama to turn, if he will, to page 957 of the hearings, which shows the specific statement made by the Attorney General upon the 3-league question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I see that part of the page.

Mr. HOLLAND. This matter is discussed at two different points on that page.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not see that previously, but I understood from the previous statement the Senator made that there was provision for 3 leagues, in the case of the west coast of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and also in the case of Texas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and for the entire shoreline of Texas.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The Senator from Alabama will find that statement at two different places on page 957. One of them is in the next to the top paragraph, which I believe the Senator from Alabama has already seen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I have seen it.

Mr. HOLLAND. In this connection, I refer also to the question and answer on that page which I now point out to the Senator from Alabama, where this matter is very specifically spelled out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is quite certain that the Attorney General conceded, and in fact stated with complete finality, that it was his understanding that the 3-league limitation or boundary distance was in existence in the case of the west coast of Florida and in the case of the entire coast of Texas; and he stated it again at another place—which I am not able to point out at this time—in his testimony. However, I have now pointed out two places in the testimony.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Let me say that I did not cite his testimony for the purpose of distinguishing the 3-mile limit from the 3-league limit, but I did so to show the Attorney General's doubt about the words used.

I point out that on page 957, after the questions which were put to the Attorney General by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], again the Attorney General said:

Attorney General BROWNELL. I believe that if you were to do it by words only, you would still have some disputes about the mouths of bays and things of that sort, which we could clear up if we could have reference to an official map and put the line right on it.

As I construe the definitions to be found in the joint resolution, including section 4, it seems to me that the line would be established by words. That is what the Attorney General was referring to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator from Florida to wait a moment, please.

First, let me address myself to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. Although I am not sure that the word "uncertainty" is the correct word to use in this connection, yet I point out to him that at both points the Attorney General referred to the effort to establish the line by the use of words, and his objection was based on that assumption. He believed that such a method would apparently raise uncertainties which would fail to clear up uncertainties which might result in litigation.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield further to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Is it not true that if a line were drawn on a map, the line would eventually have to be identified by words, including references to longitude and latitude? Would not it have to be expressed in words at sometime or other? There would be no other way out of that situation, would there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from North Carolina is correct. Certainly the mere drawing of a pencil line on a map would not suffice for all time, for someone would have to describe it in words, in order that all might know where the boundary was.

Of course, I have previously said that it seems to me it is inevitable that there

will be a great deal of litigation if this joint resolution becomes law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it is beyond question that anything we do in this field will still leave some matters which will need to be cleared up and which may lead to litigation. Certainly with 5,000 miles of shoreline and with the outside line in addition, that would be the case.

However, I wish to call attention to two things: First, trouble is occasioned by the indentations in the shoreline—the mouths of bays, and so forth. In that connection, the mere drawing of a line on the water will not deprive a State of the right to challenge the accuracy of the location of the line, if the line is not drawn where it should be drawn in order correctly to establish the line.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly recognize that fact.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I repeat what the Senator from North Carolina has said, namely, that words must eventually be used to describe the line, wherever it is placed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the second place, the present boundary situation is entirely one of words. We have greatly simplified and greatly made more uniform the situation by the legislation we now propose; and I believe all who have studied it have come to that conclusion.

In closing—and let me say here that I am most grateful to the Senator from Alabama for his generosity—let me say for all who are concerned, I think, that when they saw the first attempt at the drafting or drawing of a line, and when they realized that when the line crosses, as it necessarily has to do, questionable places, particularly in such jagged terrain as the coast line of the southeastern portion of Louisiana, it results in occasions for new litigation for almost every mile, there was a clear recognition by all of us that we were reducing immeasurably the opportunities for litigation—I have previously said that I thought the opportunities for litigation were reduced by nine-tenths, but I think it would be a great deal more than that—by having the opportunities for litigation confined to the outside line, rather than the inside line, because the outside line will be of very small importance, except in the few areas where oil and gas will be found.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Alabama that of the 20 to 22 coastal States—they are variously counted—there are only 3 in which such deposits have yet been found; and in the case of California, the deposits have been found on only 15½ miles of its entire coast line of 1,000 miles; and such deposits have not been found in any great or continuous degree along the shore frontage of Texas; the only place where they have been found in any great degree, up to

now, has been in the waters off Louisiana.

So the opportunities for litigation are immeasurably decreased by moving the line where the State and the Nation come together—by this confirmation—clearly out to a point in the water 3 miles offshore in most places, and 3 leagues offshore in two places, because the opportunities for litigation and for controversy over any assets that may be found there are so much smaller in number with a line at that location than with the line along the coast line.

I am sure the Senator from Alabama has followed that point.

It was the unanimous conclusion of those who worked with me upon the joint resolution that we were cutting down immeasurably the opportunities for litigation, as a result of the way the joint resolution is prepared.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield further to me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Florida, for I believe that both the Senator from Alabama and myself will be interested in getting the answer of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Although a while ago I agreed that I would soon yield to the Senator from Tennessee, who wishes to ask some questions, yet if the Senator from North Carolina wishes to ask at this time a question of the Senator from Florida and if it is permissible that he do so, I am glad to have him ask the question now, if I may obtain consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question in which I think both the Senator from Alabama and myself will be interested.

As I understand the pending joint resolution, no provision of it attempts to control the land beyond the 3-mile limit, or on the so-called Continental Shelf.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct in every place except off the west coast of Florida and the coast of Texas.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Yes. Therefore, the suggestion which has been made many times—namely, that in enacting this measure we shall be giving away billions of dollars' worth of oil in the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit—is simply a figment of someone's imagination, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. When the statement is made and goes out to the public that the Congress is about to give away billions of dollars' worth of oil in the Continental Shelf, whereas the measure pending in the Senate does not even relate to the Continental Shelf, so far as I have been able to ascertain, except to the extent to which the Senator

referred, that fact should be made plain so that the people will understand it. From my own thinking about the matter, and from what the Senator from Alabama has just said, control of the Continental Shelf is not contemplated by the pending measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a brief statement, in view of the fact that the Senator yielded to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under the same conditions, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from North Carolina wants to vest in the Federal Government title to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf seaward from the 3-mile mark, he can do it very simply by voting for the amendments which are now before this body. We shall look forward with interest to his favorable vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say, Mr. President, that, in the time I have occupied the floor of the Senate today, practically all I have said has had reference to the Douglas amendment. That amendment, as I understand, would draw a line in accordance with our historic international boundaries. The Senator from Florida says that the international aspects are of minor importance. I must say I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Florida, although I recognize that he has given as much study, perhaps, as anyone else to the subject now before the Senate.

By the way, Mr. President, let me say that I was pleased to hear the Senator from Florida as he brought out the various points that he has stated here today, and particularly when he referred to the relatively small amount of assets which have been found within the 3-mile area. The distinguished Senator was not on the floor earlier in the day when I was talking about the shrimp industry in all the Southern States, or when the junior Senator from Texas essentially admitted, as I recall, the statement he made, that the shrimp industry meant a great deal more to the State of Texas today than did the prospects of obtaining oil within the limited area. I also mentioned the inconsistency in which if the joint resolution were enacted, we would find ourselves placed from the international standpoint, in protesting against the arrest by Mexican authorities of shrimp boats from Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, outside the 3-mile boundary. It therefore seems to me that the international aspects of the subject are quite important.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, I assure the distinguished Senator that, so far as I am concerned, we have a much greater stake in our fisheries than we have in any hope of ever finding oil. We have been spending a good many millions of dollars in various efforts to find oil in our submerged lands, and we have yet to find the first drop; whereas, we

get many millions of dollars a year from the shrimping and other industries.

However, I have in my hand a letter from the president of the Southeastern Fisheries Association, making completely clear the fact that they are not interested in fishing within the 3-league limitation of Mexico, but that, to the contrary, when they go into that area, they encounter shallow waters, lose their nets, or tear them up; that all they want within that 3-league area is certain safe anchorage and exchange areas; that what they want above all is to have the line marked so that they will have some security against the forays made by the Mexican gunboats. Their complaints to us have been that they have been picked up, 18, 20, or 21 miles outside, and they are supporting us very strongly in our very effort.

They have adopted resolutions approving our position. Not only have the fishing groups of Florida, but also those of the Gulf generally, and of the Atlantic and the Pacific, adopted such resolutions; the fact being that they know perfectly well, and on this point I want to be as clear as possible, that the fact that our boundaries have gone out 3 leagues, in the case of Texas since 1845, and in the case of Florida since 1868, has not caused the slightest ripple of international concern of any sort. The boundaries have been patrolled by our own State boats for many, many years. We have controlled our citizens engaged in sponging, in fishing, in shrimping; we have issued licenses for this, that, and the other.

Our State has been upheld by our State courts and by the Federal courts in our exercise of that control. The Congress has upheld our control by approving the compact into which we have entered with all the other Gulf States, undertaking within our boundaries to conserve and to properly use the marine life that is there; and we know that there has not been the slightest ripple upon the international pond as a result of our occupancy and use—and, we think, our careful use. Certainly our use is sufficiently careful that the Federal Government, through the Congress, has unanimously approved the kind of conservation we have had, by approving in 1950 our compact with the grand State of Alabama, which is so well represented by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and with the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

We therefore feel that the apprehension that the enactment of the joint resolution is something that is going to bring on grave international questions should not exist in the minds of the Senator from Alabama or anyone else who gives full consideration to this question because the Congress now would simply leave in status quo, without prejudice, something that has existed for over a hundred years. The present situation has not resulted in the slightest difficulty of any kind, in spite of its long existence, in spite of the long use, in the case of Florida and Texas, of the coastal belts that lie off those States. I cannot see how the distinguished Senator from Alabama or anyone else looking at the record of over 100 years could feel that there would be grave international com-

motion created by the fact that through the pending measure we would simply recognize that there is such a situation, and set up a declaration that it shall not be prejudiced, but that the good States of Texas and Florida shall be allowed to make and stand upon their claims, and to sustain them if they can.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, Mr. President, I was not the one who brought up the point about international complications. It was the Department of State that did that, and also, at different times, the Department of Defense raised the question. Of course, I can understand why there would not be any complications in the case of Florida, which operates its own control boats and observes its own conservation practices. The problem would only arise when the boats of some other country came into the waters off the shores of Florida, and Florida tried to force them out, or American gunboats tried to interfere with them. Then question might arise regarding operations within the open seas.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator knows, because I think they also go up to his own coast, that the fishing boats of Cuba use our coastal belt to a tremendous degree; and I think the same thing is true of the coastal belt of all the other States of the Gulf area, though I cannot state that of my own knowledge. With reference to the testimony of the witness for the State Department, I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the last part of his testimony, appearing at page 1086 of the hearings, in which he made this matter very clear. I read:

Mr. TATE. I assume what the Court was saying there was that as far as the territorial waters are concerned, 3 miles anywhere, the United States had paramount rights; and as far as the Continental Shelf rights are concerned, there would be paramount rights in the subsoil and the sea bed, and they would extend out as far as the Continental Shelf extended.

Senator KUCHEL. So you would find no conflict between the traditional policy of the State Department and the paramount rights holdings in the Texas and Louisiana cases?

Mr. TATE. I am aware of none.

Senator KUCHEL. If there is no conflict, then for the purpose of the committee in considering the claims of the States in these various bills, any action by Congress to restore or give to the States any or all of the paramount rights which the United States Supreme Court holds that the Federal Government has, would not in any respect violate the policy of the State Department.

Mr. TATE. That is correct. I assume that as far as our international relations are concerned, the United States could divide up with the States any rights which it had, and those rights would be certainly the traditional right to the 3 miles, plus the right to the Continental Shelf as set forth in the 1945 proclamation.

Senator KUCHEL. And to the extent that the Court held in each of those cases that the paramount rights doctrine went considerably seaward of the 3-mile belt?

Mr. TATE. Whatever the United States has as far as the international aspect is concerned, it may divide up with the States as it pleases.

Had the Senator noticed that part of testimony of Mr. Tate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I have seen that testimony. Of course, what the representative of the State Department was talking about, as I understand, was not the constitutional question of title which was discussed by the Attorney General. Be that as it may, I do not care to labor the point further. I have taken more time than I intended to take. I still contend, based upon various citations of authorities which I gave in my statement, that the pending measure does raise international questions and it does place us in an inconsistent position of protesting through the Executive Department, on the one hand, against Mexico arresting our shrimp boats outside the 3-mile limit, and our contending, through the legislative branch of our Government, that we have a right to go beyond the 3-mile limit.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is one more question I should like to clear up as to a matter brought up earlier in our colloquy. It is found on page 944 of the printed record of the hearings, in a question by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] to the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and the answer of the Attorney General:

I read:

Senator DANIEL. General, since you have taken note of this question as to constitutionality that has been raised here, I think it would be well to point out that I doubt that it has been very seriously raised, because the former Attorney General and the former Solicitor General both testified before this committee that whatever proprietary rights that might exist within the original 3-mile or three-league belt could be given by the Congress to the States or restored to the States. As I understand it—I just want to make it clear—you believe that would be a constitutional act of Congress, too, do you not?

Attorney General BROWNELL. That is correct, Senator.

So he did not raise any constitutional question as to the conveyance or the restitution or the restoration or the confirmation to the States of proprietary interests—and that is what we are concerned with—within their constitutional boundaries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that the Attorney General made that answer, but following that he said, in effect, "Of course we are trying to avoid as much litigation as we can."

In other words, there was always hovering over them the feeling that by the proposed legislation, unless it was very carefully phrased, these questions would be involved in court.

Mr. President, earlier in the day I referred to action taken by the Senate on August 19, 1937, in connection with a resolution. It may be that the resolution has already been read into the RECORD—I do not know as to that—but I certainly should like to have it in the RECORD. Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to read it. It is found on page 9326 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 81, part 8, I read:

SUBMERGED LANDS CONTAINING PETROLEUM DEPOSITS

The Senate preceded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) relative to the establishment of title of the United States

to certain submerged lands containing petroleum deposits, which was read, as follows:

"Whereas the petroleum reserves in the United States are constantly decreasing; and

"Whereas the oil reserves now owned by the United States are in serious danger of depletion or loss from various causes; and

"Whereas large petroleum deposits underlie various submerged lands along the coast of the United States and below low-water mark and within a distance of 3 miles under the ocean below said low-water mark; and

"Whereas all such submerged lands below said low-water mark and within such 3-mile limit lying along the coast of the United States are asserted to be the property of the United States; and

"Whereas various persons have heretofore entered, or in the immediate future intend and purpose to enter, upon such submerged lands and remove the petroleum deposits underlying the same, without the consent or permission of the United States, and to the irreparable damage and injury of the United States; and

"Whereas immediate action on the part of the United States is necessary to preserve such petroleum deposits for the future use of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, by and through speedy and appropriate proceedings, to assert, maintain, and establish the title and possession of the United States to the submerged lands aforesaid, and all petroleum deposits underlying the same, and to cause and effectuate by proper proceedings the removal and ejectment of all persons now or hereafter trespassing upon or otherwise occupying the said submerged lands or removing the petroleum deposits therefrom, without the consent and permission of the United States, and through such proper proceedings to be by the said Attorney General instituted, to stop and prevent the taking or removing of petroleum products by others than the United States from the said submerged lands as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That the said Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized to bring such actions or suits in the name of the United States, and to incur such expenses and disbursements in connection therewith as he may deem properly necessary to effectuate and accomplish the directions and purposes of this joint resolution."

Whereupon Senator King, of Utah, said:

Mr. President, I should like an explanation of this joint resolution.

Then Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, who at that time was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, I believe, responded as follows:

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am not familiar with all the details of the joint resolution as it was reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, but I do know that the bill proposes to establish the title of the United States to certain submerged lands containing petroleum deposits, and it is the intention of the Government that these submerged deposits shall ultimately become part of the naval oil reserve. There is in the report a long letter from the Navy Department strongly recommending that the joint resolution be enacted into law. I entertain the same view. In my opinion the joint resolution is desirable legislation and will tend to conserve the petroleum and other valuable deposits in submerged lands that are similar to the oil deposits which the Navy now has in its possession. The passage of the joint resolution is recommended by the Navy Department. It will add to our naval oil reserves.

The question was put and the resolution was agreed to.

It is rather interesting to see the names of some of the Senators who were on the floor at that time. We certainly cannot say that the resolution went through without notice, because it was discussed, as I have read from the RECORD.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that the resolution was defeated in the House?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I simply read it as it passed the Senate. To be perfectly frank with the Senator from Texas, I do not know what became of it. I am not sure it ever got to a vote in the House. It passed the Senate. It did not become law.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that there was another similar resolution authorizing the Attorney General to bring a lawsuit against the State of California, which was offered, but did not become law?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is my understanding that no resolution of this type ever became law. I simply read it because of the fact that it was passed by the Senate, with many Senators present, who are Members of the Senate today, presumably participating in the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that on both occasions when the Attorney General asked Congress to assert claim to the submerged lands and to authorize lawsuits, Congress declined or failed to do so?

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as I know, no resolution of that kind ever cleared both Houses of Congress, but the particular one which I have read, with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, did clear the United States Senate.

Mr. President, there was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, April 19, an editorial entitled "A Matter of Sovereignty." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at the end of my remarks.

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

A MATTER OF SOVEREIGNTY

One of the most momentous decisions in the history of the country may be made by the Senate in the coming week.

It is the decision whether the belt of seas bordering the continental United States is subject to national sovereignty or State ownership.

The immediate legislation on which the decision will rest is Senate Joint Resolution 13. It would give California, Texas, and Louisiana the oil and natural gas in the bed of the seas off their coasts out to the distance which they regard as their historic boundaries seaward.

The House has already passed the measure. President Eisenhower has announced that he will sign it. A majority of the Senate is evidently ready to vote for it. A small group of Senators, led by DOUGLAS of Illinois, LEHMAN of New York, and HILL of Alabama, and including HENNING and SYMINGTON of Missouri, as well as two Republicans, TOBEY of New Hampshire and LANGER of North Dakota, are holding the thin line of defense. They hope the arguments they are advancing will persuade enough Senators to defeat the resolution, or will persuade the President to veto it.

It is a small hope, but the only remaining one. In 1946 and again in 1952 President Truman stood single-handed against the intended plunder of the national domain, saving it with the Presidential veto.

There are many cogent reasons why the United States should not surrender any part of its national sovereignty to any one of the 48 States, as it would do in this resolution.

The area involved is one of the most delicate in international diplomacy, in which the peace of the world may at any moment hang in the balance. This is a governing reason why the Supreme Court has thrice decided, in cases covering all the claimants to offshore oil, that the United States exercises and must continue to exercise sovereignty over this resource as well as all other resources of the sea-belt. "The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there," said the court. "National rights must therefore be paramount."

The oil in the marginal seas, the 3-mile belt out from low-tide mark, and in the Continental Shelf, the submerged skirt of the continent where the waters are relatively shallow before plunging into the abysses of the sea, is necessary for national defense.

These undersea fields must be developed by private initiative under Federal control. When they have been drained down to what should be their reserves for national defense, someone must have the will and the authority to put the lid on. The States cannot be expected to do this; they bear no responsibility for national defense, that responsibility is the Government's.

If the reserves were dangerously depleted under State ownership, the United States might be compelled to expend much blood and treasure to keep open or reopen lines of supply from the Middle East or elsewhere, for oil which could, by the exercise of foresight, have been kept available within easy reach of our own shores.

There are grave doubts that the proposed giveaway would be constitutional. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and former Solicitor General Perlman doubt the constitutionality of the measure. Attorney General Brownell has implied doubt on the same constitutional point by trying to avoid collision with it. The Supreme Court's own words in the California case, reaffirmed in the Texas and Louisiana cases, appear to support the conception that offshore oil is an adjunct of national sovereignty and that Congress therefore is powerless to give it away. The Rhode Island Legislature has directed the attorney general of that State to contest the resolution if it is enacted.

Adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 13, accordingly, might paralyze the development of the undersea oil lands indefinitely. Existing and possible future efforts of States to extend their boundaries farther seaward could also provide additional fruitful fields for prolonged litigation. The proponents of giving the oil to the States have argued long and loudly that it is the most expeditious way of getting the fields developed. The exact opposite proves to be the case.

In a nation struggling to make financial ends meet under a crushing burden of national defense, giving away an estimated \$80 billion or more of national assets does not make sense. To Missouri alone, its share of the national assets involved amounts to the equivalent of at least \$1¼ billion endowment for the State's public schools.

Giving away offshore oil would be only the opening move to a giveaway of the minerals in public lands and the grasses of the western range—involving a grand total of more than a trillion dollars. No wonder Perlman called the offshore oil bill "the largest wholesale looting in history of national assets."

If the United States recognized Texas and Louisiana claims to 10½ miles seaward, it

would be embarrassed in its efforts to preserve the international convention of a 3-mile limit. Other nations might retaliate with extensions of their boundaries seaward such as would endanger the freedom of the seas, as the State Department has warned.

American States would be invited by the terms of the pending resolution to extend their borders seaward to the limits of their imaginations. Texas has extended its claim in advance to 150 miles. Senator CORDON of Oregon, floor leader for the resolution, has admitted that no one knows where the coastal boundaries of the States were when they were admitted into the Union.

There is no foreseeable end to the dispute which this resolution would open up between States and the Federal Government over the contents of the seabed. An estimated \$3 billion worth of sulfur is known to exist in addition to the oil and natural gas. Still other valuable national assets as yet unknown may be present. As the Supreme Court said: "Today the controversy is over oil. Tomorrow it may be over some other substance or perhaps the bed of the ocean itself."

The Post-Dispatch has been in the battle over offshore oil since it began in earnest 8 years ago. We said on October 17, 1945, that "against any effort to use our fighting oil to any smaller purpose than the defense of our Nation, the only course is to fight." Nothing has happened in the world to lend that intention less urgency in the intervening years, and much has happened to lend it more.

The President ought to give studious and serious consideration to the accumulation of logic which speaks against this measure. He should not consider himself bound to error by opinions expressed when by his own admission he knew little of either the facts or the law. He cannot want to give the color of his signature to a quid pro quo of oil for votes in Texas and California, which cast their electoral ballots for him, and in Louisiana, a traditionally Democratic State which he narrowly lost to Governor Stevenson.

It is a decision of the gravest moment for the Senate, and for the President as for the Nation.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

During the delivery of Mr. SPARKMAN's speech,

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to submit a unanimous-consent request, but to suggest a procedural point, which I think should have the attention of the distinguished majority leader at this time.

Earlier the majority leader expressed the hope that it might be possible to reach an agreement for a final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 13. It is my suggestion that an agreement might be reached on some basis such as the following:

First, that we proceed to consider amendments which are now at the desk and which are germane to the bill, and to allow 2 hours to a side.

Privately, I would express the hope that the majority leader would be quite lenient with Senators on this side as to yielding a part of the time that might be available to Senators on his side of the question who do not wish to use the time for a discussion of the joint resolution itself, so that, in certain circumstances, it might be possible to exceed somewhat the 2-hour limitation. If that were done, a vote might be had on Tuesday next, May 5, at 2 p. m., which was, I believe,

the date suggested earlier this morning. We are happy to meet the majority leader on the final date. We do not wish to agree to a limitation of 1 hour to each Senator, or something of that nature, but would prefer to have 2 hours on an amendment, with the hope that we might expect some liberality in the yielding of time by the other side.

I wish to point out to the majority leader that steadfastly we who have been opposed to the Holland joint resolution have said that we would not prevent a final vote. We have fought to the best of our ability and have acted in good faith. We still are acting in good faith. We have said constantly that the final vote would come; that we were not trying to prevent it. We have been trying to forewarn the American people as to the provisions we think are bad in the proposed legislation, and we wanted time in which to discuss it with them. We have discussed it, and we desire that the people have a few more days in which to reflect on the discussion.

If the distinguished majority leader would present a unanimous-consent request, following this general outline, which, I believe, would have to follow a quorum call, there would be no objection, so far as I know, from any of the Senators who have been opposing the Holland joint resolution and have favored substitute measures.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the proposal made by the Senator from New Mexico is a fair one. I see no reason why we should not proceed at once to have a quorum call, if the Senator wishes to have one. I shall prepare a unanimous-consent request. My understanding of this suggestion is that we proceed to consider amendments now before the Senate, and that the debate on those amendments shall not exceed 2 hours on each side; that at the conclusion of the debate on the amendments, but not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on May 5, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the remaining amendments and on the joint resolution. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. I should say to the majority leader that I do not wish to take advantage of the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama in yielding to me to try to take him off the floor by having the time limitation begin to run now.

Mr. TAFT. My suggestion was that it should begin on Wednesday, April 29, which would be tomorrow.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should be happy to have it become effective when the Senator from Alabama has concluded his address.

Mr. TAFT. That would be satisfactory.

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

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understood that I had yielded only temporarily, and without prejudice, in order to permit the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico to be stated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas; but before doing so I merely wish to say to the Presiding Officer that I recognize that this is a somewhat unusual proceeding, but I thought we should discuss the problem for a few minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Ohio, I should like to clarify one point. As I understood the Senator, he referred to amendments now before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I was merely using words which I thought were used by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not wish to limit the amendments to those now before the Senate. I was trying to state a provision for germaneness, which would apply to amendments that might subsequently be submitted, namely, that all amendments filed after the making of the agreement shall be germane to the subject.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the Senator's proposal, if by any chance the allowance of 4 hours for each amendment does not result in disposing of all amendments by May 5, we shall, in any event, vote on any amendments and the joint resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will whichever Senator has the floor yield to me?

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

Mr. FREAR. With respect to the amendments now being debated on the floor, the Douglas amendments, after the expiration of the time consumed by the Senator from Alabama, there will then be 4 hours of debate permitted on them; will there not?

Mr. TAFT. I trust that much time will not be necessary, but I see no reason why it should not be permitted under the agreement.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Senator from Delaware that I do not think it will be necessary, but it would be permissible.

I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that inadvertently I may have left the impression that no other amendments were to be offered. However, a few days ago, I discussed with the distinguished Senator from Ohio the germaneness provision. As to the amendments now before the Senate, I do not think the test of germaneness would necessarily apply, but I think the test would apply to amendments which may subsequently be offered.

Mr. TAFT. With regard to the suggestion as to the debate on May 5, that the vote should be at 2 o'clock, does the Senator propose to divide the time between the proponents and the opponents?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was hopeful that the majority leader, in his unanimous-consent request, might suggest that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock and that, without additional formalities, there should be an hour allowed to each side. If he desired a quorum call before the final vote, that would carry the time a few minutes beyond 2 o'clock. But without

necessarily going into the number of hours or the question of quorum calls, we might proceed to have 1 hour of final debate on each side. If the Senator from Ohio feels that the hour of 3 o'clock would be better, we are not wedded to a particular hour.

Mr. TAFT. I think the proposal is important enough so that if the Senator from Alabama will yield for that purpose, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me first?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make a brief statement. I think it is only fair to our group and to the Senator from Oregon to point out that we have held meetings over a period of many days with regard to a proposal for fixing a time to vote. We intended ultimately to submit to the majority leader in keeping with the representations of speaker after speaker from the beginning of the prolonged debate on this question.

It was agreed in a meeting we held this morning that I should briefly summarize our position, as follows:

We have said from the beginning, starting with the first day of the debate, that we did not intend to follow a course of action which would prevent an ultimate vote on the joint resolution. We did say that we believed that such a dangerous measure to the public welfare, a measure which sought to give away billions of dollars of what we considered to be the natural oil resources belonging to all the people of the country, should not be voted upon quickly, and not until there had been a thorough discussion of the joint resolution, and until the public had been alerted to what we considered to be its dangerous implications.

Whether one examines the Douglas speech, the Anderson speech, the Hill speech, the Humphrey speech, the Gore speech, the Fulbright speech, the Lehman speech, or any other speech delivered during the course of this debate by the opponents of the measure, he will find in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD time and time again the statement that the fundamental purpose of this prolonged debate was to warn and forewarn the American people as to what we consider to be the dangerous implications of the joint resolution from the standpoint of protecting the public interest and the public wealth in the Nation's natural resources.

It was agreed that when I took the floor last Friday to make my long speech I should follow a course of action which we hoped would so dramatize the situation that the public would stop, look, and listen with respect to the position taken by the little band of liberals in opposition to the joint resolution.

As a group we had observed that, so far as the press was concerned, by and large the thunders of silence had been leveled against the arguments of those of us in opposition to the bill. For the most part what the press was doing was directing stories and attacks against the individual Senators who were

opposing this phase of the Eisenhower program, which we think is so much against the public interest.

We agreed in conferences that something ought to be done to dramatize the situation; and I said so quite frankly time and time again during the course of the long speech which I made. In that speech I said several times that, although we were going to come eventually to a vote on the joint resolution, we proposed to use the filibuster technique to prolong the debate until the public would stop, look, and listen.

Every member of the little band of liberals who has fought the joint resolution can testify today that we have received a reaction from the public which satisfies us that the public is looking and listening, and now analyzing, as it never has before, the demerits of the joint resolution.

Satisfied that we have accomplished the purpose we started out to accomplish, we now offer a terminal date for the debate which in our opinion will give the public adequate time between now and May 5 to make clear its attitude in regard to the joint resolution. I think this is the best demonstration we could make to the majority leader that we meant it when we said throughout the debate that we were acting in good faith. We have acted in good faith; and we are willing, on the basis of the record, to take the issue to the political platforms of America in 1954, in further contest with the proponents of the joint resolution, and let the people decide in 1954 whose point of view they prefer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. Of course, I have no right to call for a quorum unless the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor back to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if my right to continue in possession of the floor after the procedure following the quorum call is concluded is not in any way prejudiced, nor my right to complete the speech I have started, which I do not think will require very long, I shall be very glad to yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Alabama yielding with the understanding he has stated? The Chair hears none.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Butler, Md.	Cordon
Anderson	Butler, Nebr.	Daniel
Barrett	Byrd	Dirksen
Beall	Capehart	Douglas
Bennett	Carlson	Duff
Bricker	Case	Dworshak
Bridges	Clements	Ellender
Bush	Cooper	Ferguson

Flanders	Kefauver	Payne
Frear	Kennedy	Potter
Fulbright	Kilgore	Purtell
George	Knowland	Robertson
Gillette	Kuchel	Russell
Goldwater	Langer	Saltonstall
Gore	Lehman	Schoeppel
Green	Long	Smathers
Griswold	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Mansfield	Smith, N. C.
Hennings	Martin	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Stennis
Hill	McCarran	Symington
Hoey	McCarthy	Taft
Holland	McClellan	Thye
Hunt	Millikin	Tobey
Ives	Monroney	Watkins
Jackson	Morse	Weiker
Jenner	Mundt	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Williams
Johnson, Tex.	Neely	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the request I am about to make.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with reference to Joint Resolution 13, that, beginning at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senate proceed to the consideration of amendments to the joint resolution as presented, the debate on each amendment to be limited to 4 hours, the time to be divided equally between the proposer of the amendment and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]; that a final vote be taken on the joint resolution and on all remaining amendments beginning at 2 p. m. on May 5, the time on May 5 to be divided equally between the proponents of the joint resolution, to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], for 1 hour, and by the opponents of the joint resolution, to be controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], for 1 hour; amendments filed after the making of this agreement to be germane to the said joint resolution.

Does that state substantially the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico? Or does he have any suggested amendments to offer?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would suggest that the time of the opponents be controlled by the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from New Mexico would prefer to have the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] control the time in opposition to the joint resolution, instead of himself?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I make that change in the request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should also like to say to the Senator from Ohio that while I would not ask that it be incorporated in the unanimous-consent agreement, we should like to ask the majority leader to try to avoid so far as possible, any votes tomorrow afternoon. Some of us are confronted with a very difficult problem with respect to tomorrow afternoon, and would like to avoid any votes at that time. Of course, the debate could proceed on any amendment tomorrow, but without

bringing it to a vote tomorrow afternoon. I appreciate that it may be difficult for the distinguished majority leader to arrange it, and I am only suggesting that to do so would simplify our situation.

Mr. TAFT. All I can say is that I certainly shall be disposed to accommodate the Senator and his colleagues. If debate on an amendment should come to an end, the Senate could always proceed to consider another amendment, and then vote on both amendments on the following day, or make some other provision, such as, for example, that after the debate is completed to proceed by unanimous consent to reach such agreement as is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that there are four of us who have made plans for tomorrow afternoon. Some of the Senators were not extremely anxious that the unanimous-consent request be put in exactly the language in which it was put. The only reason it was finally agreed to in that language was because I thought I could ask the distinguished majority leader to hold off votes tomorrow afternoon, if possible. Of course, the debate could proceed without interruption. However, I do not want to include my request in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree that the unanimous-consent agreement shall extend also to the substitution of the pending joint resolution for the House bill and sending the whole matter to the House?

Mr. ANDERSON. That would be very agreeable.

Mr. TAFT. I add that provision to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to make certain that the unanimous-consent request under the term "amendment" includes a substitute for the pending joint resolution, which I expect to offer.

Mr. TAFT. I consider the term "amendment" to clearly include a substitute. In other words, a substitute is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, does the proposed unanimous-consent agreement contemplate that a Senator in charge of time for debate may delegate such authority to another Senator?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, that can always be arranged. If a Senator wishes to leave the floor, he may ask another Senator to act for him.

Mr. CORDON. There are several appropriation matters that must receive our attention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader tell the Senate, in the event the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, what his plans are for the remainder of the week?

Mr. TAFT. My plans would be to have the Senate meet every day from 12 to 6, in the usual manner, in the hope that we may conclude our consideration of the amendments. If we could not get through with the amendments, while providing adequate time for debate, we could stay in session longer, in order to

give proponents of amendments adequate time to present their case fully.

The same situation would apply to next Monday. On Monday we could hold a session all day and perhaps even Monday evening, if necessary.

It has been suggested that we hold a Saturday session; but I am sure we can provide hours on other days that will be sufficient to meet the requirements of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has more than a slight interest in the pending legislation; but I should like to know what the majority leader intends to take up following the disposition of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. The first thing would be to take up the calendar, on which there is quite serious accumulation of bills. There are three or four controversial measures, which may have to be taken off the calendar. They are not measures which will take a long period of time to consider. I hope at the earliest possible date the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] will be able to report the bill dealing with the Continental Shelf. Another bill to be taken up is the defense production bill, which we should dispose of as early as possible. That is all, so far as I know, although before that time undoubtedly we will have before us an appropriation bill. We have a small appropriation bill, a supplemental appropriation bill, which is almost ready for consideration. Then we shall have the first main appropriation bill ready for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as next week is concerned, can I understand that it is the majority leader's plan to call the calendar and then take up any appropriation bill which may be available, and that he will have in reserve the Continental Shelf bill and the defense production-control bill.

Mr. TAFT. I doubt very much that during next week we shall reach anything except a large number of the miscellaneous matters which have accumulated.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am the Senator who suggested to the distinguished majority leader that, if necessary, we hold a session the coming Saturday. I do not make that request as a part of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, of course; but I desire to express the hope that the majority leader will make it possible for Senators who wish to speak on pending amendments on Saturday, and who are prevented from doing so, to have an opportunity to speak at some other time, because there are a number of amendments, and I believe all Senators should have an opportunity to debate them.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. As a matter of fact, if Senators are not disposed to suggest the absence of a quorum on Saturday, we shall have a Saturday session, so that Senators may present various matters which they may wish to present.

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

The unanimous-consent request as entered, and as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 13, the so-called Submerged Lands Act, effective upon the conclusion of the speech of Mr. SPARKMAN, debate upon any amendment, motion, or appeal, that may be pending or that may be proposed to the said joint resolution shall be limited to not exceeding 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment and Mr. CORDON, or a Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment, submitted and intended to be proposed subsequent to the entering into of this agreement, that is not germane to the subject matter of the said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on Tuesday, May 5, 1953, the time between 12 noon and 2 p. m. shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the joint resolution and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CORDON, or a Senator designated by him, and Mr. MURRAY; and that any amendment pending at said hour of 2 o'clock, or thereafter proposed, shall be acted upon without debate, as shall likewise the vote on the final passage of the joint resolution.

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of the said joint resolution, the Senate shall immediately proceed, without debate, to the consideration of H. R. 4198, the corresponding House bill, that it be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, with the exception that in lieu of the words "joint resolution", wherever they appear therein, the word "act" shall be substituted; that the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill, as amended, shall be deemed to be ordered, that a vote be taken without debate on the final passage of the said bill; that in the event of the passage of the bill the title be appropriately amended, and the vote on the passage of the Senate joint resolution be deemed to be reconsidered and that it be postponed indefinitely.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT OF 1951

During the delivery of Mr. SPARKMAN's speech,

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has an urgent matter which he would like to lay before the Senate. I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1767, providing for extension of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951, and that the bill be immediately considered by the Senate.

I also ask that any discussion of this matter be limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and I hope it will not take more than 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the District of Columbia will be discharged from further consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this bill merely changes, in the District of Columbia rent control law, the date "April 30, 1953" to "July 31, 1953," so as to conform to the provisions of the national rent control bill which was passed by the Senate on Saturday. The bill now before the Senate simply gives the people of the District of Columbia the same right that already has been extended to the people of the rest of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there amendments to be proposed to the bill? If there are no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1767) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 31, 1953."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the various interruptions which have occurred be printed in the RECORD following my speech. By so doing, I assume that the interruptions will not result in breaking the continuity of my presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, but they will redound to the credit of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair. I assume that the interruptions will appear in the RECORD following the conclusion of my speech.

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

SAN JACINTO—THE LEGACY OF FREEDOM

During the delivery of Mr. SPARKMAN's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for an insertion in the RECORD, including a statement not to exceed 2 minutes, with the understanding that he will not lose his rights to the floor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not prejudice my rights to the floor I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the quality of true eloquence is rare. When it is combined with statesmanship, vision, capacity, and integrity, a man is produced who is a blessing to his Nation.

Such a man is Fritz Lanham, my good friend and former Representative from Fort Worth.

Fritz Lanham is a scholar with a deep and penetrating grasp of the significance of history. He has devoted that scholarship to the service of his country. His ability and his patriotism are attested by a lifetime of achievement.

On Sunday, Fritz Lanham delivered an address before a meeting of the Texas State Society in celebration of San Jacinto Day. He traced the course of the decisive Battle of San Jacinto and its significance to America. So forceful and eloquent were his remarks that they drew the praise of the President of the United States who was present as a guest of the society.

This is an address worthy of the attention of the members of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

In appreciative recognition of an anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto, we are gathered, unavoidably somewhat belatedly, to meditate upon the glories of that engagement and the establishment of that independence which a few brave men at old Washington on the Brazos had so firmly and boldly declared. We are sponsoring, therefore, an occasion which stimulates the patriotic purposes of our hearts and which impels us in grateful remembrance to cherish San Jacinto as a milepost for our guidance in loyal service to a State and a Nation beyond compare.

We are signally honored in that we are permitted to greet with enthusiastic welcome and pride a native son of the Lone Star State whose eminent worth has exalted him to grace the highest office Americans can bestow. He shares with us the glorious heritage of two great Republics, two transcendent histories of heroic achievement, and the consequent double measure of devotion to our united country which that resplendent heritage so plainly prompts. And, with no thought of disparagement to a beloved sister State, we are pleased to bear in mind that he was taken from the Lone Star borders when he himself was entirely too young for that departure to have been a matter of his own determination.

Today we are doubly grateful that the lovely First Lady of the Land is also our honored guest.

In its enduring significance, San Jacinto has taken its place among the outstanding battles of history. Few and worn with fatigue were the dauntless patriots Sam Houston then so sagaciously led as against overwhelming odds they won their momentous victory. And it was the memory of another of freedom's shrines that urged them on and furnished their spurring battle cry. "Remember the Alamo," they shouted as they met and triumphantly routed the oncoming hordes of that self-styled Napoleon of the West.

The Alamo. The stirring preface to San Jacinto. And what inspiring memories it

awakens. I doubt if in the annals of American history can be found a document comparable in patriotic zeal to the immortal letter Travis wrote from that beleaguered mission. Every Texan should commit to memory its hallowed lines, appropriately addressed to all Americans in the world. Let us contemplate its unparalleled appeal:

"Fellow citizens and compatriots: I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continued bombardment for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise the garrison is to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the summons with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat.

"Then I call on you, in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily, which will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. Though this call may be neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and to die like a soldier who never forgets what is due his own honor and that of his country. Victor or death."

When we meditate upon those words, attested in their sincerity by the lives of the little band within those walls, it is enough to make our blood tingle with pride as it courses through our veins that we may say, "This is our own, our Texas land."

What is the lesson of liberty which those Texas conflicts teach? Clearly it is distinctively American. They who perished at the Alamo, they who battled so valiantly at San Jacinto, hailed from every State of the American Union as it then existed. To our Texas shores then came and since have come the sons and daughters of the North, the South, the East, and the West. They have brought with them the literary culture of the East, the hustle and bustle of the West, the commercial genius of the North, and the proverbial chivalry and hospitality of the South. And there through the natural processes of attrition they have worn the rough edges from their natures and acquired the graces of the cosmopolitan American.

It is this accomplishment which characterizes the Texan wherever he may have been born. He is not sectional in his spirit or provincial in his vision of life. Indeed, from the beginning Texas has been a veritable American melting pot, and from it has come that product of which we may be so justly proud: the typical, stalwart, upstanding Texan, true to the legacy of San Jacinto and the Alamo, devoted without stint to the preservation and promotion of the blessings of liberty for which our fathers so courageously and successfully fought.

What, then, today are the duties and responsibilities devolving upon us as appreciative successors of the illustrious heroes whose memory we so appropriately honor? Surely it behooves both you and me to have and, when necessity requires, to manifest the vision of Austin, the resolution of Houston, the courage of Travis, the persistence of Crockett, the learning of Lamar, and the patriotism of them all.

San Jacinto and Yorktown. Two hallowed battlegrounds of freedom's triumphs, the treasured shrines of two great Republics now happily joined in one united country with one Constitution and one common destiny. Our country. The best expressions of pen or tongue or brush can never fully portray its sublimity or its grandeur. So revered by us its history and its heroes, so filled our Texan hearts with gratitude for its double heritage, that no artist can paint our picture of it, no poet can pen our paean to it, no orator can bespeak our devotion for it. It is our country. We love it. God bless it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad to yield for the purpose of allowing the distinguished Senator from Texas to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by former Representative Lanham, with whom I had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives, along with the Senator from Texas. I certainly agree with everything he said about that wise man.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Bush	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Holland	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young
Gore	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 13. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at earlier in the day control of the time begins at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. As I understand, 2 hours are allowed for the proponents of an amendment and 2 hours for those in opposition to an amendment. As to the amendment now before the Senate, I understand from the proposer of the amendment, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], that it is his plan to make one presentation only in favor of this

amendment. I do not see the Senator from Illinois in the Chamber. I think he will return in just a moment.

The Senator from Oregon has received no requests for time on the side of the opposition to the Douglas amendment. Therefore, the Senator from Oregon states that, so far as he is concerned, he will make a brief statement, and, on the assumption that there will be no further presentation on the other side after the presentation by the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Oregon will be prepared to yield the remainder of the time. In that case we may assume that we can reach a vote on the pending amendment yet this afternoon. I shall discuss the matter further when the Senator from Illinois returns to the Chamber, so that the Senate may be fully advised.

Mr. DOUGLAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Illinois has just returned to the Chamber. I will state again, for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois, my understanding of the situation. I understand that he has an arrangement with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who controls the time on the other side with respect to the joint resolution itself, that there will be only one presentation in favor of the amendment. That presentation will be made by the Senator from Illinois, and will require between 20 and 30 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope to make it just as brief as possible in order that we may push for a vote tonight on it, and on other amendments as well.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, since that is the case, and since the Senator from Illinois is the proposer of the amendment, I believe that the Senator from Oregon should state to the Senate information that ought to be before the Senate. Then, with the rebuttal that will come from the Senator from Illinois, the discussion of the amendment will be closed and the issue ready for a vote.

ARBITRARY 3-MILE BOUNDARY SOUGHT

Mr. President, the situation in which we find ourselves with the proposed amendment which was introduced yesterday by the Senator from Illinois, for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is substantially as follows: There are certain minor changes proposed to be made to Senate Joint Resolution 13 as reported, the net result of which would be that an arbitrary 3-mile limit would be established, rather than to follow the philosophy of the joint resolution itself. The resolution provides that the limit be the statutory boundary with which a State entered the Union, or as such boundary may have been subsequently approved by an act of the Congress. There were certain modifications which I previously explained to the Senate, and which I shall not repeat at this time. That is the substance of the changes in Senate Joint Resolution 13 itself which the proposed amendment would make. The amendment in essence is an attempt to breathe life into the dead.

Yesterday the Senate, by the rather conclusive vote of 56 to 33, laid on the table the Anderson amendment and with

it the Hill amendment. By the acceptance on the part of the Senator from New Mexico, the Hill amendment had become a part of the Anderson amendment.

In the pending amendment it is sought to revive the Anderson amendment, to make it applicable to that portion of the Continental Shelf outside the 3-mile limit. Except for that change, the proposed Douglas amendment is the Anderson-Hill measure, which was laid on the table yesterday.

Some other, and minor, changes would be made. These proposed changes are of no consequence so far as the meat of the amendment is concerned, although I call attention to one of them, because it shows, as does the balance of the amendment, that the committee's action in the first instance is the action which today should be upheld and why this amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois should be defeated.

LEGAL QUESTIONS AS TO OUTER SHELF

Mr. President, it will be recalled that the committee reported it was eliminating from the proposed legislation all provisions concerning development of the outer Continental Shelf, because the committee had found, in attempting to draft an amendment to the Senate Joint Resolution 13 as introduced for the outer shelf, that there were very many and very serious legal questions involved. These problems should be solved before legislation involving that area is submitted to Congress for enactment, the committee felt.

Those questions still exist, and they have had no answer either in the original Anderson bill or in this newly tailored Anderson bill, with the new look.

On page 9 of the report filed by the Senate Interior Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 13 there appears this language:

It must follow that the interest of the United States is, from a national and an international standpoint, politically and legally, sui generis. What Federal laws are applicable, what should apply?

I invite attention to these questions, because they are questions which bothered the committee.

What Federal laws are applicable, what should apply?

There is no answer to that question in Senator DOUGLAS' proposed amendment.

In what court, where situated, does jurisdiction lie or where should it be placed?

We have no answer to either of these questions in the proposed amendment. They are serious questions, and they must have an answer. Another question is:

Should new Federal law be enacted where existing statutes are wholly inadequate?

We look to the proposed amendment in vain for an answer.

Or should the laws of abutting States be made applicable?

Evidently the answer is in the negative, because nothing is said about it in that field.

Then I call attention to this statement:

The necessity for answering these questions is clear, when we take note of the fact

that the full development of the estimated values of the shelf area will require the efforts and the physical presence of thousands of workers on fixed structures in the shelf area. Industrial accidents, accidental death, peace, and order—these and many other problems and situations need and must have legislative attention.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the proposed amendment which takes care of any of those manifest legislative needs. There is nothing whatever in the amendment with respect to that point.

That is the amendment. It does what many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 have many times charged the joint resolution does. The Douglas amendment does nothing in this wide world but provide a method of validating leases held by the oil companies and the oil operators on the outer Continental Shelf, and makes arrangements for them to get more leases. That is all.

AMENDMENT ORIGINALLY INTENDED ONLY FOR
INTERIM OPERATIONS

One could say the amendment is one for the oil monopolists. I do not say that. It was not so intended. I know it was not so intended. It was intended by its original author to provide an interim method of keeping production going in the outer continental area, and I am not going to attribute to the Senator from New Mexico or any of those who are supporting the measure any other thought or idea or purpose than to do that one thing, namely, to provide interim operation of the oil areas and to provide for further exploration.

However, the language of the amendment itself would provide a sound basis for saying that it was written solely for the purpose of protecting those oil interests. One could say it on the face of the amendment. That could not be said with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 13.

I hope that we may get a little credit for restraint in this matter, and for restricting our discussion to the facts in the matter, at least in this particular debate.

LAW MORE IMPORTANT THAN HASTE

Mr. President, it is important that we do have law which will apply to this outer shelf. Such law is more important than is the validation of these leases so precipitantly. Such law is more important than the granting of new exploratory leases at this time, before we have prepared the kind of legislation which the committee indicated it would prepare. This legislation will have to be new law to care for the new situation. With respect to what laws now apply or might apply to the outer shelf, the committee's acting chairman has had two different exploratory groups at work on the problem for the past 2 weeks.

NEEDS OF WORKERS NOT MET

Legislation for the outer shelf will give consideration to the needs of thousands of working people who are not the people who sit in counting rooms or the people who have money or the top-level industrialists in oil operations. The people to which I refer are the ordinary working folks who are living by the sweat of their brows. They have a right to

consideration here, but they have not had it in any of the measures proposed to us as yet.

It has never occurred to the Senator from New Mexico, seemingly—and I regret that he is not now in the Chamber—that at this time no body of law of any kind or character is applicable to the outer Continental Shelf. There is none. I can understand that that thought might not occur to him, for I say frankly that it did not occur to me until I was charged with the obligation of bringing before the Senate soundly considered proposed legislation in this particular field.

When I sought to fulfill that obligation, I found that the problem was a larger one than seemingly anyone had considered. That is why the committee did not bring in a title III providing for development of the outer shelf. In my view, the unsolved problems I have touched upon briefly are the reasons why there should be no legislation respecting the outer shelf until there can be adequate knowledge and consideration upon which to base sound and complete legislation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Am I correct in understanding that it is the intention of the committee to report at this session proposed legislation to deal with the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. The answer is definitely yes.

I will say further that the proposed legislation will be reported to the Senate as soon as possible, and in any event within 2 weeks from the final disposition of the particular joint resolution now before us.

I had hoped to have a measure ready by this time. Had it not been for the intervention of duties with the Appropriations Committee, perhaps I could have had a bill ready by now, although the problem is more difficult than appeared at first.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the pending legislation, aware that I submitted to the committee amendments which involve, in essence, the same basic principles that are involved in the present Douglas amendments?

Mr. CORDON. I recall that very well.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Have those amendments received due consideration at the hands of the committee?

Mr. CORDON. I recall very well the proposed amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. However, the primary need now is to determine specifically what existing law of the United States may be made applica-

ble to the outer shelf area, by reference, and the extent to which perhaps other law that will be peculiar to that area must be drafted.

The basic proposition the Senator has in his amendment, and the one the Senator from New Mexico has in his amendment, and the one the House has in their amendments, will, of course, be the basis for the new legislation.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Oregon has partially answered the question I wish to ask, which is this: What will be the tenor of the bill dealing with the Continental Shelf, which the Senator from Oregon expects to have reported to the Senate within the next 2 weeks? Will it deal with the disposal of the income or the ownership or with establishing boundaries, or just what will be provided by the bill relating to the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. Under the bill, the funds will be placed in the Treasury of the United States as general revenue. The bill will follow, I say very frankly—and I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is not present at this time—the general outline of the Anderson bill itself, S. 107. There will have to be changes because of the conditions of which the bill does not take cognizance. The same basic principle is involved in the bill of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

LEASING AND "HOUSEKEEPING" LEGISLATION TO
BE PROVIDED

Of necessity, the new measure will contain provision for the validation of existing leases. I say that will be done of necessity; and, of course, in justice and in fair dealing, it should be done. The new bill will provide for the granting of new leases by the Secretary of the Interior on areas not now under lease.

The bill will provide for revocation of the present Executive order, in whole; I refer to the Executive order which purports to establish the entire Continental Shelf as a naval petroleum reserve.

The bill will then provide the necessary housekeeping legislation for an area that is completely new in concept in the political and legal history of this world.

Those will be the major changes over the several types of proposed legislation which have been submitted or introduced on this floor from time to time.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield again to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the bill which it is proposed to report to the Senate—I refer to the proposed bill to deal with the Continental Shelf—preclude any State from undertaking to extend its boundaries outward into the Continental Shelf in the future?

Mr. CORDON. It will contain the same statement that appears in Senate

Joint Resolution 13, where the statement appears in a negative form, solely because we did not care to have a partial title III. If a new subject had been gone into, a title III would have been needed.

The bill will provide for the sole jurisdiction and control of the outer Continental Shelf by the United States of America—period.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand that the bill will provide for the disposal of the income which may be received from leases in the Continental Shelf, and will provide for having 100 percent of that income go into the United States Treasury alone?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DANIEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CORDON. I shall yield in a moment, Mr. President. In my opinion, it is the present view of the Senate, as I sense it—and I may say that my view has always been so—that the individual States have no rights, as such, in any part of the outer Continental Shelf. The only way there could be any State participation in that area would be in the event it were deemed advisable to "farm out," in a manner of speaking, by housekeeping law part of the Continental Shelf to a particular coastal State, and provide that the State be paid a reasonable value for governmental services rendered. That is the position that has been taken on the House side.

However, this body will have that matter clearly before it, I believe, by amendments which in all probability will be offered to the bill when introduced.

Mr. AIKEN. Then does the Senator from Oregon believe that if the joint resolution now before the Senate becomes law and if a bill which he evidently hopes the committee will report to the Senate—

Mr. CORDON. The committee will report it—

Mr. AIKEN. In the near future also becomes law, the two bills will establish definitely the limits of the coastal States in their seaward boundaries?

Mr. CORDON. Absolutely.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait a moment please. Previously I promised to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I hope Senators will be able to make their questions brief, and I shall try to make my answers as brief as possible, so we shall be able to conclude this evening.

Now I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that all the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have stated that they will not advocate that the States be given any title or ownership beyond the boundaries that existed at the time the States entered the Union or as

heretofore approved by Congress, as stated in the Holland joint resolution?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Those who would represent that the State of Texas is trying to obtain ownership beyond our 3-league boundary as it existed at the time when it entered the Union are not stating the facts in the matter, are they?

Mr. CORDON. No such purpose was indicated in the hearings; and, particularly, no such purpose was indicated in the executive sessions which the committee has had printed, and which are available for reading by all who desire to read them.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask another question: Is it not true that those who support the Holland joint resolution will be participating in the first congressional declaration—it is contained in section 9, on page 20—that all of the natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf beyond the area covered by the Holland joint resolution appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a question?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. CORDON. I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota, who previously asked that I yield to him.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the following question: The statement just made by the Senator from Oregon is in accordance with the first explanation of the Holland joint resolution he made when he presented it to the Senate in the statement he then made; is it not?

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. THYE. So no new proposal is being made here, in the case of the pending joint resolution; is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The only new proposal being made here in this amendment is the attempt to bring back into being the Anderson bill with the Hill amendment, which were laid on the table yesterday.

Mr. THYE. They are to be brought back into being?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. In new proposed legislation?

Mr. CORDON. The amendments now being debated would do that.

Mr. THYE. But the statement by the Senator from Oregon that the committee will report another bill is not a new stand on the part of the committee, is it?

Mr. CORDON. It is not.

Mr. THYE. The present stand of the committee is exactly the same as the stand the committee took when the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] reported the original Senate Joint Resolution 13; is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. CASE. Referring to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas relative to the fact that none of the States were claiming anything beyond their historic boundaries, how do

those who defend the pending measure as now written get around the fact that, under the act of February 20, 1811, when the Territory of Orleans was authorized to form a State, the boundary of the new State of Louisiana was described as "thence along the middle of said river," and so forth, "to the Gulf of Mexico; thence by line of the said gulf to the place of beginning?"

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the question is entirely irrelevant to the question asked by the Senator from Texas and answered by the Senator from Oregon. If the Senator will read the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13, he will find the answer. The Senator from Oregon cannot now turn aside to go into that matter which is now ancient history, and—I am sorry—does not propose to do so, because he does not have the time, and because he wants to continue on the pending amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

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

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has read Senate Joint Resolution 13, and, as nearly as he can understand from a reading of the measure and the statements made by Senators defending the bill, it is proposed that the State of Louisiana shall obtain an area within the Gulf of Mexico beyond the shore of the gulf. It has been the position of the Senator from South Dakota that the States which were carved out of the Louisiana Territory heretofore had as much right to any domain beyond the edge of the Gulf of Mexico as did the State of Louisiana. The Senator from South Dakota is unable to find in the answer given by the Senator from Oregon any answer to the question posed by the Senator from South Dakota on the statement of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment, please. The Senator yielded for a question, and got an assertion; but that is all right. But I am not going into this matter in detail, Mr. President. We can argue that at various other times. I say that the pending measure does not create any State boundary lines. If the Senator desires to change the boundary lines of the State of Louisiana, I hope he can find a method of doing it. The Senator from Oregon does not know how to do it. The lines are fixed, wherever they are. They were fixed when Louisiana came into the Union as a State. They are still fixed. It is quite as useless to inquire of the Senator from Oregon, "Do you know where that boundary is in the Gulf of Mexico?" as it is to ask the Senator from Oregon, "Do you know where the Senator from Illinois was born?" The Senator from Oregon does not know the answer to either question. But he does know that the Senator from Illinois was born, and he does know that Louisiana does have a State boundary. He seeks not to turn aside to answer either question, beyond that.

PROVISIONS NEEDED IN OUTER SHELF LAW

Now, Mr. President, getting back to the amendment, the Senator from Oregon calls attention to necessary provisions in any legislation to be drafted with respect to the outer Continental Shelf. There must be law there, Mr. President, law that will protect the people who are working there. In case of personal violence, certainly there must be law that will give them protection, that will punish the guilty, and that will compensate the injured. There is no such law applicable today.

Take, Mr. President, the case of a man applying for an oil lease in that area—someone who does not have adequate financing of his own, and who may have to seek funds from outside sources. There is not a place under the shining sun where he could either file for recording the evidence of his obligation, his mortgage, his trust deed, or anything else; nor is there a court under the shining sun into which anyone could go to enforce an obligation connected with such a lease. That is why I say that this matter must have the consideration necessary to set up housekeeping law within that area.

There is nothing provided under which the workmen out there could have any protection whatever. It is even doubtful whether a murderer could be indicted and punished for his crime committed on the outer shelf. There is nothing now in the law with respect to this area, under which a workman can have any basis of compensation for unemployment, for industrial accidents, and the like—nothing. And there is no court to which a worker can appeal to have his rights protected.

ADMIRALTY LAW NOT APPLICABLE

One may say, "The admiralty law attaches." Mr. President, the admiralty law does not attach. It attaches to the waters above the Shelf. It does not attach to the land below. The law goes wherever one turns. When we get into the matter we find that these things must be attended to, and now is the time to do it; and the committee expects to attend to it.

Merely to give one other example, Mr. President, of how little attention has been given to these amendments, or to the factual circumstances surrounding them, the measure reported by the committee provides, at least, for repeal of the Executive order establishing a petroleum reserve within the area with which it deals. But the pending measure does not even repeal that portion of the Executive order which purports to make the portion of the Continental Shelf with which it deals a petroleum reserve, even though at the same time the amendment sets up another jurisdiction vested in the Secretary of the Interior. Of course, the dual jurisdiction and authority would set up an impossible situation. I call it to the attention of the Senate merely as another example of the necessity of going into this matter and properly bringing it to the floor of the Senate for decision.

AMENDMENT VIOLATES PHILOSOPHY OF COMMITTEE MEASURE

I could discuss the proposed amendment in great detail, but in closing I

merely wish to say, Mr. President, that the suggested changes, so far as they affect Senate Joint Resolution 13, violate the basic philosophy of the committee measure. So far as the proposed amendment adopts the Anderson bill, it is not in any wise a fully considered piece of legislation. It would only take care of existing leasehold interests and provide for further exploration and further leasing without making applicable any of the necessary legal structure which we must have within the area in question. That area is a political entity, in a manner of speaking, over which the American flag flies. However, our jurisdiction is horizontal and not in any sense a vertical jurisdiction. In my opinion, the amendments should be rejected for that reason.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky for a question.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is saying that title III of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois would deal with an area which is not at all the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. And the proposed methods of administration and distribution of the funds?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is saying that as the one handling the matter in the committee he will consider the area which is not now covered by Senate Joint Resolution 13, and that a bill will be introduced dealing with that area?

Mr. CORDON. And that area alone.

Mr. COOPER. Is it true that this amendment relates to the subject matter of Senate Joint Resolution 13 in that it would make uniform the boundaries of the Coastal States at a line extending 3 miles seaward from their coastal line?

Mr. CORDON. No. I do not say that, and I cannot agree with it. The proposed amendment will not and cannot make uniform the boundaries of the States. It will draw a 3-mile line as to the particular benefits that are contained therein with respect to the States, but it does not and cannot affect the boundaries of those States.

Mr. COOPER. Would this amendment differ from Senate Joint Resolution 13 in that it would limit the boundaries of all the Coastal States to a line extending 3 miles seaward from their coastal line?

Mr. CORDON. That is the same question, in other words. It does not do that. The Senator will find that what it does attempt to do is to provide that the natural resources, and so forth, which are the subject matter of the proposed legislation, namely, the resources in the soil beneath waters inside State boundaries and in the waters themselves, which are conveyed to the States, will be limited to an area the outer boundary of which is 3 miles from the coast line; but the proposed amendment cannot affect the boundaries of the States themselves.

Mr. COOPER. Would it not be possible to vote upon the last matter which

I have mentioned to the Senator, without joining to it further amendments and without attempting to go into other matters?

Mr. CORDON. The amendment is a single one. How the amendment is to be treated is another matter.

Mr. COOPER. But, by a much simpler amendment, the question of the 3-mile limit could be decided without joining with it the matter of supervision of the entire Continental Shelf.

Mr. CORDON. There is no question about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator has given the answer to my question in reply to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I heard the beginning of the Senator's remarks and was called from the Chamber and returned when the Senator was discussing, as I understood, a bill now before the committee which will undertake to deal with the subject of supervision and the mechanism necessary for the Federal Government to exercise complete control over all that part of the Continental Shelf which is not involved in Senate Joint Resolution 13 and reserved to the States.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understood the Senator, the proposed legislation is necessarily quite complicated, and that a study will have to be undertaken before the bill can be dealt with at this session of Congress.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. I may say to the Senator that there lies on my desk at this time a 16-page, single-space memorandum from the Department of Justice involving legal propositions, and all the answers are not found in it by any means.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming that the pending amendment should be agreed to, the other problem would still have to be taken care of by supplemental legislation; is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This amendment is not adequate to accomplish that?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. It is my view that it is not adequate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I wanted to be sure of, if the Senator can assure us of it, is that the follow-up legislation dealing with the Continental Shelf will be available for this Congress before it adjourns, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. CORDON. I give that assurance as strongly as I can give it. There was not a dissenting voice at any time in the entire committee with reference to that particular matter. The members were one in the particular decision to get the matter reported by the committee as quickly as may be possible. I think the Senator from Montana will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the matter is a very active project of the committee at this time.

Mr. CORDON. Indeed, it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the pending amendment embrace the Hill amendment or provision that was involved yesterday in the debate?

Mr. CORDON. The pending amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is the Anderson amendment as we laid it on the table, which at that time included the Hill amendment, but tailored to apply only to what we have sometimes termed the outer Continental Shelf or that portion of the Continental Shelf lying beyond 3 miles distant from the coast line of the coastal States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the committee giving consideration, in the bill it has now undertaken to process, to the Hill proposal with respect to the revenues that may be derived from the remainder of the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. That matter has not been discussed before the committee. I will very frankly say that so far as I am concerned, I shall oppose that amendment. However, the idea of whether the Hill amendment should be included in the new bill is a matter for the Congress to determine. I am sure the energetic Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] will be on hand with his amendment in case it is not a part of the bill as reported and he will do his best to have it adopted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the Hill amendment, even if the committee rejects it, would be germane to the bill and could be made an issue on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; and it undoubtedly will be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Oregon has correctly stated the position of the Senator from Alabama, in saying that the Senator from Alabama certainly will push the amendment with all the power at his command?

Mr. CORDON. I am sure of that. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] will unquestionably be there presenting his views.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from New Jersey would like to be there now, and he will be present at the proper time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In stating that this question is a matter of first impression, unlike anything else that has come up in the history of the United States, is not the Senator referring to the fact that the area outside of the State boundaries lies neither in a State of the United States, in a Territory of the United States, nor in any possession of the United States as heretofore defined by law?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not the Senator giving attention to the fact that the area in question is even without a name, up to this good date?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon knows of no name that has been legally attached. Perhaps the Senator from Florida may desire again to suggest

what would appear to be a very applicable name.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator may recall that he suggested the name "Suboceanica," but that suggestion did not receive the warm approval of the committee.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in the last sentence of paragraph 5 of the committee's report, page 9, there is the following statement:

As stated previously, the committee already has done considerable work toward recommending a legislative solution of the problems of the outer shelf, and it is committed to introducing and reporting to the Senate a measure, or measures, to that end as soon as possible during this session of the 83d Congress.

Noting that specific commitment of the Senator in his report, am I correct in my understanding that the Senator gives that assurance to the Senate today, and makes the commitment even stronger by stating that within 2 weeks after the disposition of the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13, the committee will have taken action on the additional measure relating to the Continental Shelf, and will report it for action by the entire Senate?

Mr. CORDON. I have given that assurance as strongly as a man can give it. I call attention of the Senate to the fact that, so far as I know, there is no objection in the committee itself, nor do I believe objection will be heard on the floor of the Senate, to the basic proposals involved in proposed legislation for the outer shelf. Certainly there can be no objection to the application of the necessary housekeeping law to the area. There will be differences of opinion in the other field, as to what law may be made applicable, but differences can be debated on the floor of the Senate. But there cannot be any question in the wide world that a measure providing for the development of the outer Continental Shelf will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator to state if it is not a fact that, in his first appearance during the debate upon his amendment in the nature of a substitute, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] after pointing out that title III in the House bill, as adopted in the House of Representatives, had various defects, which he regarded as serious defects, did not take the same position as did the Senator from Oregon on this question, by stating:

I think the decision to leave out of the Senate joint resolution any provision of that kind was made very wisely by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Of course, the record speaks for itself. I do not recall that particular statement, but I do recall similar statements made by the Senator from New Mexico to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have completed my presentation of this matter. I feel that the only orderly, sound procedure is to enact that portion of the proposed legislation which is comprehended in Senate Joint Resolution 13, and to bring the remainder before the Senate, whenever it can be brought here, in such form as to discharge the whole duty of Congress with reference to the administration of the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not a fact that at the hearings, the executive branch, through the Attorney General, recommended that the administration of the development of the Continental Shelf should be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Is that the sort of bill which the Senator from Oregon will propose, in order to carry on the development of the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that that is the kind of bill we are going to propose.

Mr. MURRAY. I see; the Senator says "we." Very well. It seems to me that the entire question of administration and the development of oil in that area should be under the Federal Government, because the Federal Government is in a position to handle any problems that may arise with reference to international questions. It seems to me that the whole administration of the area should be provided for in one bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Montana knows my views on that subject, as does every other member of the committee, I believe. I would have been willing to go along with an application of State conservation laws, and the like, to the area, with a reasonable reimbursement, as a means of getting the necessary and ordinary housekeeping law for the area, and I would still be willing to do so, so far as I am concerned. The need is not that of Federal law or State law; the need is law. What is needed is adequate social control, in order that orderly handling of the operations may be had, and in order that peace and order may prevail in the area.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very anxious that we have a vote on my amendment tonight, so it is not my intention to speak at the length the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Florida have spoken. I hope that we may stay in session long hours and complete action on this and other amendments tonight.

Yesterday afternoon the United States Senate was in a very giving-away mood, because when we defeated the Anderson amendment, and, apparently, placed our seal of approval on the Holland joint resolution in the form in which it then was, we paved the way for giving to the

States and to private oil interests between fifty and three hundred billion dollars' worth of oil, gas, and sulfur.

What would the Holland joint resolution do if it should pass, as it probably will? In the first place, it would give to all coastal States property in and ownership of the submerged lands out to the 3-mile limit from their shores. That would be true for all States, but we know that, so far as oil and gas are concerned, it would apply primarily, and perhaps, indeed, exclusively, to California, Texas, and Louisiana, with Florida acting as a sort of hopeful bridesmaid, and, of course, with the possibility of Alaska becoming involved later, as well. Admittedly, the bill would do that. It would give to the States ownership in the submerged lands and the resources out 3 miles from their coastal shores.

In the second place, it is expressly designed to give to some of the States, notably to Texas and to Florida, a very strong arguing point for further ownership of submerged lands from the 3-mile limit out to the 9-nautical-mile limit, or 10½ geographical-mile limit. It would do this because it is recognized in section 2 (a) (2), on page 10, of the joint resolution, that they are to have title in the submerged lands out to "the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward—or into the Gulf of Mexico—beyond 3 geographical miles."

We all know that Texas claims that at the time she came into the Union, her boundary extended out 9 nautical miles. We all know that Florida claims that at the time her representatives were readmitted into the Congress of the United States in 1868, her constitution claimed, and she alleges that that Congress recognized her claims, such a 9-nautical-mile boundary on the west coast of Florida.

I shall discuss the merits of these arguments later, and point out that what Texas wants are the boundaries she had before she came into the Union and not the equal footing with other States which she had after she entered the Union. And Florida wants not the boundaries she had when she entered the Union but those which she claims as a bonus for secession. If time permits, I shall return to these issues.

In addition, I think we are likely to find other States claiming that they had extensive boundaries which were recognized at the time they entered the Union. Louisiana has already shown its hand, and will probably claim at least 3 leagues, or 9 nautical miles, at the very least. We may find that some of the original States will also come forward with large claims. It must be remembered further that under the equal-footing clause, if certain claims of ownership and sovereignty are granted to some of the original States, States which were subsequently admitted under the equal-footing clause are very likely to file similar additional claims.

That is the second type of grant which a majority of the Senate was apparently willing to make. I wish to emphasize

that it is a grant of ownership to the States in the submerged lands to the degree that the States may claim that their boundaries—which represent a different question—extended beyond the 3-mile limit.

In the third place, the Senate passed this open-end provision—and it is an open-end provision, or a come-and-get-it provision—that the States may have property in the submerged lands even out beyond the 9-mile limit, to the degree that their claims have been "heretofore, or may hereafter be, approved by the Congress."

If one examines the Holland bill, he will see that what it does is to create a vacuum beyond the 3-mile, or 3-league, or 9-mile limit in which Federal control or ownership is not confirmed, and with respect to which no system of development is established. Under the Holland bill, a complete vacuum exists out on the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile or the 3-league limit.

If we look at section 9, which is sometimes cited to refute this contention, it will be seen that the language in section 9 is true only insofar as the area is defined by section 2. So section 9 really places no Federal defense in the way of further State claims so far as this Shelf area is concerned.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the Senator's argument. The language is, "all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed."

That seems to me to be very definite language.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but it relates to the area seaward and outside of lands underneath the navigable waters, "as defined in section 2." That brings us to the very point that to the degree to which the States—

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish my statement? Then the Senator may speak in his own time.

To the degree to which the States extend their claims out into the Continental Shelf, to that degree the dominance of the Federal Government becomes a receding factor. It will hold only the residual claims, which will ever shrink as the claims of the States are pushed farther and farther out into the Continental Shelf. So the farther out the States go, the smaller becomes the territory over which the Federal Government exercises dominion and control. The zone of Federal control will be like that of the Indians as they were pushed farther and farther westward. At last it will reach the jumping off place.

This outer zone may be called the Continental Shelf, but it becomes of diminishing magnitude depending upon the degree to which the States are able to assert their prior claims. It will become of diminishing magnitude to the degree to which competent authorities find that the claims of the States have been heretofore approved, or may hereafter be approved by Congress.

All kinds of claims may be filed; that Congress has heretofore approved the territorial claims of the States, which are now translated by this measure into property, which is something different.

I had never heard—and I think very few other people had ever heard—of the claim of Florida until it was brought up recently. I think very few others had heard of the claim of Louisiana, but it is now coming to the surface. We are likely to find other claims covered by the "heretofore" clause, particularly in the case of these States which were colonies. In addition, under the "hereafter" provision we will recognize everything that comes hereafter. That provision is an invitation to surreptitious sleepers to be put over at the 5 o'clock hour, or at the noon hour, when no one is on the floor or on guard.

What we are likely to find is that the Continental Shelf belonging to the United States will be gradually whittled away until not very much of it will be left. That is one of the points with respect to which I found myself taking issue when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] spoke, because there was no guarantee in what he said that the portion of the Continental Shelf which would be left would be really a sizable factor.

Mr. President, we know that Texas has designs on the entire Continental Shelf. Its State legislature has passed an act saying that the boundaries of Texas go out to the very edge of the Continental Shelf. I am not certain that my good friend the junior Senator from Texas would necessarily affirm that claim. We hope that he will be with us for a long time; but other Senators may appear who will assert claims out to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

We know that in the State of Louisiana there is a very strong political faction which has, indeed, passed an act through the State legislature extending the claims of that State out to the 27½-mile line. The States will begin competing with one another in promoting such an extension. There is no guarantee, in spite of the gentlemen's pledges, which very honorable men give on the floor of the Senate, that we may not find ourselves confronted not only with these claims, but with legislation enacted by the Congress.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I declined to yield to the Senator from Florida, but I do not want to be ill humored. I do not want to appear to be shielding myself. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Texas, with the understanding that then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida, if he cares to renew his request.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator does not contend, does he, that the Holland joint resolution conveys to the State of Texas anything beyond the State's 3-league boundary as it existed at the time Texas entered the Union?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not explicitly do so, but it unlocks the door for future grants to be made, by failing to assert Federal control over the Continental

Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit, or beyond the 9-mile limit, and by providing that if claims to boundaries have been recognized in the past, claims to ownership will be recognized in the future. Sleepers may also go through in the future granting such extended boundaries and title.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator realize that in section 9 it is explicitly provided, as to the natural resources beyond the boundaries as they existed at the time the States came into the Union or as heretofore approved by Congress, that the Congress is now asserting the rights of the Federal Government to that property? Does not this colloquy on the floor, and that which occurred in the first week of the debate, both on the part of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas, to the effect that we do not interpret the joint resolution which we helped to write, as giving to the States anything beyond their boundaries as they existed at the time they came into the Union or as heretofore approved by Congress, furnish sufficient evidence of legislative intent to prevent the States from claiming anything more under this measure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. With every appreciation of the influence and prominence of the Senator in his home State, certainly such colloquy is not binding upon the State of Texas. The Senator from Texas has no power to commit the State of Texas, any more than any other Senator has power to commit his State. The Senator from Texas is not the authorized agent of the State of Texas. A change of political fortunes in Texas, or an increase in the political expansiveness of Texas—if that is possible—might readily lead to the active pushing of the claims of Texas out into the Gulf. Texas has already done pretty well. Texas already claims the entire Continental Shelf. Indeed, the Senator from Texas may find himself disavowed by the State of Texas on the ground that he is not defending the full claims of Texas and is shrinking back within a 9-mile limit, whereas Texas claims 150 miles. The Senator from Texas, who is now the hero of his State, may, when he returns to his home State, find himself rejected on the ground that he has not been sufficiently expansive in his arguments. This would be regrettable, but it might occur.

I hope that will never happen to my dear friend.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my time is very short. I am very eager to hasten the debate and get to a vote. I do not want my opponents to filibuster this measure, and I should like to be permitted to continue. I will yield to the Senator from Texas, however, if he so desires.

Mr. DANIEL. Is not the issue what the joint resolution covers instead of what some people in Texas might claim it to cover? And does not the resolution clearly confine itself to lands within the boundary lines as they existed when

Texas and the other States came into the Union? Is not that the real question. I am sure the Senator will agree that the question is not whether I will be criticized at home, but whether the joint resolution covers anything beyond the historic boundaries. That, it seems to me, is the real issue, and I see no basis for the imaginary fears of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the joint resolution unlocks the door through which expansive Texans may rush, even though the junior Senator from Texas may politely stand aside.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest to my amiable friend that they make their speeches in their own time.

Mr. LONG. It is a question that I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am afraid I am like the girl in the operetta Oklahoma who could not say "No." When the Senator from Louisiana gets up and looks at me with that seductive look of his, I must yield to a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not correct to say that, even if the Senator's amendment were to be adopted, sleeper legislation could always be put through giving to anyone anything the Federal Government wanted to give away?

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it would be much more difficult if the authority and control of the Federal Government in the area beyond the 3-mile limit were definitely asserted and fixed and the development of resources by it authorized and begun. In that way we would lock the door, and it would require repeal legislation to give away this area.

Mr. President, yesterday we were in a very expansive mood, and we gave away everything. My amendment now proposes to reduce the giveaway, to lessen the damage, to save as much of the oil and gas for the people of the United States as it is possible to save.

We, who are defending the rights of all the people, were beaten yesterday. We now fall back to our next position, and we say, "All right, you who favored the giveaway outvoted us. You got all these areas, layer after layer. You won yesterday, for the moment, although you made a great mistake. However we are not at this time going to refight the question of the 3-mile zone."

Mr. President, we are willing to say, for the purposes of this argument, although this will not make me vote for the joint resolution, "All right, let the States take the submerged lands out to the 3-mile limit, but for heaven's sake stop there."

In other words, at least let the submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit out in the international zone be under the control and dominion of the Federal Government. We aim to do that by asserting Federal dominion and control and by authorizing Federal development. Far from creating a vacuum, as the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]—who left the floor—has stated, what our amendment would do would be to assert Federal dominion in the area beyond the 3-mile limit and save for the Fed-

eral Government the oil and gas resources beyond the 3-mile limit.

Incidentally, Mr. President, this would save for the Nation the major part of the oil and gas, because, very roughly, according to the Geological Survey—page 514 of the hearings—about 12 percent of the oil and gas seems to be within the 3-mile limit, another 5 percent off the cost of Texas between the 3- and 9-mile limits, and about 83 percent, or five-sixths, beyond the 3-mile or 9-mile limit. Since the pending amendment would cut off all States' ownership at the 3-mile mark, it would save 88 percent of the oil and gas for all of the people.

That is about what there is to the present amendment, with the proviso, of course, that the Federal share of the revenues beyond the 3-mile limit is to go during the present national emergency for defense purposes, and then for the purposes of education, according to the plan of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. President, let us consider the present amendment in connection with the vote yesterday. It seems to me that certainly every Senator who voted for the Anderson amendment yesterday, that is, all who voted against tabling it, should vote for this amendment today. If Senators voted yesterday to save for the Nation 100 percent of all the oil and gas in the submerged lands, certainly today they should vote to save 88 percent of it. How can they say, "Yes, we wanted to save 100 percent of the gas and oil, but we do not want to save 88 percent of it"? Therefore a vote for the Anderson amendment yesterday would logically seem to carry with it inevitably a vote for the Anderson-Douglas amendment today.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the vote which was taken yesterday on the Anderson amendment dealt with the area either from the coastline seaward 3 miles, or in some cases to the historic boundary line, while today the amendment which the Senator from Illinois is sponsoring deals with an entirely different subject, namely, the area seaward of the 3 mile limit? Therefore, is it not correct to say that the Senate is not voting on the same question on which it voted yesterday?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot agree with my good friend from Kentucky in saying that we are voting on an entirely different subject. We are voting on a smaller subdivision of the same subject, which was the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Yesterday the Anderson amendment proposed Federal control and Federal dominion over the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Now we are proposing Federal dominion, control, and development in the submerged lands seaward from the 3-mile point.

So that roughly, in terms of oil and gas, it is 88 percent the same as yesterday.

In addition, Mr. President, I can understand how some Senators who voted against the Anderson amendment yesterday should vote for the pending amendment today.

The very able Senator from Florida, in his initial speech on the subject, spoke at great length about filled land. He wept copious tears about what the Anderson bill would do to the private real estate developers in the cities along the west coast of Florida.

His fears were largely fictitious. They were 99⁴⁴/₁₀₀ percent fictitious. I say that because the Anderson bill in its original form recognized the filled land under public and private ownership on inland waters and on ocean waters, and recognized public filled land in the future on coastwise waters. But there was one point—which we frankly admitted—namely, that of future private filled land on coastwise waters, which was not completely covered by the Anderson bill. That may have troubled not only the Senator from Florida, but the senior Senator from Massachusetts as well.

Well, Mr. President, under this amendment, all that now is given to the States. Certainly no one is going to fill land out beyond 3 miles from the present coastline.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. The States merely insist on the rights which they possessed when they joined the Union, I may say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know that my good friend comes from South Carolina, and he has different views about the nature of the Federal Union from mine. However, I do not wish to revive the battle of Fort Sumter, although it did play a very important part in history. I do not want to let loose again the bombardment on Fort Sumter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois was practically reared at Parris Island by the Marine Corps. He knows South Carolina.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is where, in one sense, I was reborn. I am more proud of having graduated from Parris Island than from any university I have attended.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are not fighting the War of 1861-65. I was talking about the Revolution, and the rights which the States had when they joined the Union. The Senator from Illinois knows that to be the fact. I admire him very much.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say, Mr. President, that there is no more beloved man in the Senate than the Senator from South Carolina. We all love him, and he is a valuable asset to this body.

To come back to the previous point, we are now going to recognize in this amendment all future filled land. I do not believe that even Florida, in its most expansive moments, intends to extend Miami Beach more than 3 additional miles into the sea.

They can fill it up all they want to; and Mr. Robert Moses—and I do not know whether he wishes to fill in the

bullrushes, but he has had a very distinguished career in New York City—will not have to worry at all, and therefore the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] should weep no more tears about Rockaway Beach or other places in that area.

Furthermore, under this amendment I do not think the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] need worry as he did the other day about the future of the Massachusetts clam industry. I wish the Senator from Massachusetts were on the floor at this time. We remember how he said he wanted the Holland joint resolution enacted because it would be a means of protecting future Massachusetts clams. Of course the Anderson bill would protect them anyway. However, now the Senator from Massachusetts, under the pending amendment, will have 3 miles in which to extend the dominion of Massachusetts over clams. Even though those waters may be filled in the future by the energy of the people of Massachusetts, the clams will still be at the bottom of the filled land and future archeologists from Harvard University will be able to discover them; and the dearly beloved Hasty Pudding Club can have a clam chowder; and all of it will be legal.

So, Mr. President, to the degree that future filled land was an objection, that objection has most certainly been met.

Now let me say a word about the fishing industry. So long as we do not assert ownership beyond the 3-mile limit—to which this amendment restricts the give-away—either for ourselves or for the member States of the Union, we can with good grace say to Mexico, "You shall not assert ownership beyond 3 miles," and we can say to Canada, "You shall not assert ownership beyond 3 miles," and we can say to Russia, "You shall not assert ownership beyond 3 miles."

But when we grant to the States not only boundaries, but ownership beyond 3 miles, what those nations are likely to say then, when we protest, is, "So is your old man." [Laughter.]

They will say, "You are giving Texas 9 miles, and you are giving Florida on its west coast 9 miles, and possibly you are giving Louisiana 27 miles, and possibly you are giving Texas out to the Continental Shelf, or 150 miles. Why should not we have our place in the sun? Why should not we also extend our domain the edge of the Continental Shelf?" Then, Mr. President, when the shrimp boats come down, as they are now, from Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, and fish for shrimp off the Mexican coast, between the 3-mile limit and the 9-mile limit—the 3-mile limit being the one we recognize, and the 9-mile limit being the one that Mexico claims—those shrimp fishermen are likely to be seized and thrown into the "hoosegow," as is done now; and we shall not be able to get them out. The same thing may apply to the California fishermen out of San Diego and San Pedro Harbor, who fish off the lower coast of California.

Now, Canada is getting into the act. The Canadians notice the debates that occur here. I believe the Canadian Par-

liament and the Parliament of British Columbia are, at this very moment, considering extending the control of Canada over the waters off her coast beyond the 3-mile limit which she has previously claimed and which we have recognized.

If that should happen, the United States fishermen from Bellingham and Everett, Wash., and from other Washington ports, who now fish in Vancouver Sound and off Vancouver Island, and in the Strait of Juan de Fuca, are likely to be in trouble; and we shall be helpless to protect them.

The same trouble will arise in the case of the Massachusetts fishermen who fish off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland; and the same trouble will be likely to occur in the case of those who fish off the coast of Alaska, in the Bering Strait; and we shall be helpless to protect them. We are likely to strike down the fishing industry of most of our coastal States.

If, on the other hand, we do not push ownership beyond the 3-mile limit, but if we assert Federal control, which is a different matter, out from the 3-mile limit, we can then with good grace protect our fishermen as they fish close to the coast, but beyond the 3-mile limit, off Mexico, Canada, and possibly Siberia.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. There is no legislative or administrative vacuum left by the legislation we propose. In the first place, article III, section 2 of the Constitution provides that the Federal judiciary shall have jurisdiction over not only admiralty but also over maritime matters. That means that the Constitution, statute law, and the common law of the United States extends to the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit.

In the second place, the leasing and development plan of this proposed legislation is not hastily thought out; it is not a proposal by a Senator in his first term, such as I am. I am not the author of this proposal. Nor, indeed, is the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], great as is his experience, the real author of this proposal. The legislation here proposed is really the O'Mahoney bill, which was introduced and presented on the floor of this body last year by former Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming. The present amendment was then the subject of the bill and majority report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill, which was before the Senate last year, was carefully drawn and carefully considered.

Of course if this matter were merely one of the comparative competence in this field of the senior Senator from Illinois and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], there would be no question but that the senior Senator from Oregon is more competent in these matters than I am. But I am merely serving, however, unworthily, as the temporary sponsor of a measure which is the crystallization of years of discussion, which is an assertion of Federal authority in a field which is now a vacuum, which declares that there is Federal dominion and control of the Continental Shelf at least beyond the 3-mile limit, which would save seven-eighths of the submerged oil for all of the people of all

the States, which would protect our fishing industry, and which would lock the door against the raids which are likely to come. I hope the amendment will be approved.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], submitted for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to the committee substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that so far as the Continental Shelf is concerned, a bill is being prepared by the committee. I am sure it will be here within 2 weeks; and I can assure Senators that the whole subject will be dealt with comprehensively in that bill, and will have most careful study.

I hope the amendment now before us will be rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes to speak.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, if I may. I simply say that I do not think we should buy a pig in a poke, without knowing what the nature of the pig is.

This present amendment is, on the other hand, definite and decisive. The Senator from Oregon promised 2 weeks ago to have a bill before us. I doubted it, at the time. He now postpones it 2 weeks more into the future. We do not know what the contents of that bill will be. Now is the time to deal with this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was not the 2 weeks—

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I should have said it was 2 weeks from the date of the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I should have said that, because of course the Senators concerned have been involved in the debate, and have been unable to do that work.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the joint resolution now before the Senate confirms the title of the United States to the Continental Shelf. That question is settled by the joint resolution.

The amendment now pending tends to deal with a very long and complicated question which I think can be dealt with far better by the bill the committee will introduce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], submitted for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to the committee substitute.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, first, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gore	McClellan
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Barrett	Griswold	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McCarran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], offered for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to the committee substitute. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "nay."

I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—26

Anderson	Ives	Morse
Case	Jackson	Murray
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Fulbright	Kefauver	Pastore
Gillette	Kennedy	Sparkman
Gore	Kilgore	Tobey
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Hennings	Mansfield	Young
Hill	Monroney	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Frear	Millikin
Barrett	George	Mundt
Beall	Goldwater	Payne
Bennett	Griswold	Potter
Bricker	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Hunt	Smathers
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Cooper	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Kuchel	Taft
Daniel	Long	Thye
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Martin	Welker
Dworshak	Maybank	Williams
Ellender	McCarran	
Ferguson	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—12

Bridges	Hayden	Lehman
Chavez	Humphrey	McCarthy
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Flanders	Langer	Symington

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendments were rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 11, line 10, to strike out the words "or hereafter"; on page 17, line 18, to strike out the words "or is hereafter"; and on page 11, line 12, to strike out the colon and insert the following: "but in no event shall the term 'boundaries' or the term 'lands beneath navigable waters' be interpreted as extending from the coastline more than 3 geographical miles into the Atlantic Ocean or the Pacific Ocean, or more than 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida wish to debate his amendment? My intention was to recess at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if there is any extended debate to occur on it, I should be glad to have it go over until tomorrow morning. These are suggestions which have been made by several Senators who are opposed to the joint resolution and by several who are in favor of it. The suggested changes are minor changes for the purpose of clarification which I think will be helpful, in view of certain questions which have been raised. They do not depart in the slightest from the intention of the sponsors of the joint resolution.

If there is no extended debate, I should hope that the Senate would act on the amendment speedily.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator from Florida think there should be some explanation of the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to explain it.

Mr. President, there are two places in the joint resolution where the words "or hereafter" or "or is hereafter" are used, and I will indicate those places to every Senator who has before him a copy of the joint resolution, so that we may be sure of what we are doing.

On page 11, line 10, the words "or hereafter" appear just after the word "heretofore." And the same meaning applies—in the other place, which is on page 17, line 18, the words "or is hereafter" appear. In each case, those words, if stricken from the joint resolution, while they would not in the slightest degree take away the jurisdiction of Congress to act in this field if it chose to do so hereafter, would not in the joint resolution itself give any intimation that the Congress is looking forward to any such action being taken. I think nothing is added or subtracted by taking out those words, but certain Senators who are opposed to the joint resolution maintained that the appearance of those words may act as an invitation hereafter to extend the boundaries, which is not the intention and which I think would not occur.

I have already stated that, so far as I am concerned, the words are practically meaningless, because Congress has jurisdiction to act hereafter if it sees fit to do so. I have also explained in the RECORD why the words were used, because the States of Texas and Florida, which were very active in the introduction of the joint resolution, have boundaries extending by law beyond 3 geographic miles, and we did not want to appear in any sense to preclude any of the coastal States which might have a claim about which we knew nothing from asserting it. We do not want to preclude them from presenting their claims. We now want the words to be stricken because they have caused concern in the minds of both proponents and opponents of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the very able Senator from Florida if it was by inadvertence that he strikes the words "or hereafter" on line 10, page 11, and does not strike the word "hereafter" on line 1 of page 11? Does he propose to omit the word "hereafter" on line 1, page 11?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one place where the word "hereafter" was deliberately left in the joint resolution. As to whether that is the place, I am not sure. The amendment was drafted by my assistant, and I should like to check with him for a moment.

I am quite content to admit to the Senator from Illinois that the omission of that particular "hereafter" was inadvertent. It should have been included in the language, but was omitted. The word "hereafter" that was not affected by the amendment is in line 8 on page 17.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was proposed to strike the words "or hereafter" in line 24, page 10, and line 1, page 11?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I shall modify my amendment to so provide. As has already been stated, the intention is to remove any feeling on the part of any Senator that we are inviting a change of boundaries hereafter. That same point applies to the latter part of the amendments which, by the way, I hope will be considered en bloc, because they all affect the same situation, to bring about greater certainty where it had been felt there was not sufficient certainty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the word "hereafter" written subsequently in the joint resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one place where the word "hereafter" is properly retained. In going over the joint resolution myself, I noted—

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if that is on line 18, page 17?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. That is one of those which are proposed to be eliminated by my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand that the Senator from Florida is now providing that the 3-league limit which is to be under State ownership shall be not merely for the States of Florida and Texas, but apply to the entire Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. HOLLAND. No, there is no such intention in mind, and no such intention is accomplished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask what would happen to the boundary of Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. The boundary of Louisiana is not intended to be affected in any way whatever by this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I then suggest to the Senator from Florida that since the boundary of his State is 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico, it would seem to me that the amendment would include not merely the west coast of Florida and Texas, but also Louisiana, Mississippi, and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has not correctly read the latter part of the amendment, on page 11, line 12: "but in no event shall the term 'boundaries' or the term 'lands beneath navigable waters' be interpreted as extending from the coastline more than 3 geographical miles into the Atlantic Ocean or Pacific Ocean, or more than 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico."

The words are words of limitation, not words of grant or release.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would depend upon the definition of what the boundary of Louisiana was at the time Louisiana entered the Union.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think this is substantially similar to an amendment I had sent to the desk. I agree that it does improve the joint resolution, but I wish to ask the Senator whether, if the amendment shall be adopted, it will constitute a legislative history in recognition of the understanding that out beyond the 3-mile limit on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and beyond 3 leagues, if it should be established as applying to the Gulf of Mexico, the United States has paramount right to submerged land out beyond those boundaries or lines.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, but the change proposed would not bring about that result. That result is already reached by another provision of the joint resolution, section 9. This amendment is simply clarifying language, both with reference to the meaning of section 9 and with reference to the limitation which we have already discussed in an earlier portion of the joint resolution, where the amendment appears.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Wherever that interpretation may come, I think it is very important, and I ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that we need to leave the impression with our neighbors to the south, and with Canada to the North, that we are retaining the right, or that Congress thinks there is a right, further to extend boundaries in the event that is desired, but that this Congress believes that as to anything beyond the 3-mile limit or the 3-league limit, the paramount right is in the United States, and not in the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct in his position, but I would not wish the RECORD to indicate that the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Tennessee believes that these minor changes could in any way affect in the slightest the right of other Congresses to take action as they may see fit in this field, because the Senator from Tennessee knows that we could not accomplish any such result. This is just a minor change of verbiage, to make very clear that Congress at this time is seeking to do only those things which the authors and supporters of the joint resolution have so very fully, and rather repeatedly, stated for the RECORD heretofore during the course of the debate.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was very much worried about the effect the word hereafter might have in the joint resolution. I spoke at some length about that recently. Would the adoption of this amendment have the effect of at least giving the interpretation that, so far as the Senate is concerned, by adopting the amendment, the States would not have any rights or title out beyond the 3-mile limit in the Atlantic or the Pacific, or beyond 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. HOLLAND. In general, I should say that the Senator is correct. The amendment will simply indicate that this Senate, in the passage of the joint resolution, is certainly not inviting additional claims, and it knows of no additional claims. At the same time, I repeat what I have already said, that nothing that this Senate could do, nothing that any Senator could say upon the floor, would be sufficient to indicate properly to anyone that we are seeking to deprive future Congresses in any way whatsoever of their full power. We could not do so if we wished to, and we should not desire to do so.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator believe that the legislative history of

the measure we are considering is important for purposes of interpretation in the Supreme Court, and that the Senator's amendment might aid in obtaining favorable consideration of the joint resolution by the Supreme Court?

Mr. HOLLAND. I doubt very seriously if that result would occur, because I think the amendment has very little effect. But I am perfectly willing to meet the suggestions of my friends, some of whom have been opponents, and some of whom have been supporters of the joint resolution, to the effect that they would like to have the language more clearly spelled out than it was in the original measure, to the effect that there is no intention whatsoever to grant boundaries beyond 3 geographical miles in either the Atlantic or the Pacific, and that this Congress knows of no possible situation under which greater boundaries are claimed or could be granted in the Gulf of Mexico than 3 leagues; and, in that case, this Congress knows, although this amendment does not indicate it, that there are but 2 States affected by that particular situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, in order to clarify one point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have a very high regard for the State of Louisiana and the very distinguished Senators from that State. But is there anything in the last part of the amendment of the Senator from Florida which might be interpreted as granting the State of Louisiana a boundary of 3 leagues out from its shore, rather than the 3 miles which I understand it now claims?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say categorically to the Senator that there is not.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am certain the Senator is aware, is he not, that there are some persons in Louisiana who contend that the language is the enabling act which brought Louisiana into the Union, referring to the boundary as including all islands within 3 leagues, might be susceptible of the construction that Louisiana had the same rights as does Florida, for example, with regard to the 3-league limit? The Senator is not, by his amendment, proposing to prevent Louisiana from seeking adjudication in the courts as to what the actual boundary is, is he?

Mr. HOLLAND. Indeed not. The Senator from Florida would not, if he could, do anything whatsoever to limit or adversely affect the State of Louisiana in that regard. Any rights the State of Louisiana has would be left undisturbed by these amendments.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to Texas and Florida, these amendments do not propose to state that those States have a boundary of 3 leagues. They merely give them the right to establish that their boundary is 3 leagues.

Mr. HOLLAND. These amendments would not change the situation which

has always existed. The States of Texas and Florida would simply be left where they were placed—the State of Texas by the action of Congress and its own action in 1845 and prior thereto, and the State of Florida by action of Congress in 1868 and its own prior action. We are simply left without prejudice in any way. The Senators from Florida and the Senators from Texas have made no attempt to have the boundaries of those States confirmed or reasserted, and, of course, we will not do so in this legislation. They stand for themselves as they existed at the time of admission or as heretofore approved by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendments, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he has included the "hereafter" on page 11, line 10?

Mr. HOLLAND. On this point the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 11, line 10, strike out the words "or hereafter"; on page 17, line 18, strike out the words "or is hereafter"; on pages 10 and 11, strike out the word "or" at the bottom of page 10, and "hereafter" at the top of page 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. I will yield for the purposes of insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of offering certain amendments?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for the purpose of offering amendments, in order that they may be the pending question, but not in order to proceed with their consideration this evening.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, action will be deferred until tomorrow.

Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments offered by Mr. MONRONEY to the committee amendment are as follows:

On page 10, beginning with "and to the" in line 21 strike out all through "miles" in line 3 on page 11.

On page 11, beginning with "as they" in line 9 strike out all through "Congress, or" in line 11.

On page 11, line 17, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "In Title II the."

On page 12, insert after line 23 the following:

"(1) The term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the natural resources therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of lands beneath navigable waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf;

"(j) The term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration,

development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and

"(k) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

On page 17, beginning with the comma after "confirmed" in line 11 strike out all to the period in line 18.

On page 20, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

"SEC. 9. All natural resources within the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall appertain to the United States and be subject to its jurisdiction and control as provided for in this title.

"SEC. 10. (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

"(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this joint resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this joint resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this joint resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

"(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this joint resolution;

"(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however*, That, if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this joint resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however*, That, if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions

of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

"Sec. 11. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on lands beneath navigable waters vested and assigned to such State under title II of this joint resolution, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the natural resources within them.

"Sec. 12. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 10 of this joint resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this joint resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 10 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not al-

ready done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 10 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 10 (b) shall govern such lease.

"Sec. 13 (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 10 of this joint resolution.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any lands beneath navigable waters pursuant to section 11 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is land beneath navigable waters.

"Sec. 14. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, all moneys received under the provisions of this title shall be held in a special account in the Treasury and shall be used semiannually by the Secretary of the Treasury exclusively to pay and reduce the national debt of the United States.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 12 of this joint resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"Sec. 15. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased submerged lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

"(c) All leases issued under this title, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this title, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this joint resolution, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"Sec. 16. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this title."

On page 20, line 17, strike out "Sec. 10." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17."

On page 20, line 22, strike out "Sec. 11." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 18."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of such lands and resources, and to confirm and provide for the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to inquire from the Senator from Ohio whether or not it is the understanding that the amendments of the Senator from Oklahoma will be the pending question tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Exactly. No action is to be taken on them today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Giving Away Your Millions," published in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, April 26, 1953.

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

GIVING AWAY YOUR MILLIONS

The Senate is apparently about to approve the House bill giving control of the so-called "tidelands" to the States—and opening the door to broader claims extending to the edge of the Continental Shelf. The President has promised to sign the legislation.

There are grave constitutional questions involved in this giveaway program. But there are economic questions, too. There are dollars and cents involved for every resident of Wisconsin and every other State in quitclaiming the resources held in trust for the Nation.

Let's look at the low, medium, and high estimates of natural gas and oil resources made by experts before the congressional committees which held hearings on the tidelands bill. And let's assume that the royalties on gas and oil, based on those estimates, were divided among the States for purposes of education based on the population of children between the ages of 5 and 17, as contemplated in the almost sure to be rejected proposal of Senator HILL, Democrat, Alabama.

Low estimate is by the United States Geological Survey, which says it believes that gas and oil can be developed from the submerged lands to the tune of \$50 billion. Wisconsin's share, at royalties of 12½ percent, would be \$139,800,000. At royalties of 20 percent it would be \$223,680,000.

Medium estimate was by L. G. Weeks, reputable petroleum expert. He estimates a value of \$125 billion. At 12½ percent and 20 percent royalties Wisconsin's shares would be \$349,500,000 and \$559,200,000.

High estimate was by Wallace Pratt, former vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. His figure is \$300 billion. Wisconsin's share would be \$838,800,000 at a 12½ percent royalty figure and \$1,342,080,000 at a 20 percent royalty.

That's what the State would get for education if the Federal Government retained title to the submerged lands and distributed the royalty funds for education. Many experts say that as the area has hardly been tapped as yet estimates may be well under real value. That's what would go to help

cut down the national debt if the Government kept the royalties for its own use.

Milwaukee talks of the need for an \$18 million school-construction program—our share of the lowest estimate at 12½ percent would give us \$27 million for schools; of the highest estimate at 20 percent it would give us \$268 million.

That's what the "giveaway" program would give away. It's your money that Congress is preparing to hand over to the people of three States—Texas, Louisiana, and California.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for remainder of the term expiring April 9, 1954.

Harry P. Cain, of Washington, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1953.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John B. Stoddart, Jr., to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Robert L. Kinnaird, pastor, Presbyterian Church, Christiansburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of men and nations and our Heavenly Father, humbly and sincerely we pray Thy blessing on us this day. In Thy providence Thou hast called us to the tasks of life. We are Thy servants who shall give an account to Thee. Help us to be so faithful to our duties that we shall render to Thee our account without shame or dismay. Make us right within with Thee that we may be right with our fellow men.

Grant, Heavenly Father, if it be Thy will, that peace may come to the troubled nations of the world; a peace rooted in righteousness and lasting.

These things we pray in accordance with Thy will and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1419. An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

MAY 3 IS POLAND'S DAY

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, the Soviet terror can never wipe out the memory of Poland's Constitution Day.

It can never stop the Polish people from dreaming, praying, and preparing for the time when their valiant Christian nation will be free again.

In every country outside the Iron Curtain men pause in their labors to think of this day and what it means. What happened to Poland could happen to us unless all men who fear slavery shall work together to rescue mankind from the savagery that is communism.

The Polish people have proved their endurance many times in the past. They will not surrender now. No "brainwashing" technique ever devised can destroy the faith in God and the deep-rooted love of liberty that have always sustained the Poles.

Besides, they know that we in the United States, no matter where our ancestors came from, identify ourselves with them.

Our moral support is a factor not to be underestimated.

When the time is ripe, it will assert itself more vigorously and help rout the aggressors from the lands they have usurped.

It would be reckless and premature to encourage the Polish people to revolt at this time when the Communists are at the height of their material power. Sooner or later, as more people in this world become aware of their treachery and cruelty, the tide will turn, and captive nations will be liberated as communism becomes weakened by its own excesses.

That is why we honor the memory of Constitution Day, in preparation for the future when Poland will be a self-governing nation again and its people free to direct their own destinies.

I do not say this merely to encourage the millions of Americans who claim Polish descent.

I firmly believe that Poland will inevitably win back her independence as surely as right must triumph over wrong.

The observance of Constitution Day strengthens me in that opinion.

FARM PROGRAM

Mr. SUTTON. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the country has been waiting for months for some sign of a farm program advocated by the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. Apparently, and judging from the last few days, certain officials from the Department of Agriculture have brought about the Benson plan. This plan, I presume, is to solve the problems of the Nation.

Certain officials of the Department of Agriculture have been talking about the problem of the marginal farmer. They are saying that the inefficient producer should get out of agriculture and that the farm can no longer be considered a haven for those with less-than-average ability.

Of 3,597,000 full-time family farm enterprises in the United States in 1950 1,603,000 had a net cash income of less than \$1,000. Seven hundred and seven thousand of these families had incomes under \$500. I do not know what the gentlemen of the Department of Agriculture consider to be a marginal farmer but presumably a family with a net income of less than \$500 a year would fit their definition.

I just wonder if the Secretary of Agriculture is advocating the Benson plan to solve the farm program by plowing under every fifth farm family? If so, I am sure that the farmers of the United States will not agree with this Benson farm plan.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. 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. 31]

Abbitt	Dingell	McCulloch
Baker	Gamble	Mason
Barrett	Gordon	Mollohan
Blatnik	Green	Oakman
Boggs	Hardy	O'Konski
Bolton	Hart	Polk
Oliver P. Brooks, La.	Hays, Ohio	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Rabaut
Brownson	Hosmer	Riehlman
Cederberg	Hull	Sheehan
Chatham	James	Shelley
Condon	Johnson	Steed
Cooley	Kearney	Teague
Coudert	Keogh	Tuck
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	
	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for this afternoon for 15 minutes. I am not ready for it yet. I ask unanimous consent that it be transferred to tomorrow afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next on the subject of interest rates, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4828, with Mr. MCGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak this morning on the subject of synthetic fuel. The original request for appropriations for the Department of the Interior contained an item of \$7,900,000 for the maintenance and continuation of the synthetic-fuel program by the Bureau of Mines. Secretary McKay reduced the request substantially when he asked that \$2 million be removed from the appropriations for the production of synthetic fuels from coal and that operations by the experimental plants for the hydrogenation of coal be discontinued. The Committee on Appropriations going even further has eliminated completely all funds for the continuation of production of synthetic fuel from coal and oil shale at experimental plants in the Bureau of Mines, and has directed that those facilities be disposed of by the Government.

Appropriation for synthetic fuels, fiscal year 1954

	Original appropriation	Secretary McKay's requested appropriation	Appropriation in bill H. R. 4828
Research.....	\$1,435,200	\$1,435,200	\$767,600
Gas.....	985,400	985,400	-----
Coal.....	3,095,800	1,095,800	250,000
Shale.....	1,943,904	1,943,904	250,000
Power.....	445,000	445,000	-----
Total.....	7,905,304	5,905,304	1,267,600

All that is left in the bill as far as appropriations for this purpose is concerned is about \$1,267,000. Five hundred thousand dollars of this would be required to liquidate the plants and to put them in moth balls, and the balance of \$700,000 would be just enough to cover the dismissal leave pay for all the minor employees. So that we can conclude the whole program will be junked.

The Bureau of Mines has 6 plants and laboratories engaged in research and production of synthetic fuels on a pilot and experimental basis. In Louisiana and Missouri, two coal-to-oil demonstration plants are presently in operation, one producing oil by coal hydrogenation and the other by utilization of the Fischer-Tropsch process. In Rifle, Colo., an oil shale demonstration plant is run by the Bureau of Mines which produces oil by the retorting of shale and the refining of shale oil. In Gorgas, Ala., an underground station for producing oil from coal synthetically without mining exists, while two synthetic fuels laboratories, one in Laramie, Wyo., and the other in Bruceton, Pa., are integral parts of the Bureau's program for successfully perfecting processes for producing oil from coal and shale.

Synthetic fuels plants and laboratories of Bureau of Mines

Location	Nature of facilities	Number of employees
Bruceton, Pa.....	Research Laboratories for study of catalysts and pilot plant production by gas synthesis and coal hydrogenation.	308
Gorgas, Ala.....	Underground gas station for synthetic production experiments without mining coal.	-----
Louisiana, Mo.....	One coal to oil demonstration plant producing synthetic fuels and chemicals by hydrogenation of coal and one coal to oil demonstration plant utilizing Fischer Tropsch process.	462
Morgantown, W. Va.	Gas synthesis plant.....	124
Rifle, Colo.....	Oil shale demonstration for retorting and refining shale and shale oil.	245
Laramie, Wyo.....	Oil Shale Research Laboratory.	80

When originally undertaken in 1944, the synthetic production oil seemed a distant and impracticable possibility. Perseverance and intensive research of the Government has indicated, however, that synthetic fuels are now almost susceptible of industrial utilization on a commercial basis. Rapid strides have been made in studies based upon the production of gasoline from hydrogenation of coal.

Estimates of production costs have been made by the Bureau of Mines itself, by a firm of private consultants, Ebasco Services, Inc., and by the National Petroleum Council, comprised of representatives of the petroleum industry. While the resulting production costs varied as among the three estimates, in general it can be said that as of the moment synthetic gasoline production by coal hydrogenation, absent Government assistance, in one manner or another, is not ready for commercial exploitation.

Ebasco concluded in its report that we do not believe it would be feasible to finance the projects described in the Bureau of Mines report dated October 25, 1951, with private capital under conditions prevailing as of January 1, 1951.

The National Petroleum Council in October of 1951 expressed the opinion, after its survey of industrial costs, that as of that time, "coal hydrogenation for the production of synthetic fuels is uneconomical." Even the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, acknowledged that Government assistance would be necessary at the moment to launch such a project.

If production of oil is not yet feasible, how could private industry take over? They would refuse.

Estimates of cost of production of gasoline by hydrogenation of coal

	NPC (Oct. 31, 1951)	EBASCO (March 1952)	USBM (Oct. 25, 1951, revised Nov. 19, 1951)
Manufacturing costs.....	25.3	19.5	17.7
Housing costs.....	2.6	-----	-----
Financial charges.....	19.0	22.0	8.2
Total costs.....	46.9	41.5	25.9
Less byproduct revenue.....	5.5	13.4	14.9
Gasoline.....	41.4	28.1	11.0

Bureau of Mines studies with respect to the production of synthetic fuels from oil shale indicate that the latter source may be more nearly ready for commercial exploitation than the hydrogenation or gas synthesis of coal. Estimates are that gasoline can be produced from shale at approximately 14.7 cents per gallon which should be compared to estimates of 29 cents a gallon for gasoline produced by the gas synthesis and anywhere from 11 to 41 cents for that made by coal hydrogenation.

NEED FOR CONTINUATION OF THE SYNTHETIC FUELS PROGRAM

Oil is one of the most important of all commodities for the Nation's defense. Present supplies, coming in the main from the Near East and Venezuela, are susceptible of coming to a gradual or abrupt halt depending upon world conditions. The development of inherent domestic resources, therefore, is essential to guard against eventualities of all kinds so that the national defense may not be imperiled by the elimination or shutdown of international sources of supply.

Our own resources are not unlimited. Despite discovery of new reserves and even the successful development of synthetic fuels, our petroleum supplies will not last indefinitely. As the Paley Commission recently concluded:

But no matter how large the Nation's petroleum resources ultimately prove to be, one fact is now clear: eventually the resources will dwindle and become progressively inadequate.

In this light, the continuation of efforts to successfully produce petroleum products from coal by hydrogenation and gas synthesis, and to obtain gasoline by retorting and refining oil shale seems highly sensible.

Recognizing the essential need for developing the Nation's actual and potential resources, Congress has already authorized more than \$75 million for the development of a synthetic fuels program. Beginning in 1944 and continuing to date, it has spent more than \$5 million a year for research and production of synthetic fuels from coal and shale oil.

Government investment in synthetic fuel program

Year:	Appropriation
1945.....	\$5,000,000
1946.....	7,000,000
1947.....	5,250,000
1948.....	7,000,000
1949.....	14,885,000
1950.....	9,750,000
1951.....	8,833,000
1952.....	8,117,000
1953.....	10,480,000
Total.....	76,315,000

¹ Includes \$2,600,000 for new Morgantown (W. Va.) Experimental Station.

Included in the figures of the Government's investment in the synthetic fuels program are large amounts of money which have been put into developing adequate plant facilities and equipment. The following table indicates with respect to each of the facilities involved the amount incurred for furnishing adequate buildings, equipment, and resources:

<i>Costs of facilities for synthetic fuels program</i>	
<i>Situs</i>	<i>Cost</i>
Bruceton, Pa.....	\$3,500,000
Morgantown, W. Va.....	200,000
Louisiana, Mo.:	
Coal hydrogenation plant.....	10,000,000
Gas synthesis plant.....	4,900,000
Laramie, Wyo.....	550,000
Rifle, Colo.:	
Mine development.....	1,500,000
Plant, including housing.....	5,000,000
Retort.....	400,000
Gorgas, Ala.....	300,000

It is evident that the abrupt discontinuance of the synthetic fuels program, rather than have an economizing effect on the Nation's finances, will result in a tremendous loss, not only in technological knowledge and skills, but in actual taxpayers' money invested in the above facilities.

If the expenditures in the fuel program had not to date shown concrete and tangible results, there might be a legitimate reason for discontinuing the program. But far from condemning the work of the Bureau of Mines in its experiments with synthetic fuels, the committee in its report has clearly recognized that both coal hydrogenation and the retorting and refining of shale oil have been brought almost to the point of commercial development and that the contribution of the program to date has been substantial.

The objective of the Appropriations Committee to obtain the commercial development of synthetic fuel production by private enterprise is highly commendable. That has been the aim of the Bureau of Mines in cooperating with private enterprise throughout. Efforts have been made by the Bureau of Mines without success, to interest private parties in the commercial production of synthetic fuels. These processes are on the verge of private development. But the way to assure private enterprise of the

know-how, the technological skills and techniques, and continued experimentation and improvement, is certainly not to abolish the program at its brightest moment.

This junking of the program of synthetic oil production from coal and shale would be of untold assistance to the big oil companies to prevent a new type of oil from coming into the market. These companies do not want this type of competition. They are powerful enough, apparently, to pressurize the scuttling of the plan.

Progress means naught to them. The only sight they have their eyes trained upon is higher profits. These new processes would mean, according to the Bureau of Mines, an additional new yield of from 1 to 2 million barrels of petroleum per day from rock, at reduced prices. The saving to the public, according to the Department of the Interior, would be approximately \$150 million per annum.

Petroleum now is at its highest level of production. Petroleum is also at its highest price to all users. We now import 1 million barrels of crude oil a day from the Middle East and from Venezuela. All possible sources of oil are needed for our security and for our defense. There is great need to stockpile this precious liquid fuel.

I would like to ask, Did the Subcommittee on Appropriations consult our internal security officials as to whether they should junk this plan? Did they consult officials of the Department of Defense whether they should scuttle this plan? Did they consult the President of the United States? I will wager he would be madder than the hind feathers of a hen in a high wind if you told him what you were going to do. I am sure that he knows the urgent need for more oil production, more sources for the production of petroleum needed for our national defense. We are already short the amount in import, namely, 1 million barrels a day.

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

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

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

Mr. FENTON. But the gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. CELLER. I will yield to the gentleman later. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not a well-known fact that the States producing coal are in distress at this time to find a market, and that development along this line might relieve the situation?

Mr. CELLER. There is no doubt about it. I hold in my hand some eight volumes compiled by the Bureau of Mines concerning the huge potentialities of coal in the manufacture of oil in Louisiana, in Arizona, in Nebraska, in New York, in Oregon, in Michigan, and in Missouri; and there are many others. I call upon the Representatives from those States to look into this matter. Coal is a depression industry. It is in the doldrums.

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

Mr. CELLER. We find that oil, as fuel, is being rapidly substituted for coal right and left. New uses for oil, instead of coal, in home and plant are developing.

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

Mr. CELLER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York refuses to yield. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is going to let his time run out, and we will not have a chance to ask him anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York refused to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CELLER. I will yield to the gentleman in an orderly process if he will just have patience. I will not yield if the gentleman becomes unruly and truculent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor and refuses to yield. The gentleman from New York has consumed 5 minutes of his time.

Mr. CELLER. We know the experience during the last war: A great number of vessels were sunk. The war exigencies could cut us off from large supplies of oil again. We have never been told the number of tankers that were sunk by submarines, but I can assure you even from the information I have that it was a great number that went to the bottom loaded with this precious "black gold." Now we have the opportunity of developing these great preserves and resources, and what do we do? We say to turn it over to private industry. But the time is not ripe for that; private industry is not ready; private industry cannot do it without Government assistance.

Private industry will enter the picture, yes; private industry will enter—for what purpose? Not for the manufacture of oil. The Bureau of Mines has given us a very interesting report on the number of byproducts that can be developed by this process. The part of private industry that is interested is the chemical companies. They are interested only in the chemicals to be made. They are not going to make oil. Here is what they are going to make out of the coal and shale. I am reading from the Bureau of Mines report entitled "Prototype Plants for Synthetic Liquid Fuels" at page 2; subtitle, "Coproducts Chemicals—A List of Chemical Products That Could Be Produced From a Single 15,000-Barrel-Per-Day Prototype Coal Hydrogenation Plant" is shown below. These are the products from a small plant, the coproducts—15,000 barrels per day is a comparatively small plant:

	Per year
1. Benzene.....	M gals. 16,710
2. Toluene.....	do 29,817
3. Xylenes.....	do 34,033
4. Isopropyl alcohol.....	do 812
5. Ethyl benzene.....	do 6,718
6. Naphthalene.....	do 56,940
7. Phenol.....	do 28,733
8. M-p-cresol.....	do 27,681
9. 3-5 xylenol.....	do 6,132
10. Special xylene.....	do 31,500
11. Ammonium sulphate.....	tons 82,081
12. Sulfuric acid.....	do 125,700

Those are valuable chemicals, all in short supply. Several are on the criti-

cal list. Several are imported. Goodly sums of money can be made from their production, and they can be produced from coal and shale. You do not mean to tell me that these chemical concerns are going to pass by the manufacture of these very important chemicals now in short supply for which they can get huge sums of money and devote themselves to the manufacture of oil. They would be foolish to do so. We are not going to get any oil from these private concerns, and it is mighty strange, oh, passing strange. And now, reading from the Washington Post:

The question for Congress is whether the experimental work by the Government now is to be dropped.

Senator HENNINGS and Representative PERKINS have raised disturbing charges with respect to Mr. McKay's proposal that also call for a reply from the Secretary. Senator HENNINGS asks how five private firms knew, before the public or Congress was aware of the plans, that the plants would be disposed of; and Representative PERKINS has charged that the decision to stop the work is a payoff to the oil and gas lobbies. These are serious charges. America's oil reserves are not inexhaustible, and the national interest requires that alternative supplies be developed if possible. If the Federal project is to be suspended, there at least ought to be some assurance that the important research work will be carried on by private sources.

Where did these companies get that information from? Before any member of the Appropriations Committee knew about the plans? These private companies, these chemical companies knew all about it. Is this a sort of payoff? This is surely not a payoff in any literal sense. But it is a great boost to oil companies. It must make them happy. Maybe national campaign contributions helped a little. Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentleman accusing the committee of taking a payoff?

Mr. CELLER. I am not accusing anybody. I spoke generally, referring to the Washington Post. Of course, there is no payoff in any vulgar, immoral sense.

Mr. JENSEN. You just said it.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking quite generally referring to the Washington Post. Certainly your action is pleasing to oil companies. I do not accuse anybody; I am simply speaking in general terms, accusing nobody in particular. I quoted from the Washington Post. But it is very strange that these—

Mr. JENSEN. I resent even what the gentleman said—"Maybe it is a campaign payoff." I want to assure the gentleman that there is no payoff. If he takes payoff in this kind of thing, that is something we do not know about. We have had enough of your harangue and your insults.

Mr. CELLER. I have had enough of your questions. There is no need for excitement.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this is one matter we cannot blame entirely on the executive department, because the Secretary of the Interior himself only recommended a reduction of \$2 million, whereas the committee slashes the entire amount out

arbitrarily without giving any reason for it.

Mr. CELLER. This additional aspect of the synthetic fuel program should be emphasized. The successful commercialization of processes for converting coal and/or shale into gasoline would have widespread repercussions on the economic development of many areas in the United States. Substantial coal reserves which could be used in synthetic gasoline production exist in such States as Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Montana, Indiana, and Kentucky, to name but a few. The development of a petroleum and chemical industry based upon coal as a raw material would see a

renaissance of the coal industry in these and other areas.

In Colorado abundant deposits of oil shale could support a thriving industry manufacturing petroleum products which would add immeasurably to the wealth of this State. In Utah also exist reserves of shale oil which might be commercially exploited for industrial production of synthetic fuels by retorting and refining.

I herewith set forth an interesting summary of coal reserves which could be used for synthetic liquid fuel. It was prepared for the Bureau of Mines by the engineering firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis in 1952:

Summary of recoverable coal reserves considered for synthetic liquid fuels manufacture (as of Jan. 1, 1949)

State	Recoverable coal reserves (1,000 tons)				Heating value B. t. u. per pound as received	
	Total ¹	In general areas of coal availability, suited for—		In general areas of coal and water availability, suited for—		
		Hydrogena- tion	Coal synthine	Hydrogena- tion		Coal synthine
Alabama.....	1,236,754	1,045,622	1,045,622	1,045,622	1,045,622	12,360-14,270
Arkansas.....	415,664		250,454		250,454	13,550-14,430
Colorado.....	16,396,782	13,818,683	13,818,683	11,540,816	11,540,816	9,130-13,160
Illinois.....	24,867,174	15,356,946	15,356,946	15,356,946	15,356,946	9,750-12,610
Indiana.....	6,966,623	6,412,055	6,412,055	6,412,055	6,412,055	11,110-12,040
Iowa.....	2,318,166	1,669,517	1,669,517	1,669,517	1,669,517	9,200-10,530
Kansas.....	452,832	150,578	150,578	150,578	150,578	11,790-13,080
Kentucky.....	12,826,094	11,910,205	11,910,205	11,910,205	11,910,205	10,790-14,090
Maryland.....	241,257		159,287		159,287	12,850-13,520
Missouri.....	859,104	552,324	552,324	552,324	552,324	9,900-11,860
Montana.....	21,825,137	17,536,309	17,536,309	17,442,371	17,442,371	6,020-10,690
New Mexico.....	3,324,816	3,062,988	3,062,988	1,144,647	1,144,647	10,360-11,420
North Dakota and South Dakota.....	14,767,277	9,543,786	9,543,786	9,242,848	9,242,848	5,720-7,090
Ohio.....	6,023,031	4,788,412	4,788,412	4,788,412	4,788,412	11,470-13,350
Oklahoma.....	1,251,888	701,116	1,037,562	701,116	1,037,562	11,520-14,350
Pennsylvania (bituminous coal).....	14,750,959	7,214,990	10,026,411	7,214,990	10,026,411	12,530-14,020
Pennsylvania (anthracite culm).....	318,569		256,311		256,311	8,340
Tennessee.....	1,018,314	956,053	956,053	956,053	956,053	12,900-14,050
Utah.....	5,902,209	4,635,258	4,635,258	1,220,958	1,220,958	10,390-13,060
Virginia.....	2,133,979	1,234,328	1,652,946	1,234,328	1,652,946	12,190-14,070
Washington.....	513,412	102,433	102,433	102,433	102,433	10,030-11,750
West Virginia.....	21,057,259	9,884,265	14,576,392	9,884,265	14,576,392	12,190-14,760
Wyoming and Idaho.....	10,123,374	6,412,120	6,412,120	3,750,458	3,750,458	7,770-12,870
United States.....	169,590,374	116,987,988	125,912,652	106,320,942	115,245,606	

¹ Estimated in accordance with the specifications and procedures established for this survey; before elimination of unsatisfactory areas and of excess secondary reserves.

Here is another summary prepared by the same engineering firm, of recoverable ore shale:

Summary of recoverable oil shale reserves and oil-impregnated strippable deposits (as of Jan. 1, 1950)

State	Oil shale reserves (1,000 tons)	Strippable deposits (1,000 tons)	Esti- mated average yield (gallons per ton)
Colorado.....	211,632,063	35,966,583	25-15
Utah.....	35,966,583	966,340	25
California.....	1,234,328	283,928	19.3
Kentucky.....	513,412	346,811	26.5
United States.....	247,598,646	1,507,079	10.6

It is essential to stress the importance of the successful development of the synthetic production of fuels, not only for their potential effect on the economic development of the Nation's resources, but I repeat, as a security measure to safeguard against the possibility of depletion of our own natural resources at home and the elimination or reduction of foreign sources of petroleum supplies located thousands of miles away

from this Nation's shores. Aware of the acute need to develop alternative petroleum sources, the Paley Commission recognized two essential tasks for hydrocarbon technology as follows:

Developing economic methods of coal hydrogenation to bring about the simultaneous production of chemicals (especially benzene and phenol) and liquid fuels. * * *

Completing development of oil production from shale.

To do this would require the continued and persistent efforts of the Government and the Paley Commission specifically recommended:

That the National Security Resources Board, with the aid of the Department of the Interior, undertake a continuing study of the economic aspects of producing synthetic liquid fuels from shale and coal in relation to security needs and the outlook for future petroleum supplies.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$1,060,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 2, after line 12, insert the following:

"For expenses of planning for the construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities to carry out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825e), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$50,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, many revisions of budget requests have come to the committee, however some had not arrived when the committee completed marking up the bill, so there are a few instances in connection with this bill that need clarification and amendment. This is one of them, hence the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAYBURN: Page 2, line 22, strike out all of lines 22, 23, and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$3,736,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with purchase of electric power and energy and for the payment of rentals for the use of transmission facilities."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those continuing fights that has been going on for many years, ever since the Southwestern Power Administration was set up. It seems always when the Director of the Southwestern Power Administration appears before the Committee on Appropriations he is received, he is complimented, and he leaves there feeling in fine shape, as he did when he appeared before the committee this year. But when the bill is written up the Southwestern Power Administration, as far as a continuing fund is concerned and carrying on its functions, it is just about murder or manslaughter. As a fellow said one day in arguing a case: It did not make any difference to the fellow who was dead whether he was murdered or manslaughtered. I think this provision in the bill leaving out all of these funds is manslaughter as far as the Southwestern Power Administration is concerned.

I might recite a little history about the Southwestern Power Administration and a little about rural electrification. The Southwestern Power Administration was set up after the Denison Dam and Grand River Dam were built. As other dams were built, they were brought into that system. In the beginning all the power companies fought the Southwestern Power Administration; they even fought the building of the Denison Dam where there was a tremendous shortage of power in that area then, and there is

now. Everybody in that area is interested. You talk all you please about free enterprise, and I am for free enterprise as much as anybody as long as it will perform its functions and serve the public. Free enterprise had the opportunity to provide rural electrification, but when the power companies had the authority and the exclusive authority of electrifying the farm homes in the Southwest, when we passed the rural-electrification bill in 1934 fewer than 3 percent of the farm homes of the Southwest, of all the States in the Southwest, had access to rural electrification. Today, not giving but lending to farm cooperatives money to build rural lines, more than 90 percent of the farm homes of that area are now electrified and are being served in great part by the Southwestern Power Administration.

I have had more telegrams and more letters, not from my State especially, but from Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and other States about this one thing, than I think I have had about any one item in any bill since I have been a Member of the Congress. The people are excited about it; they are distressed about it. It is getting along fine down there.

The Southwestern Power Administration made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. A good contract both for the Government and for the utility company. And, I will say for them that each has lived up 100 percent to that contract. They have been helping each other, and in helping each other they have been helping the people. The two power companies in Oklahoma signed a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration, and they are proud of that contract, and they are living up to it 100 percent. Last year the Power Administration sat down with 12 other utility companies in the Southwest, and they had a tentative agreement on a contract. Well, since there has been talk around here about doing away with public power and selling power at these dams, at the bus bar, to the utilities, and having no more distributed by any governmental agency or any agency that has anything to do with distribution of this power, these companies now say that they want to withdraw their tentative agreement to that contract and write a new contract. When that will happen, I do not know, but this is the entering wedge to kill public power in the United States of America, and we might just as well face it today as later. I have been in this thing a long time. I happen to be the author of the Utility Holding Company Act of 1934, when we fought these things out at that time. The holding companies who laid over these power companies, who did not own a dollar's worth of stock or a bond of any sort in these operating utility companies had absolute control of them by owing part of the voting stock of other holding companies.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, while I am at it, this is the only time I will

take up on this bill if I may have my time extended for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. The holding company had two ways of making money only, because it produced nothing. The only money they made was from two ways: One was milking out of the operating company, because the operating company was the only thing in the whole set-up that had anything to sell, and the other was by the manipulation of stock, to which it lent itself particularly. They forced the operating power companies to come here and fight the bill, and now every power company man that operates a real producing concern says it is the best bill that ever happened to them.

Going back to this matter of fewer than 3 percent of the farm homes in the Southwest being electrified, at that time if the electricity had been offered to the farmer he could not have paid for it because he was being charged from 13 to 15 mills a kilowatt hour, and they were not making money because the price was so high.

Now these public power dams have come along and they are wholesaling electricity now to the farm cooperatives for 5.6 mills, and the power companies are doing the same thing, and they are making more money today than they ever made in their history because they have got it down to the point where the price is reasonable and people can use the power. The volume has made it.

As to this continuing fund, I am not going back to the so-called Truman budget or anything of the sort. I am taking the budget that was submitted by this administration, \$3,736,000. They thought that was reasonable. We are going to be told before this argument is over that the power companies are going to say, "Well, if you will throw this Southwestern Power Administration out of this business, then we will build these transmission lines and we will furnish them all the power they need."

I have no way of judging the future but by the past. They never did do it. In my opinion, if the Southwestern Power Administration is strangled and is not able to perform its function, and it will not be able to unless this amount is added to the bill, then the power companies will go where they think is the richest field, and they will not go to the poorer fields, so that the many farmers will still be left without the comforts and conveniences of rural electrification.

Maybe some of you do not understand what it means to live away out there somewhere on the side road, where it is lonesome, where you sit on the fence and just wish that somebody would come by, anybody, to break the loneliness, with no conveniences. The mother and the sisters build up a big fire in the fireplace in July and August and scorch their arms and their faces putting smoothing irons down there. They rub their knuckles off on the washboard. You trim lamp-wicks, and have to carry a lamp from one room to another, and have the chimney burst in your face.

Now most of those places have the comforts and conveniences of electrification, and they are enjoying it. It has lifted them up more than anything in the world. I do trust that we will carry on these programs until the conveniences and comforts of rural electrification are offered to every farm home in America, because nothing can lift up the farm home and take more drudgery off the farm wife than to have the conveniences of rural electrification.

We need these people out on the farms, and if we can get them all rural electrification and if we can get them an all-weather road out there, they will live there, because they can have all the conveniences anybody has. They want to stay out there. It used to be in the black mud of north Texas when it rained they had four mules and a wagon. There are no more mules and wagons. There are tractors and automobiles and trucks, and when it rains they are stuck in that mud until it dries up.

I wish you would think about these things just a little, even though you never saw a farm, even though you never lived on one. I want to say to you now that every citizen in all that country in the Southwest understands that when you vote to cripple the Southwestern Power Administration you are voting to cripple rural electrification—and that is exactly what you are doing.

So I trust in the wisdom of this House that we may go along with this thing and trade with these companies and have contracts with them which are beneficial to both parties, and in that way we can get along and have electricity sold in such volume that the people can buy enough of it to make it a profitable business both for the cooperatives and for the power companies themselves.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is the most difficult thing in the world for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and me to disagree on anything pertaining to hydroelectric power, REA, municipal power, or any other kind of power, because I learned long ago that his thinking and mine were identical, or almost identical, I should say. I remember well when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] came before our committee a few years ago and said, "Some folks think that all the power in America should be produced and distributed by the Government. There is another group that thinks it all should be produced and distributed by private utilities." Then he said, "I do not belong to either one of those groups. I think there is a place for every kind of electric energy producing and marketing agency in this country, and I have come to the conclusion that we need them all." To that, I agree completely. There are, however, a number of things to take into consideration when we appropriate money for hydroelectric power and its transmission. We have laws on the statute books which provide that hydro-power, which is produced by the Federal Government, shall be distributed to preferred customers, public bodies, and cooperatives. They have the priority. We

have held to that. This committee has recognized that law and we have acted accordingly. The committee, however, and the Congress do have another responsibility, and that is that under our form of government this Congress is dutybound to protect private industry and private enterprise whether it be large corporations—or the corner grocer, or the peanut vendor on the corner. After all, it was never supposed that Government should enter into business where private industry can carry on that business in the proper manner, and where private dollars can do the job instead of the taxpayers' dollars. This is one of those cases where private industry has absolutely testified to the fact that they will deliver this power from these hydroelectric dams in the Southwest power area to preferred customers, public bodies, and others, in accordance with the law, and that there will be no interruption of power to anyone.

I have that statement in a letter from the chairman of these 16 private utility companies who joined hands during the war, at the request of the President, to be sure that adequate power was made available to all of the defense installations of the Southwest. They did a marvelous job. Those men are honest men.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JENSEN was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JENSEN. The men who made that agreement and gave that guaranty to the committee—and I have it in writing and you can read it in the hearings—are honest, conscientious, patriotic Americans. They are simply working for a few million people, the stockholders. Not a member of this committee nor any Member of Congress that I know of is on their payroll. We are simply doing the job that is necessary, according to our oath of office.

Now, this continuing fund which was originally requested was for \$5,650,000, to be used by the Southwest Power Administrator, Douglas Wright. He is an able administrator and a good engineer. I have complimented him many times—and I might say that he has worked very closely with the private utilities down there and with the REA's, which every member of this committee has supported to the limit. They are working out a contract, a comparable contract with the contract which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was instrumental in working out between the REA's and the private utilities and the Southwest Power Administration in the State of Texas. It is working fine. There is no trouble at all. It is good for everybody. The same kind of contract is now in effect in many places over this Nation, because the committee insisted that they do enter into such contracts as the Texas contract. This continuing fund was reduced from \$5,650,000 to the figure which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has inserted in his amendment, because the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas just recently ruled that the contract between the Southwest Power Administration and the super-

co-ops, REA co-ops, which joined hands a couple of years ago and made a contract to lease all of their facilities and all of their transmission lines to the Southwest Power Administration over a period of 40 years, was illegal. Hence approximately \$2 million of this continuing fund which was to be used to purchase power by the Southwest Power Administration from REA's was deleted by the Department in its revised estimates. A case is pending now in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia about the Missouri section of the Southwest Power area. The two cases are almost identical. We do not know what the court is going to do, but should the court of the District of Columbia take the same position that the Arkansas Supreme Court has taken, then very little of this amount which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has asked be put back into the bill will be necessary.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The committee has allowed \$150,000 in this bill for the State of Oklahoma where power can be purchased and wheeled with the \$150,000 we have allowed in the bill.

I was raised on the farm; I remember how we carried the old lantern morning and night; I remember well how I ground the old corn sheller, and the corn grinder, and even the fodder grinder, the separator, and the washing machine. But those were the days, Mr. Chairman, when we were very happy even with all the drudgery; there was no one telling us what we had to do; we were free as eagles. All we had to do was be good neighbors, and we enjoyed life from morning until night. But when the REA was established, believe you me, I was for it. I went to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the two ranking men on the Committee on Agriculture, when the budget reduced the request for REA funds a couple of years ago from \$300 million to \$100 million. Someone had told the farmers that the Bureau of Reclamation was going to build all these lines all over the country, so there was no use of their obligating themselves. I went to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and asked them to put another \$100 million back in the bill for REA. There were others who did the same thing, others who knew the story about how Clyde Ellis, the great REA guy whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and others have criticized on many occasions on the floor of the House, had gone around to the farmers about REA and said: "Why, the Bureau of Reclamation is going to build these lines; you do not have to worry." They came into my State of Iowa and told them that. So there was no use of their obligating themselves to build a lot of REA lines

because the Bureau of Reclamation was going to build them.

Now, I want to read a letter which was sent to me by Mr. Frank M. Wilkes, chairman, executive group of Electric Utility Cos., that operate in the Southwestern Power area. First I shall read the names of the companies involved:

Arkansas Missouri Power Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., The Empire District Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Missouri Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., Missouri Utilities Co., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., St. Joseph Light & Power Co.

The letter of Mr. Frank M. Wilkes, dated April 6, 1953, reads as follows:

APRIL 6, 1953.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, Member of Congress, chairman.)

GENTLEMEN: As representative of the electric utility companies in the Southwest area appearing before your committee on Tuesday afternoon, March 31, 1953, which companies are listed below, we hereby officially request your committee in all fairness to the companies and the efforts of many of them to negotiate contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the service areas of the companies, that all appropriations requested from the continuing fund for rental of transmission lines, for payments under wheeling contracts and for purchase of steam electric power be eliminated from this year's appropriation, and that the continuing-fund language be changed to agree with the wording of the Southeastern Power Administration's appropriation for last year (i. e., "to provide for emergencies and continuity of service" the sum of \$50,000 per annum), as requested in the statement of Frank M. Wilkes before your committee on Tuesday afternoon, March 31, 1953.

If this is done, we hereby make the unequivocal statement that no individual, cooperative, or municipality now receiving service in the Southwest area covered by these companies will have any disruption to his or to its electrical service during fiscal year 1954 by reason of the withdrawal of the appropriations from the continuing fund. The Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma are now operating under an agreement with Southwestern Power Administration made under date of July 13, 1950, and the remaining companies, whose names are listed below, will diligently pursue the negotiations with Southwestern Power Administration, and will use their best efforts to work out an honest and fair result of such negotiations which will protect the interest of the preferred customers of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as it now exists, subject, of course, to any amendatory action of the Congress, as well as the interests of the United States Government, its taxpayers, and the private electric utility companies involved.

Yours very truly,

FRANK M. WILKES,
Chairman, Executive Group of Electric Utility Companies Appearing Before Your Committee on March 31, 1953.

In addition, I will insert into the RECORD also a telegram which I have just

received from Mr. D. C. McKee, president of the Empire District Electric Co.:

JOPLIN, Mo., April 28, 1953.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Interior Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations,
House Office Building.

The Southwestern Power Administration can serve all of its customers in Missouri without the use by it of any money from the continuing fund. The absence of a continuing fund appropriation will result only in SPA being unable to acquire by lease or purchase a large transmission system in Missouri. All present power requirements of the customers of Kamo Electric Cooperative, Inc., are now being supplied and future requirements provided for by the companies under contract. Under a wheeling contract between the 12 companies in the Southwest and SPA, which is now being negotiated, the present and future customers of KAMT can be supplied Government hydropower without the use of the continuing fund. Empire now supplies all the requirements of the city of Springfield, and under a long-term contract. Empire has guaranteed to supply all its future requirements. Under the wheeling contract between the companies and SPA, which is now being negotiated, Springfield can be supplied Government hydropower over Empire's transmission system without the use of the continuing fund.

D. C. MCKEE,
President, the Empire District Electric Co.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. What about the REA companies and the super co-ops that have contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it will all be covered in one contract. The agreement that will be entered into under the contract similar to the Texas contract protects everyone. It protects the preferred customers, and it is so stated in their contracts with these REA's. Rates are set by your official rate-setting bodies in every State. So, there can be no danger, there is not a chance in the world but what the REA's and the people of this area in question will be treated commensurately with the treatment that the people in Texas and the people in every other area of these United States are now being accorded where such contracts exist.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This matter of servicing these lines already built is one thing, but the getting of additional transmission lines is another thing. The gentleman knows I promised this House many times that the Southwestern Power Administration would never parallel anybody's line or put them out of business. But the thing about this contract is, they do have a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. and they were on the verge of entering into a contract with these other 12 utility companies, and yet when they read this language they say, "No, we are going to buy the power at the bus bars; we are going to withdraw our contracts, and we

do not have any contracts with them."

Mr. JENSEN. Let me assure the gentleman from Texas that the contract that will be entered into, whether this continuing fund goes in or not, will be almost identical, if not identical, with the Texas contract, which protects the REA's and the people.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say to the gentleman that if it is, it will have to be vetoed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the people of the State of Oklahoma through their Rural Electrification Administration representatives, have emphatically requested me by wire, signed by various REA cooperatives in southwestern Oklahoma, to support continuing SPA and I quote:

Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your continued support for continuing SPA. Our 15 years for western electricity may be useless without this interconnection. We know we have your full support but we are urging an all-out fight.

Northfork Electric Cooperative, Sayre, Okla.; Cimarron Electric Cooperative, Kingfisher, Okla.; Caddo Electric Cooperative, Binger, Okla.; Southwest Rural Electric Association, Inc., Tipton, Okla.; Kiwash Electric Cooperative, Inc., Cordell, Okla.; Cotton Electric Cooperative, Walters, Okla.; Harmon Electric Association, Hollis, Okla.; Western Electric Cooperative, Inc., Hollis, Okla.; and the Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Hooker, Okla.

I am positive that the people of Oklahoma, whom I am honored to represent in the Congress, would wholeheartedly concur with me in the statements just made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

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

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to say that my REA people in Oklahoma agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I come down here in defense of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. Looking at the record, like I said yesterday, I see that in 1932 the Alabama Power & Light Co. had 145,000 customers. In 1952 the Alabama Power & Light Co. had 556,000. Why did they not have electricity back in the other years? I recall many years ago that when a girl was born on any farm in the United States, not only in the Southwest or the Southeast or the Far West, but in the State of Ohio, she was born a slave. You could put a tag right on her leg and on that tag inscribe: "I was born to slavery." Imagine a girl that was born on a farm home in those days alongside of what we have got today when there

was nothing in sight, no sweeper, no lights, no nothing at all to relieve her burden. That is what she was born into. But today she can enjoy life the way any girl in the city can. Radios, sweepers, mangles, TV, all those things were denied until the co-ops came along.

Within the Capital of the United States just 2 years ago a Congressman applying to the light company for power had to pay \$1,200, and he lived only 12 miles from this Capitol, before they would put lights on his farm. I asked the head of the Southwestern Power Co., and it took quite a while, I believe, 3 or 4 years ago, a half hour to get a statement out of him whether they did a good or bad job.

I said yesterday that in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the year of 1868 there was a home completely supplied and lighted with electricity. It was the first in the United States, and that was in 1868. In 1932 very little progress had been made, down through all those years, in one of the oldest industries, utilities, very little progress had been made until they came along with the co-ops and public power and whatever you have.

Down in the Southwest, from those dams, all the power the United States Government can take away right now from those dams, from the private utilities, is 16 percent of that potential power. That is the best yardstick for the United States or any government to have over private utilities to see that they do a good job, but it is just 16 percent. Out in the West in the Central Valley, all the Government can take in California is 8 percent of the power away from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. It is nothing but a yardstick to see that they are good servants, that they serve this power and serve the people the way they should be served.

No, you look at the record down through the years of what suffering went on in this Nation when it did not have to go on. Yet today in Ohio 300,000 get electricity in their homes through rural electrification. Why was not that given to them down through the years? Just simply because they had to pay anywhere from \$1,000 to \$1,500 to get that service.

I said yesterday on the floor that when Grand Coulee was within 6 months of being completed to distribute power the private utilities out there called on every customer, ranchman, and farm owner, and said, "If you will sign up with us to take power for the next 5 years we will put your poles and lines in free." Why did they not do that before they brought in Grand Coulee? Why did they not do any of those things over the Nation? The record shows they did not do it, and there is no excuse for it. There were 64 years from 1868 to 1932 for them to put it there, and they never put it there. What assurance do we have that they are going to keep it there? That is what I am asking you here today.

We had better get together, not for some people out in Oklahoma or Texas or Ohio or wherever they may be, but for the Government. They are all hollering down there about that we think so well and so much of. For that Government we had better get together and

do something for the Government—never mind the private utilities so much, they will take care of themselves, but do a little for this Government. If we will do that, we will be able to get by, and we will make everybody happy that is living in and under this Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 15 minutes, and that the committee have the last 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, why does the committee want the last 5 minutes? You have had about half an hour.

Mr. JENSEN. There are other members of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why take so much yourself?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 79, noes 92.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get to some agreement on limiting debate if we allow a little longer time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, that is certainly agreeable to me, but there are 8 or 10 Members on this side who have always been very much concerned on this particular subject matter.

Mr. JENSEN. How long a time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think they should have 5 minutes each. If I might suggest, the Members who want to be heard on this might stand and be counted so that we might see how much time is necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is before the Committee now, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The suggestion has been made by the gentleman from Texas, in concurrence with the gentleman from Iowa, with reference to limiting the time on this particular amendment by unanimous consent, if an agreement can be reached.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May a Member reserve the right to object in the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to object, that will be his privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is not before the Committee as yet.

Will those Members who desire to be heard on the amendment stand so that they may be counted?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is proceeding in the regular order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 1 hour.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises each Member will be allowed approximately 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. I had hoped it would not come to this point; that it would not be necessary to make this fight.

Long before I ever dreamed I would be a Member of this Congress, we went through this battle of electricity for the rural people of north Arkansas. So it is with a great deal of experience that I cast my lot today with the rural people of north Arkansas, all Arkansas, and the entire Southwest.

We are dealing with human nature, and it is hard to change. It may be that in the distant future the 18 rural electric co-ops of Arkansas will begin to feel their oats. They might want to take over the whole business of electricity and its distribution in Arkansas. If they do, they will find me, if I am still alive, on the side of opposition to them, because I do not want any group of free enterprise to have a monopoly on the development of electricity and its distribution in my section. Just as surely as this item is cut from the appropriation bill and the Southwest Power Administration eliminated down there, the weaker of the two, the private power companies or the REA co-ops will suffer. What little influence I have and certainly my vote today are going to be cast on the side of those who I think need my help the most. If I had it within my power today, I would call these two groups together and I would have them sit down with the Southwest Power Administration and work out a contract that would be agreeable to both sides and profitable to both sides, so that this infernal row that continually goes on and disrupts the hopes and arouses the fears of the rural people in my section would be stopped. Already I hear—I have not gotten it first-hand or officially, but already I hear that the private power companies in Arkansas are going right back now to the position they took when I was a younger man many years ago. I helped to put up a fight to get rural electrification for the farm people of Arkansas. We must adopt this amendment to use, not as a club, but as a referee to make the people involved, regardless of who they may be, do the right and just thing.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, to answer adequately the argument of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], one would need a pail and a mop to dry up the tears he shed for the people of his district. Serving one's constituents is a part of a Congressman's duty, but it can be overdone. That statement of the gentleman was a masterpiece and if it was to be delivered to the voters of his district just prior to the next election it would make many votes. But, even though it is a Congressman's duty to serve the people of his district, it does not follow that his colleagues should follow his argument where it calls for a special out-of-line appropriation which is in conflict with the general policy of the Government. Some of us must decline to go along with the gentleman's plea for an added sum when we recall, as we do, that it is now necessary because of wasteful, excessive spending during the past 20 years, that we reduce the tax rate and balance the budget.

Then I cannot quite understand the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], that every girl who was born in the State of Ohio was born to slavery.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there? I did not say that; I said that any girl born on any farm in any State—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will accept the correction; the gentleman broadens his assertion—makes it more inaccurate. Certainly it does not apply to Michigan; I can assure you of that.

The young women of Michigan do not consider the privilege of living and working on a farm any form of slavery. They consider life upon a farm a life of independence, of freedom from many things irritating, annoying, unpleasant, which one must endure if he would enjoy the pleasures and benefits of the cities.

Mr. KIRWAN. I broadened it out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I passed through Ohio on my way to Congress, I saw girls and women out in the fields doing farmwork, and they did not seem to be at all embarrassed by the work. In fact, as I met some of them, they seemed happy. They certainly were independent and they assured me that they enjoyed life in the open, the freedom which it gave, the opportunity to provide for the future.

In my country they even put headlights on the tractors so they can work longer and they do not cry about that. They go about their work, earn what they can, save their money and buy the things they need or want. That is the way they do it, and there was equipment by the side of the barns in Ohio that showed that is the way they do it there, too. By and large and as a rule, the farmers of this country are an uncomplaining lot. They are what might be called the free people of the United States of America. They certainly are

the independent people and they ask less of the Federal Government than possibly any other group. They are, I think, better able to take care of themselves in time of adversity than any other group.

I just feel sorry for the people described by our former Speaker, especially sorry for the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN]. Oh, he must have had a terrible time in his youth down on the farm. But he seems to have gotten along all right. Apparently, he retained enough of his health and strength so that he was able to make enough progress to become a Member of Congress, to be the Speaker of this House for, I understand, longer than any other Member who ever came here. The poor, little farm boy, despite the terribly trying conditions which confronted him, has been able to advance to a position of high honor and great authority in this, our Federal Government—and in my opinion, a land which gives one greater opportunity than elsewhere anywhere in the wide, wide world.

Well, some of the rest of us have been on the farm, too; some of us know what it is to follow a plow through new ground when the handles hit your ribs when you hit a stone or a stump; oh, yes; I know about that.

Some of us even know about tallow candles and how to make them, yes. Believe me, I would rather go back to the day of the tallow candle than surrender my freedom and have some dictator here in Washington collect my hard-earned dollars and waste them abroad, or even here at home.

If my history was read aright, Lincoln at times did not even have a tallow candle to light him on his way. The fireplace was his standby light—electric power, incandescent light. Of course, none of us appears to be a Lincoln, but we should at least attempt to have the courage, be as industrious, as willing to work and learn as was he, even though our talents be far less. For myself, if I must be forced to choose I will take the old tallow candle, the log cabin, and my freedom rather than the electric light, the home with all the plumbing, all the electric devices which we have attained. If the cost of the former luxuries, now necessities, is to be the destruction of my Government, a lack of security for those I leave behind, and which grows out of unsound policies and wasteful spending, I will take the so-called hard days when perhaps only the rugged, those willing to work and make sacrifices, survived. The things we earn, not the things which are given to us, are the things worth while.

Sure, my grandparents were born and I was born in Pennsylvania, district and the State, Mr. GAVIN, that you so proudly, so ably represent. Yes, tallow candles. Poor old granddad.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; you are from Pennsylvania, but you do not represent the hard-working Dutch people up there—not by a long shot. You live in the city where you want everything brought to you.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman referred to me and spoke in a disparaging manner of how I was representing the people of Pennsylvania. I ask that his words be taken down, and that the gentleman proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I did not speak disparagingly of the gentleman; I was trying to praise the gentleman, saying he represented people from a grand industrial section of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCORMACK. I demand that the words be taken down. I think it is about time that we—

Mr. ROONEY. Let the gentleman from Michigan be seated.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman from Michigan be seated?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but just who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will please take his seat until the Clerk has reported the words taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; you are from Pennsylvania, but you do not represent the hard-working Dutch people up there—not by a long shot. You live in the city where you want everything brought to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request, were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; you are from Pennsylvania, but you do not represent the hard-working Dutch people up there—not by a long shot. You live in the city where you want everything brought to you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair rules that the words used by the gentleman from Michigan do not indicate any intent to reflect upon the character or integrity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and are not objectionable under the rule.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4828, with Mr. MCGREGOR in the chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how much of my time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in those 2 minutes I want to apologize most profusely and most humbly to my colleague from Pennsylvania

[Mr. EBERHARTER] if I unintentionally and inadvertently offended him. All I intended to say was that some of us had different ideas about those so-called tough old days. Some of us enjoyed them. To others, they were a challenge to be met and overcome. Success at the end of the day was looked upon with pride. My dad was a blacksmith. He made buggies and wagons and sleds and sleighs, by hand. Remember the words:

Under the spreading chestnut tree
The village smithy stands;
The smith, a mighty man is he,
With large and sinewy hands;
And the muscles of his brawny arms
Are strong as iron bands.

Toiling, rejoicing, sorrowing,
Onward through life he goes;
Each morning sees some task begun,
Each evening sees it close;
Something attempted, something done,
Has earned a night's repose.

Days of hardship? Nonsense—builders of physical strength—of sound character.

Yes, dad was a blacksmith, and, in his boyhood days, he never dreamed of an electric light, of a telephone. Radio, television and flying through the air—except by Darius Green—was something for the future, but dad did a day's work. At breakfast, he thanked the good Lord for the coming day; at evening, thanked Him again for the strength which had been given him to toil, to work, to earn; for the courage which induced him to save so that his children could have the benefit of an education denied him. Cry? I never heard him mourn, I never heard him regret, the lack of opportunity.

In my youth I helped my grandmother mold tallow candles, and I repeat what has been said before—a lantern instead of an electric light in the barnyard—I took the lanterns and went out, but not to the barn because milking time was over. We cut wood, we did many a chore by lantern light. I did not suffer too much.

My poor old grandfather and grandmother who came from Pennsylvania and went West did not have a telephone and, as you may have gathered, they did not have electric lights. They moved on from the tallow candle to the old kerosene lamp with the tin bottom or if they were too hard up to paper shades. They did not have electric lighters—in fact, neither granddad, dad, nor the uncle smoked, nor did they have many store matches. A paper quill, a sliver from basswood or pine, carried a light from one candle to another, from a fireplace, or later from a stove, to where it was needed.

But they got along all right. They did not have this electricity that you talk about. If they wanted to go to town, which was 6 miles away, they took the old horse and it took them about an hour to drive to town. Why did they go to town? On week days they went in to take the eggs for which they got 6 cents a dozen in trade. On Sundays they went to church twice. Oh, they had terrible, terrible times. They suffered, sure they suffered. Or did they suffer? From all I could see and learn of their lives, true, they were hardworking,

industrious people, thrifty and kind, but contented and happy. They had what they earned and what they had and earned was sufficient. They complained not at all. They were thankful to the good Lord for their daily food, for the roof which sheltered them, for the opportunities which the country gave to them.

No one carried them around—neither on a chip nor a silver platter. They were dependent upon no one. And they and others of similar mind had strength and stamina, made this country what it is today—a great, a free, and an independent nation. Independent, did I hear you say? Yes, independent, insofar as we have been able to prevent a ruinous foreign and domestic policy from destroying us and our freedom.

Grandmother had a loom in the kitchen where they made cloth from their own yarn. It is unbelievable the things that those people suffered, was it not? Do I hear you murmur, "Oh, how they suffered." Oh, rot and nonsense. They were not crybabies. They did not ask anyone to put the food on the table, the clothing on their backs, or a roof over their heads. They were not weaklings. They did not ask that the Government support them. Not only did they not ask that the Government support them, neither did they ask that the people bring it to them, then pay them for accepting it.

There were no strikes in those days, and had there been, they had enough in the cellar or in the smokehouse and out in the granary; they had enough of everything they needed to keep them a year and they did not depend upon a can off the grocery-store shelf.

They lived on, and when they came to the end of the road they had already purchased a cemetery plot and a monument; they had a sum laid up to pay the undertaker, and they had something left for their children and even their grandchildren—yes, they did. They were independent, they were happy, they were God-fearing, and they did not have anything given to them. They did not cry to a Government for charity. Nor do the farmers of today. It is the vote-seeking bureaucrats like Hopkins who cry for them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the motion being withdrawn and I ask to be heard in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, the United States House of Representatives is a great deliberative body. It carries a heavy responsibility not only for America but for the world and it ill behooves us to depart from the dignity in keeping with that responsibility.

Now let us, if we may, clear away a little of the underbrush. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is merely a proposition to return to the Eisenhower budget. The original budget carried approximately \$2 million more than the sum provided in the pending amend-

ment. It does carry the full amount of the Eisenhower budget, which means a saving of \$2 million on the original proposition. But these figures are the Eisenhower figures.

Another thing that seems not to be generally understood is that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] does not take a single dollar out of the Federal Treasury. On the contrary, it puts money into the Federal Treasury. The only proposal here is to allow these cooperatives and so forth to operate—allow them to sell electric energy and turn the profits over to the Federal Treasury. And those profits are large. This puts money into the Treasury instead of out of it. Surely, no one should object to that. But that is the committee position on this amendment.

Why does the committee insist on refusing to permit the Treasury to accept money which will be paid in, in a constantly flowing stream every day in the year.

Here it is. A man has written a letter after the hearings have closed and no one has an opportunity to cross examine him.

He is the chairman of the private-utility organization which has been fighting rural electrification and public power at reasonable rates in every session of Congress. Why, he might as well ask the Kremlin to pass upon the question of putting our children in charge of Communist teachers in this country. He is the head of the private-utility lobby who has been fighting for years to deny our children the primitive necessities of modern civilization.

Since the cooperatives were not allowed to pass on this letter before this bill was reported, here is what they say about it now. These are your representatives in REA and municipal ownership cities and other public-power projects:

CHILLICOTHE, Mo., April 27, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Appropriations Committee in deleting all but \$150,000 of the continuing fund for Southwestern Power Administration creates a situation of dependency upon the promises of commercial power companies, such promises being ambiguous and misleading. In complete selfishness the companies seek to monopolize all SPA hydroelectric power for commercialism to themselves through their customers in stating: The deletion of such fund (continuing fund) would not in any way result in interruption or curtailment of service to any preference customer or other consumer or their systems.

There are scores of cooperatives and publicly owned municipal utilities without direct or indirect interconnection with power company facilities. There are five generation and transmission cooperatives whose interchange contracts with SPA will be abrogated in the absence of the continuing fund. Many municipal utilities can secure SPA hydropower only through operation of the generation and transmission cooperative contracts.

ERNEST C. WOOD,
Chairman, Advisory Committee for
the Southwest.

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., April 27, 1953.
CLARENCE CANNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

It requires a cunning mind to cook up such a nefarious scheme as the plot that will unfold if continuing fund is not restored to

Southwestern Power Administration appropriations. We need not apologize to anyone when we come to the front to fight against higher rates for our city and also to more than 200,000 farm families. As of now the privately owned utility companies require no succor. Their balance sheets show lusty results. On the other hand rural folks are having a hard time and you should be inspired to protect them against financial marauders. Certainly this question is as important as any that will arise during your congressional career. Do your duty.

LOUIS W. REPS,
Managing Director, Springfield
Chamber of Commerce.

ELDORADO SPRINGS, Mo., April 28, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are asking your full support on money for southwest power construction also including funds for continuance to operate our Southwest power system in southwest Missouri. We hope we can get this all reinstated which the committee has deleted.

JESSE L. POWELL,
Manager, SAC Osage Electric Co-op.

LINN, Mo., April 27, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Kindly request subcommittee on appropriations for Interior to restore continuing fund for SPA in the amount required to fulfill obligation under existing contracts with cooperatives, municipalities, and private companies.

STEVE A. SCHAUBCKER,
Manager, Central Electric Power Co-op.

POPLAR BLUFF, Mo., April 27, 1953.

Reduction of SPA continuing fund serious blow to rural electrification and municipal power supplies in this area. Power requirements dependent on SPA ability to transmit federally owned power through use of continuing fund. Committee decision apparently based on power company letter dated April 6 after committee hearings. This letter ambiguous and incomplete in its facts. This decision the most biased and unfair experienced this area. Request your assistance to restore these funds on House floor.

M. & A. ELECTRIC POWER CO-OP.,
JAMES W. OWENS, Jr.,
Manager.

POPLAR BLUFF, Mo., April 28, 1953.

House committee reduction of continuing fund for SPA very disturbing. Our contracts with SPA depend on continuing fund and our power requirements are jeopardized by its reduction. Present committee decision represents sell-out to private interests and not based on facts of testimony before committee. Request your assistance in restoring fund on floor of House.

BYRON KEARBEY,
President, Board of Public Works.

SIKESTON, Mo., April 28, 1953.

Sikeston municipal light plant has a contract with and is depending on SPA for power. The cut in SPA continuing fund will hamstring the operation of SPA and seriously endanger our service and maybe stop it entirely. Please use utmost influence and have this fund restored.

E. P. COLEMAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Public Works.

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo., April 27, 1953.

Feeling that our contracts are void by reduction of SPA continuing fund. Utilities present proposal will permanently scuttle the chances of Government power reaching preference users. For first hand information suggest you call Douglas Wright in Tulsa.

CENTRAL ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE,
TRUMAN GREEN.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The time on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not taken out of the time already allotted for debate on this subject?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. All debate on the preferential motion has expired, but not all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Under the rules of the House, is it not permissible for a Member to offer a pro forma amendment to a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. Two Members are allowed to speak on a preferential motion of this type. The gentleman from Michigan spoke and the gentleman from Missouri spoke. Consequently, all time on the preferential motion has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. GAVIN.)

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him equally to Mr. ALBERT and Mr. EDMONSTON.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished minority leader and his very pitiful plea about conditions in Texas. I deeply sympathize with the gentleman from Texas, whom I greatly admire. However, I believe this will come as a surprise to the chambers of commerce of Dallas, Fort Worth, Austin, San Antonio, Houston, and Galveston, which speak so glowingly of the great State of Texas.

I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his statement about Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is a great State of some 10 million people, a State that sent some 1,400,000 men and women into World War II, a State that produced 30 to 35 percent of all the war materials.

I have been around here now for over 10 years and watched the development of these various hydroelectric projects, navigation projects, land reclamation projects, irrigation projects, and flood-control and river and harbor projects all over the Nation. I am just a little bit concerned that possibly instead of some of us being a little selfish maybe the people who are expounding and exploiting public power are a little bit selfish.

I do not mind telling the House that I would rather see miners at work and coal being mined in Pennsylvania than see water flowing over the TVA dams to produce cheap, tax-exempt, hydroelectric power. For your information, if these conditions are as pitiful as has been pointed out to you here today, I might say that the conditions in my State, too, are pitiful. Thousands of miners are out of work; whole commu-

nities in the parts of our State that produce coal are at a standstill as they are dependent upon the coal industry for their livelihood.

You talk about cheap public power. It ought to be cheap. It is tax exempt. Why should it not be cheap? Who pays the bill? The millions of people in the New England States, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. We furnish the money through taxes to pay the bill for cheap power; in other words, we sharpen the razor that cuts our economic and industrial throats. So, my friends, do not cry too loud and long about the conditions in other States, because my State, in this highly competitive economic and industrial warfare, is having the toughest time of its life trying to protect its interests and what it has to maintain its industrial life and continue some degree of progress and prosperity for our people. Take the TVA for the sake of argument. It cost approximately \$800 million. So Pennsylvania pays 8 or 10 percent of the Federal taxes, therefore, we pay in about \$70 to \$80 million to make the TVA possible. What does TVA do? It produces cheaper hydroelectric power, which is tax exempt. Down in that particular area of the country with unorganized labor and preferred freight rates, what happens? When an industry wants to locate, do they consider locating in Pennsylvania? No; they go down where they have cheap hydroelectric power. I repeat what I said. All we do is furnish the money for all of these projects to cut our own economic and industrial throat.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I have waited here for an hour for an opportunity to have a few minutes, and you have had plenty of opportunity on the committee to talk. Let other Members have a few minutes of time. I want to say it is about time we gave some consideration to the coal industry. We heard our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], try to defend coal. Coal produces steam and with steam you produce power. But, when you have cheap hydroelectric power projects, tax exempt, scattered all over the country, certainly they are not using coal so do not cry too loud or shed tears about your great interest and your desire and ambition to help the coal industry because if there ever was a time when a great industrial State needed help to protect its economic and industrial life it is the State of Pennsylvania today. So today we have this project before us and we hear about these grave conditions in other States. I just thought it would be in order to call this situation to the attention of those, particularly of Members from the New England States, who are rapidly losing their industries to other sections of the United States because of these various projects. Where do these industries go? To the South, Southwest, the west coast, and the Northwest. Certainly, these various projects have affected the economic welfare of 10 million people in my State who are trying to make a living where their homes are

and where they have lived all their lives. So it is time we gave some consideration to the problems of these other States along with the rest of the country. Talk about cheap hydroelectric power? Who pays the bill? We all pay the bill. It is presumed that Uncle Sam is a rich uncle whose pockets are inexhaustible and that we can continue to spend and spend and spend without ending up in bankruptcy. Well, we all pay the bill. It is a fallacy to think you are getting this money for nothing to develop these projects all over the country. We all pay the taxes to cover the cost. That is what I am trying to point out. The State of Pennsylvania pays its share, and therefore the State of Pennsylvania should be considered in the development of all of our projects throughout the entire Nation to protect people who are trying desperately to maintain their standard of living, particularly in the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard and affection for the distinguished gentleman who has just yielded the floor. He is a most amiable and companionable gentleman, but not one single word that he said in his entire speech applies to the amendment before the House. His remarks had no relation whatever to the pending amendment, and his astonishing statement that the taxpayers must provide the money involved in this bill is absolutely without any foundation whatever.

In the first place, the money for these cooperatives, when originally provided, was loaned to them and has been paid, or is being paid back with interest. Every cent of it is paid back. The taxpayer does not supply a penny of it.

In the second place, the money provided in this amendment for these cooperatives, brings money into the Treasury of the United States instead of taking money out of the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman peremptorily declined to yield to me, but I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. If it brings money into the Treasury, then why do we have a \$267 billion debt today? There are some phases of these projects which do not bring in any money to the Treasury.

Mr. CANNON. Again, what the gentleman is saying has no relation whatever to the situation before the House today. He might as well and as consistently ask about the price of oranges. He has not touched the question before the House top, side or bottom. Never has a more fallacious statement been made on the floor of the House than that made by the eloquent gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The proposition before us is very simple. The question is will you vote to put money into the Treasury or vote to keep money out of the Treasury? That is the question presented by this amendment. If you vote for this amendment, you are not only voting to give the 250,000 families in the country, heat, light, and power, and all the comforts of

modern civilization, but you are voting to put money back into the Treasury of the United States that would not otherwise be there.

There should be no difficulty in choosing a prosperous countryside and more money in the Treasury and voting against the former and for less money in the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER].

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I have never looked with favor upon sectional arguments or sectional bias or prejudice. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] made the remark a moment ago that this amendment would detrimentally affect the area which he represents; that industries of the New England States and Pennsylvania were going to the Southwest.

On the contrary, the markets of the Southwest are and have always been the most fertile field for the products produced in the New England and Pennsylvania section of the United States. The development of public electric power in the Southwest has increased the markets for New England States products more and more each and every year.

A short time ago the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] read a letter from the private commercial power companies. I want to read to you a statement from Mr. Clyde Ellis, who represents the National REA Association. This is what Mr. Ellis has to say about the proposed drastic reduction of appropriation for loan to the Southwestern Power Administration:

An appropriation of \$1,650,000 recommended by the House Appropriations Committee today for the Southwestern Power Administration might be termed as a slap in the farmer's face. The committee's action kicks the farmers of the Southwest out the back door and makes a preferred customer of private commercial utilities.

I was always under the impression that the private commercial utilities were in the business of generating and selling electricity, but here they attempt to encroach upon the REA by taking over their transmission lines, with the ultimate purpose of dominating and controlling the REA program throughout the United States. It is the first step in that direction. Once they take over it will affect not only the farmers but also the city consumers as well, because they would bring in and take over all of the REA companies into their companies, thereby raising the cost of their operation and the cost of their investment, in proportion to number of consumers as a basis for increasing the cost of electric power to city consumers as well.

President Truman's budget last January recommended and requested \$9,050,000. The Eisenhower Budget Bureau cut the Truman request to \$3,700,000. Now, the Appropriation Committee with a Republican majority and by a solid Republican vote presents a bill to the House which further reduces the loan appropriation to \$1,650,000, as requested by the private commercial light and power companies. Who is controlling the opinion and decisions of this Republican 83d Congress? Is it the Eisenhower

leadership or the private power companies? Or, is the Eisenhower leadership sincerely and in good faith truly exercising its influence on such issues as this when the big power company interests are involved?

Certainly the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas should be adopted, because it is right; it is just; and for the best interests and the benefit of the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, our distinguished minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN].

Southwestern Power Administration in its revised budget requested \$3,736,000 to be appropriated to the continuing fund. The committee has cut this request to \$150,000.

The money in the continuing fund does not come from the taxpayer. It is derived from the sale of power and therefore comes from revenue produced in its operations. It can be used only for the purchase of power and pay the lease rentals on transmission facilities as directed by the Congress. It cannot be used for construction or for the payment of regular operating expenses.

Southwestern Power Administration has been pursuing a policy of working out contracts with private companies and cooperatives to use their facilities where possible to carry the surplus power to the preference customers as provided by law. This policy has already saved the Federal Government many millions of dollars which would have been required for transmission lines and other facilities. The Congress has from time to time urged Southwestern Power Administration to work out such contracts. The committee that cut this continuing fund this year in its report stated:

In connection with the construction program of the Southwestern Power Administration, the committee strongly urges that the Department of the Interior and the companies in the area of Southwestern operations, immediately work out some satisfactory arrangements by which the need for any additional construction by the Southwestern Power Administration is eliminated, and by which the business and other standards of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 will be satisfied (p. 3).

How does the committee expect SPA to carry out this request when it deletes the very money requested for this purpose?

SPA has requested the following amount to carry out its existing contracts:

Oklahoma private utility companies	\$112,800
Other private utility companies	60,900
M. & A. Electric Power Cooperative	25,100
Central Electric Power Cooperative	1,239,500
Northwestern Electric Power Cooperative	1,073,000
Western Farmers Electric Cooperative	1,055,700
KAMO Electric Power Cooperative	169,000
Total	3,736,000

It appears the committee has allowed just enough to carry out the contracts with the private companies and disallowed funds to carry out the contracts with the cooperatives.

Unless these funds are restored to SPA it will mean bus bar sales to the private companies and the real recipients of the benefits of low cost power in the Southwest will be the private companies and not the farmers and customers of municipal systems. It means that Wall Street and not Main Street will profit by the Government projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise here this afternoon following the eloquence which has preceded me, however I ask the Members' indulgence just to quote from the Arkansas Supreme Court case which describes for what purpose these funds have been and are to be used. This is taken from the opinion of the Arkansas Supreme Court:

By the lease contract Arkansas Electric leases to SPA for 40 years the 544 miles of 69 kilovolt transmission lines, these lines to be completely maintained and controlled by SPA. The rental is not fixed in dollars and cents but is to be so calculated that it will exactly repay that part of Arkansas Electric's REA loan that is allocable to the transmission lines. SPA has the option at any time of purchasing the lines by paying the remaining REA balance so allocable to the lines. In the event of such a purchase SPA is relieved of any duty to reserve transmission capacity to meet increased demands of Arkansas Electric's consumers. If SPA has not bought the lines before the expiration of the lease it may then do so for \$10. Thus it will be seen that the lease contract is in substance an installment sale of the property to SPA.

All of us believe in the theory of the REA that people can associate themselves together to provide the electrical facilities which they themselves need. No one can quarrel with that. But here we have another concept. The REA's borrowed money from the Federal Government to construct those facilities. Now they are selling the facilities back to the Federal Government for exactly what they owe the Federal Government. That would not be public power through locally managed REA's where local people can run their own business. It would destroy public power by REA's and substitute Federal power operated by the Federal Government, controlled from Washington through its arm, the Southwestern Power Administration.

I say in all sincerity that if this policy is not brought to a halt the REA program in the United States as we have known it cannot continue to exist. The Federal Government will run it all. Personally, I prefer the local control and am satisfied that in the long run it will be the wiser.

Mr. CARNAHAN. 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. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished minority

leader [Mr. RAYBURN]. I support this amendment because it is fair and just to both the public and the private power groups and at the same time gives consideration to the masses of our people who are using the power and who are still anxious to get electric service.

I still insist that there is both room and dire need for the continued service and expansion of the service of both public and private power groups. I do not feel that an advantage should be given by legislation to either group. Certainly the deletion of these funds to SPA will give a decided advantage to the private-power group.

I will not be satisfied until every family in the Nation that wants and needs electric power is served dependable electric power at a rate which is fair to both the supplier and the user.

The adoption of this amendment will make a further positive contribution to the attainment of this worthy and just objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and I do so because I feel this is necessary unless we subscribe to the theory that we want to return to the private utilities the responsibility for the distribution of power to our rural consumers. It is said that a burned child fears the fire.

I have had the personal experience of dealing with at least one of the companies that signed the letter referred to by the gentleman from Iowa at a time when I was mayor of a city in southeast Missouri, when we were forced to put in a municipal light plant. I told the company that was opposing us at the time we made certain requests of them which they denied that upon our voting the necessary bonds and building the plant they would meet those same requests in all of the other towns in that district once they became convinced that they would be faced with municipal light plants in these other various towns. That prediction came true and it proved to me that the utility companies have to be forced to give this service. I think we can only judge a company's promises by its past performances. I think we have all seen how these private utility companies have failed to perform in the past and failed to give service to the rural communities. That is why the people in my State, including some of our larger farm organizations, our REA cooperatives, and others, are urging the restoration of these funds. Typical is a telegram from the Missouri Farmers Association, representing 146,000 farm families of Missouri, reading as follows:

Restoration of continuing funds for Southwestern Power Administration as requested is absolutely necessary. If proposed drastic reduction is allowed to stand three-fourths of Missouri's farm homes will continue to suffer from unconscionably high rates and inadequate power. On behalf of the 146,000 farm families of the Missouri Farmers Association I respectfully urge that you support restoration of SPA funds.

F. V. HEINKEL,
President, Missouri Farmers Association.

Mr. Chairman, I say that those people who are trying to cut out this appropriation in this bill might as well adopt a policy of saying that we could reduce the public debt entirely if we sold all of our resources, including our Navy, Air Force, and all of our defense installations, to the Soviet Union. There would be about as much soundness in that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in rising in support of the amendment which has been offered to restore a portion of the very severe cut in the Southwestern Power Administration I would like to make it very clear at the outset that I do not speak on this measure as a champion of either side in the controversy between public power and private power. The only cause which I seek to champion in the 83d Congress and in this debate is the cause of the Second District of Oklahoma, and I believe that cause is vitally affected by this legislation. In regard to public power and private power I am firmly convinced that each has a vital role to play on the American scene today, and I see no valid reason why the Government of the United States in this year of 1953 should undertake to destroy either public power or private power. In the State of Oklahoma great progress has been made toward the goal of achieving effective and efficient teamwork between private utility companies, the State power agency known as the Grand River Dam Authority, the rural electric cooperatives, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The Southwestern Power Administration has performed a vital role in coordinating and making more effective that teamwork in order to bring to the farm people of the State of Oklahoma the great benefits which have already been described here today by previous speakers.

Existing contracts of the Southwestern Power Administration call for expenditures of funds from the continuing fund in the amount of \$3,736,000. That is in the form of either contracts already concluded or contracts which have been tentatively agreed to and are before the Secretary of the Interior for his approval. It would appear from the fact that the revised budget which was submitted by the new Secretary of the Interior calls for the sum of \$3,736,000, that the Secretary of the Interior today feels that this amount is necessary in order to carry out these contractual obligations. These contracts, as I believe it has already been stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, include agreements with private utility companies of Oklahoma calling for \$112,000 a year. I have been assured by senior members of the subcommittee that the \$150,000 in the appropriation for the continuing fund will take care of contract obligations to Oklahoma private

utility companies. I am grateful for that assurance. I feel as a Member of the Congress representing a district that I have an obligation to represent the stockholders, the officers and directors of private utility companies the same as I have an obligation to represent the farm people of the Second District of Oklahoma. I believe these contracts with the private companies should be honored and should be respected and I believe that Congress should appropriate the money to meet these contract obligations to private companies as the subcommittee recommended that we do. But I can see no good reason, Mr. Chairman, for honoring contract obligations to private companies and refusing to honor contract obligations to associations of farmers in the State of Oklahoma or in other States of this Union.

I can see no good reason for appropriating money to meet the obligation of a contract with a private utility company and then refusing to appropriate money to meet the obligation of a contract with an REA cooperative.

If the reason for this cut is economy, I see no good reason for the application of rules of economy without uniformity and fairness to all authorized governmental functions.

You can look down the list of the different agencies covered by this subcommittee's bill, and I do not believe you will find a single agency in the United States covered by this bill that has been cut as severely as the Southwestern Power Administration.

You can look at the bill, and when you say that economy dictates a vote in favor of a cut, Mr. Chairman, when we vote for the Rayburn amendment that is before the House today we are making an economy move. The recommended figure for appropriations for construction for 1954 of \$1,500,000 has been deleted from this bill. A previous authorization for construction of over \$1,400,000 has been rescinded by this committee. The appropriation for operation and maintenance has been reduced by \$400,000. In this instance, in the case of the item for the continuing fund, covered by the Rayburn amendment, if we vote the Rayburn amendment we are still appropriating \$2 million less than the budget estimate called for which was first submitted to this committee.

It is an economy move. It is a vote in accordance with the pledges of both parties to vote in support of this bill. The Democratic Party platform the last election provided:

We will continue to fight to make electricity available to all rural homes, with adequate facilities for the generation and transmission of power.

What did the Republican Party platform say on the subject?

We urge the further development of rural electrification and communication—

Not support of existing REA's but further development of rural electrification and communication—

with federally assisted production of power and facilities for distribution when these are not adequately available through private enterprise at fair rates.

That was the Republican Party platform.

What did the leader of the Republican Party in the last election say about the subject? At Casson, Minn., on September 6, General Eisenhower stated:

We must be always concerned with developing rural electrification.

Not with supporting existing REA's, which this agreement with these companies might possibly take care of, but with developing rural electrification.

At Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, General Eisenhower said:

I have made clear the Republican support of the rural electrification program.

Those are the pledges of the two parties on this subject. It is not a party position to argue for this amendment. It is a position which is supported by the platform pledges of both parties, a position which is supported by the pledges on the campaign stump of the leader of the Republican ticket in last November's election. I think when those votes rolled in out in the Midwest and the farm areas, including the State of Oklahoma, which went for President Eisenhower by over 80,000 votes, those pledges with regard to rural electrification were in the minds and the hearts of the farm people of those States as they went to vote.

So I say to you today, if we really believe in this program we will vote in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let pass by without comment the rather noisy tirade put on by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. I would like to remind my colleagues and Mr. GAVIN as well that he has spent two-thirds of his time since being in the Congress heaping praise on the head of a famous Punxsutawney groundhog he has up there, and I sure am glad at this late date that he has found out there are 10 million other good citizens in the State of Pennsylvania besides that groundhog.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the question under discussion. In the early depression days, at the time of the initiation of the REA program, there were in the mountain State of West Virginia, less than 3 percent of the farm people that had electricity. As soon as it was possible, a unit of the REA was set up. It happened to be in my district. It was so popular that they had more requests for the extension of their services than they had finances. When I came to the Congress in 1945, one of the first things I did was to negotiate a couple of loans for them. No sooner had I done that, than the power company over in the Monongahela Valley came along and said, "My goodness, Congressman, do not do that, we have decided that we will extend service to all those people, and why build up this REA unit right here in the center of our activities?" I said, "Well, the best way you can answer my question is to get to work." The power company did go to work, and in 1 year they put electricity in 12,000 farm homes. They have been keeping it up, and today we

have nearly 80 percent of the farm homes of West Virginia being serviced. But the only reason they did get it was this yardstick in the form of the REA unit. I am for this proposition offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] for the simple reason that it sets up a yardstick which forces action upon the part of the private utilities to extend service. What I am after is service to the farm people of this country. I will not be satisfied until 97 percent instead of 80 percent of the farm people in West Virginia are served. I sincerely hope the committee will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader. I do so because this item is vitally important to the rural sections and many of the municipalities in the southwestern part of the United States. In Oklahoma a very fine plan has been worked out between all those who generate, transmit or sell electricity including the State of Oklahoma, through the Grand River Dam authority, the rural electric cooperatives, including generating and transmitting cooperatives, and the private utilities of the State of Oklahoma. From conversations which I have had with representatives of all groups, I was under the impression that everybody is not only satisfied but delighted by the arrangement which they have made. Everybody feels, if I have been properly advised, that we should carry out these contracts which the Southwestern Power Administration has already made with private companies and cooperatives in the State of Oklahoma and elsewhere in the Southwest. If we do not do this, somebody is going to suffer. The distinguished gentleman from Idaho a few minutes ago read from the decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas. But the item which we are sponsoring here today has nothing whatever to do with the matter involved in the Arkansas decision. Funds for that purpose have been specifically excluded both in the revised budget request and in the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. Unless the Congress accepts this amendment, new users are not going to find it possible to be served by the facilities which are serving the existing cooperatives and users in the Southwest.

Personally, I do not think the policies of this House should be written by any group, governmental or private. I certainly do not think that the policy of this Congress on this bill should be dictated by the chairman of a group of public utilities and president of a Louisiana power company who himself has said, if I have been properly advised, that he will not serve new users coming under this program in new areas.

It seems to me that a vote in the interest of sound legislation is a vote in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have yet to find a single Member of Congress who does not approve what we call the Texas contract, and that same principle has been applied in Oklahoma more recently. That is the arrangement under which the private power companies in the area carry power from these dams and distribute it to the REA agencies, municipalities, or anybody else. That arrangement involves no duplication. It means a saving of public funds. It means a saving of invested capital. It means the continued operation of private business. It means proper use of a public resource.

Now, how did we get the Texas contract? How did they get a similar arrangement in Oklahoma? We got it solely and only because we had the power to build the lines necessary to take the power from these publicly owned dams to the final user, if we needed to do so. I grant you that the Texas Light & Power Co. is headed by a man whom I consider to be the most enlightened and most progressive of all power executives I have ever met, Mr. Bill Lynch; but neither Mr. Lynch nor any other power executive would have had the power with his own company to put over such a contract at that time had it not been for the fact that the public agencies had a loaded shotgun behind the door.

The President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget have in effect said, "Keep that shotgun." President Eisenhower's budget said keep that shotgun behind the door and we will pay for the shells. But the committee met and took the shells out of that shotgun, and did so in the presence of the very people who are proposing to hamstring all public power. You did not even go back behind the barn to do it, Mr. JENSEN. You did it in public. You took the shells out of the shotgun right in Mr. Wilkes' presence and then you said to those people in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri: "You are protected. You still have the same old gun." Yes, they have got the gun, but they have no shells in it, and Mr. Wilkes of the Southwest Gas & Electric Power Co. knows that full well. I predict that unless you put those shells back in that gun you will never have the Texas form of contract in these other places. You put those shells back and you will not have to shoot, you won't have to spend this money. Put those shells back and those people will get the same kind of deal in the rest of the Southwest that we now have in Texas and Oklahoma.

If you want the private power companies to share in the business and also in the obligations, you should encourage the further expansion of the Texas type of contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I would like to say, as one of the new Members of the House that I came here with the firm determination to make my own investigations about legislation and make my own decisions. I very quickly

found that that was humanly impossible, that oftentimes I will have to consider and accept the recommendations of those more experienced than I on many matters that come before us.

I discovered in this piece of legislation, to which this amendment is offered, that the Truman budget made available, from the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration, the sum of \$5,650,000 for costs in connection with electric power and energy. The Eisenhower administration recommends \$3,732,000. If I must accept the recommendation of any of those who have studied this matter thoroughly, much more thoroughly than most of us have had time to study it, I believe I prefer to accept the middle of the road recommendation of the Eisenhower administration which has already knocked \$122,973,200 from the Truman estimate for the Interior Department and which seeks the sum of \$3,726,000 provided for in this amendment.

The Republican committee of the House has reduced the total amount provided in the Truman budget by \$202,473,161. It has reduced the Eisenhower recommendations in the total sum of \$79,499,961. I am for economy, not false economy. I do not believe in being pennywise and pound foolish, especially when we are not appropriating, but only enabling, making available.

For these brief reasons, and others which I do not have time to relate, I am voting for this Eisenhower amendment bearing the name of our distinguished minority leader, Mr. RAYBURN.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those whose ox is gored every time I see money going out of the Treasury of the United States when I think it should not clearly and properly go, and this is one of the occasions. For that reason I feel impelled to take the floor and say just why.

Oklahoma is not involved in this situation, because Oklahoma has been provided for by the committee's operations.

The places that are involved are those where litigation has already been completed against them, in the Arkansas Supreme Court and also one where there is pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a suit for enforcement of section 5 of the flood-control law.

The thing that is cut out is the operation of a wheeling contract and where rental of transmission facilities where the REA outfits entered into a contract to build 8,000 miles of transmission lines which were, after 40 years rental payment, to belong to the Department of the Interior.

The Arkansas court has ruled them out, and the others are pending.

Your committee did not feel that it should under those circumstances provide funds for them. They can get all the power they need and all they want, I believe, just as cheap as they have been getting it the other way if this item is carried as it is. I hope the House will sustain the position of the committee,

because if we do not sustain the position of the committee on those things where it is not necessary to provide Federal funds, this country is in a terrible way. We have got to meet our responsibilities, the responsibilities are heavy upon us, and we should not try to be selfish; we should not try to do things which would transgress the authority that has been given to these agencies by the law and the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman from Iowa to yield so that I may read a telegram I have just received from the president of the St. Joseph Light & Power Co., of St. Joseph, Mo., as follows:

ST. JOSEPH, Mo., April 28, 1953.
Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,

Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Respectfully ask your support on the floor today of the Jensen subcommittee action reducing appropriations for Southwest Power Administration. Contrary to reports being circulated, no person in northwest or central Missouri will be deprived of service by elimination of the continuing fund. The only purpose of that fund is to enable SPA to acquire extensive transmission and generating system in Missouri, for which the Congress has denied direct appropriation. The reinstatement of the continuing fund would certainly jeopardize the accomplishment of contracts being negotiated by companies and SPA as directed by the Congress of the Department of Interior.

C. A. SEMRAD,
President, St. Joseph Light & Power Co.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that there is no construction of transmission lines involved in the pending amendment. Whether it is adopted or not there will not be 1 inch of transmission line built. So there is no transmission lines building program involved in the amendment.

Let me read to you the amount of money which these 12 companies, these private utility companies, have paid in local, State, and Federal taxes in the last few years. In 1951 they paid \$58,120,078; in 1952, \$65,351,706; in 1953 they estimate \$76,033,702, and in 1954—that is this fiscal year coming on—\$81,147,334, which amounts to almost 4 mills for every kilowatt-hour they produce. Think of it, in local, State, and Federal taxes they pay almost 4 mills for every kilowatt-hour of power they produce.

Mr. Chairman, the private utility companies have been doing a good job for many years past. They have gone out and built transmission lines; they have furnished power to the "skim-milk areas" in every part of the United States. They have built hundreds of thousands of miles into the skim-milk areas, so to speak, as well as the cream areas.

It has been said that this committee has not followed the revised budget. Let me say that if we had followed the revised budget there would have been at least three irrigation projects which would have had no funds at all so far as this bill is concerned. We put them right back in because this committee, I

am sure, knows better what this country needs than a lot of folks downtown.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 107, noes 142.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. ALBERT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 133, noes 173.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 2, line 24, after "energy", insert a comma and the words "and rentals for the use of transmission facilities."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a perfecting amendment, which is identical with the language that was in the bill last year, that is, the bill for the fiscal year 1953. It was an oversight that the committee did not put the language in this bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take 5 minutes but I am going to take a minute to make the observation that on this last standing vote not a single person was observed to be standing on the left hand—Republican—side of this aisle as I now face it. I did not think this was a partisan situation of trying to continue this power for the REA through the Southwestern Power Administration. If I have made a misstatement, I would like anybody on the Republican side of the aisle who voted for the amendment to please stand.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not know it was a partisan issue until the gentleman said that you folks all voted—

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. I did not say that. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that. I said not a Member from your side voted for it.

Mr. JENSEN. And you raised the question.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I raised the question and I still invite anybody on that side that would like to get themselves on record to say that they voted for it. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$38,300,000.

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. FOST: On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$38,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,420,000."

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment I have offered this afternoon. My amendment would restore \$120,000 for the Idaho

Panhandle. It is deleted on page 5 of the Interior Department Appropriation Report. This appropriation request was made by the Bonneville Power Administration, for the construction of a transmission line between Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and Troy, Mont., and for the erection of a substation at Troy, Mont.

I would not take the valuable time of my colleagues, if I did not know this appropriation is vital to the people of my district, Idaho, and if I were not absolutely convinced that this cut is false economy.

I say it is false economy because this is not a new project. The Bonners Ferry-Troy transmission line is not a new line. Already \$750,000 has been obligated, and in fiscal 1954 we need only \$120,000 to complete the construction and an estimated \$35,000 for clean-up work in 1955.

Mr. Chairman, here is a \$905,000 project almost completed. All rights-of-way have been secured. All materials have been purchased and are on the site. The clearing contract for the line is 51 percent complete. Here is an extension line that was started in 1950, and was scheduled for completion this fall. All that remains to be done is to set the poles and string the line. We need \$120,000 so the power can flow over the line to serve the growing needs of the farmers in northern Idaho.

The Northern Lites, Inc., a cooperative which serves 2,500 farms and homes in northern Idaho and Montana, has already constructed 100 miles of distribution lines in anticipation of this additional power.

At present, power is carried long distances over low-voltage lines which are not adequate. This new line and substation offer the most economical method of meeting the area's increasing needs for power.

Without this appropriation, the Government cannot begin to receive revenues from the thousands of dollars already invested in this facility. Without this appropriation to complete the transmission line and substation, the farmers will not receive the power, and they, in turn, will not be able to repay their loan from the Rural Electrification Administration. So again the Government will lose.

A radar station, YAK, is located in western Montana, and is another anticipated receiver of this power. This radar station is highly important to the defense of the country. If the facilities are not completed, the only source of power for the radar station is diesel plants, which would be very expensive for the Government to operate.

So the Government stands to lose, just as do the farmers and the home owners in my district, if this \$120,000 appropriation request is not restored. To deny these funds is not economy—it is waste.

We have already spent \$750,000; let us go the rest of the way; let us appropriate the \$120,000 to complete the project. This appropriation is a matter of economy of good sound business. I hope you will vote in favor of my amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, all thoughtful Americans recognize there is a great need for economy in Government. We are spending billions of dollars annually more than is obtained in revenue from taxes. The budget must be balanced if our people are to escape further inflation and ultimate national bankruptcy. Taxes must be reduced in order that every American family can retain more of its own money to spend on its own needs.

We of the Pacific Northwest recognize this need for economy. We are willing to cooperate in obtaining that economy. We of the Pacific Northwest do not object that this committee has cut the amount appropriated for Bonneville power line construction below last year's expenditures. We do say, however, that the committee has cut it too deeply—much too deeply.

Last year, \$66,523,000 was spent for new power lines in the Pacific Northwest by the Bonneville Power Administration. Secretary Douglas McKay of the Interior Department is a good, sound and realistic businessman. He realizes as much as any of us that we must have economy in the Federal Government and that to obtain it, costs and expenditures must be reduced in all departments of Government.

Secretary McKay, who is President Eisenhower's spokesman on power development matters, recommended that instead of spending \$66,523,000, the sum spent for Bonneville power line installation last year, that this item be reduced to \$55,200,000 for the coming year.

The Secretary McKay proposal would have saved \$11,323,000. This would be a saving of 17 percent on the amount spent last year. This 17 percent saving, if applied to every department and agency of the Federal Government, would represent a total saving of \$12 billion, under last year's budget. That would be enough to balance the budget and leave enough over for a substantial tax reduction.

We of the Pacific Northwest raised no protest against this 17-percent reduction in Bonneville power-line appropriations. We were willing to take that reduction uncomplainingly in the interest of doing our part toward obtaining a balanced budget.

But the committee was not satisfied with the \$11,323,000 saving on Bonneville power line and substation funds proposed by Secretary of the Interior McKay.

Instead of granting the \$55,200,000 appropriation asked by Secretary McKay, the committee proposes that only \$38,300,000 be provided for building Bonneville lines and substations. This represents a cut of \$23,223,000 from the \$66,523,000 spent last year. This is a reduction of 41 percent and, in my opinion, is an unreasonably large and unrealistic reduction. It is entirely out of line with reductions being made in other agencies and departments. Such a reduction will prevent the construction of power lines to keep pace with the increased generation of electricity soon to be available due to the completion of several great Columbia River power dams that even now are nearly finished.

The Pacific Northwest would have been agreeable to the 17-percent reduction proposed by Secretary McKay, but we are not agreeable to the 41-percent reduction proposed by the committee. We sincerely hope the other body will restore the amount—\$55,200,000—Secretary McKay, as the spokesman for President Eisenhower, proposed.

The Bonneville Power Administration last year sold 15,900,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Bonneville officials now estimate that they will market 48 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity in 1960, only 7 years from now. In short, in 1960, Bonneville will sell three times as much power as that agency sold last year.

The Bonneville Power Administration last year had \$38,300,000 receipts from the sale of power. In 1960, it is estimated, it will have receipts from the sale of power of \$115,700,000. In short, the Bonneville Power Administration in 1960 will be doing three times the business it did in 1952.

If a trucking company expanded its business volume from \$38 million to \$115 million, as Bonneville power is doing—a threefold increase—that trucking company would need more trucks to handle its expanding business. If a railroad had a threefold expansion in the freight it carried it would require additional locomotives and freight cars. Based upon the same reasoning, commonsense should dictate that the Bonneville Power Administration, when its business triples, will need more power lines.

It is going to do no good to generate more power if we do not build the facilities to deliver that power to the consuming centers.

These power lines are not costing the taxpayers of this Nation one cent. The Bonneville Act provides that Bonneville power must—and I emphasize the word must—charge sufficient rates to return to the Federal Government within 50 years all the money used to build these dams and power lines, and pay all the expenses of operating and maintaining them. Not only does the Bonneville Act provide that sufficient rates must be charged to return all of this money but also that the money must be returned to the Federal treasury within 50 years with 2½ percent interest on that money during the time the Bonneville Administration is using it. In other words, the power dams and power lines do not cost the taxpayers of the Nation anything. The Government gets back every dollar invested in these dominant powers and it gets that money back with interest.

The Bonneville Power Administration, already, after paying all costs of operation, maintenance and interest, has returned to the Federal Government \$83,578,000 toward paying off the principal of the money so far advanced for dam and power line construction. In addition to this it has paid the Government more than \$63 million in interest.

Secretary of the Interior McKay, who formerly was Governor of Oregon, understands our western power problems. In a recent Meet the Press radio program, I heard him tell reporters that he was in favor of the completion of all power dams now under construction on the Columbia River. In saying that he

presumably was speaking the sentiments of President Eisenhower for as Secretary of the Interior he is the spokesman for the President on such matters.

These unfinished dams, now under construction, in which we have hundreds of millions of dollars invested, surely are going to be completed. We are not going to let them stand there unfinished to be nonproductive white elephants after we have invested so much in them.

When these dams are completed, most of them prior to 1960, we will be generating three or four times as much hydroelectricity as is now produced in the Columbia River Valley. Power lines are absolutely essential to getting the power generated from these dams to the consuming centers. Without power lines the electric energy generated by the new dams will be useless and go to waste. Failure to build the transmission lines to deliver the power the new dams generate to consuming centers would be a short sighted policy. It would, in my opinion, be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

I hope that when this bill goes to the other body that the Senate will provide the \$55,200,000 recommended by Secretary McKay as needed for next year's construction of Bonneville power line and substation facilities.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this item of \$120,000 which the gentlewoman from Idaho has asked be reinstated in the bill is one of many which the committee took from the bill for one very good reason: There came to Washington about 30 days ago representatives of the public utilities districts of that area, representatives of the municipal power companies of Seattle, Tacoma, and other cities, and a number of representatives of private utilities of the Bonneville area. They met here in Secretary McKay's office and explained to the Secretary that there were many items in this budget request for 1954 for the Bonneville Power Administration which they thought should either be deferred for the present time because the power was not yet available to be carried over these transmission lines and related facilities or which they would build with their own money. They stayed here for more than a week going into this entire matter of the Bonneville Power Administration request. They worked with the Department of the Interior officials and with the Bonneville Power officials here in Washington. They came up with this list of projects which you will find in the report on page 5, and they recommended that some items on that page be deleted from the bill, including the Idaho Panhandle line. We deleted them in accordance with the wishes of all those representatives from the different areas and municipalities, and at the suggestion of the public utility district representative himself. There is one project that the public utility district representative, we are told, did not agree to, but it was not the project which is named in the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho.

The State of Montana is one of the States of this Union which has more surplus power than any other State in the

Union. The Montana Power & Light Company has done a magnificent job in furnishing transmission lines and power facilities for their people and they have worked in full cooperation with the REA's. There is no power problem or controversy in the State of Montana, let me assure you.

The pending amendment involves a proposition of running a transmission line to the lumber and mining industries of the State of Montana as is stated in the justification of the Department of the Interior for the Bonneville Administration. Because of the fact that there is a great surplus of power in Montana—in fact to a degree that they send power out of the State to other users where power is needed and into the Bonneville area also—certainly there is no need for the expenditure of \$120,000 which the group that came here representing all of these companies stated is not needed.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to some of the proposed cuts made by the committee for the Bonneville Power Administration for the ensuing fiscal year. While I am in full sympathy with the administration's program to cut out waste and unnecessary appropriations and in the general plan to reduce the cost of Government and balance the Federal budget, I do feel that in the interest of economy and good business judgment Federal agencies that are performing a useful and efficient function in Government should be supported.

The cuts made in the Bonneville Power Administration, however, are so drastic and so deep that they go beyond any such program for economy in Government and will result, in my judgment, in crippling an essential agency of Government which will result in great financial loss to the Government and inefficient service in an essential activity.

One of the most serious cuts made by the committee is the Dalles area service and McNary substation items where a reduction of \$2,284,000 is made, reducing the budget to a balance of \$480,000. I am advised by the Bonneville Power Administration that these items cover autotransformers which operate to obviate the necessity of installing additional transmission lines at very heavy expense. I am not an electrical engineer but I understand an autotransformer is a complicated electrical facility which serves the purpose of stepping up transmission power at its origin and then reducing it in the service area which results in making unnecessary the construction of costly transmission lines to carry heavy voltages from the generators at the power plant to the load centers. It takes some 3 years to secure this equipment and the order should be placed immediately in order to insure delivery in time for use in this load area.

Another meat-ax type of reduction is \$2,400,000 below the budget request of \$7,400,000 and a reduction of \$1,600,000 below the appropriation for 1953. This is for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Administration. This blow is so heavy that it will necessitate the closing down of much of the Bonneville

power operation and curtail the efficient service to the customers in the Pacific Northwest where hydroelectric power is so vital to its economy. Both of these cuts should be restored in the interests of good business judgment and sound economy.

It should not be overlooked that hydroelectric power administered by the Bonneville Power Administration is a profitable undertaking by the Federal Government and is returning to the Federal Government from the sale of power the entire cost of generating facilities, including interest and maintenance. The Bonneville Power Administration is ahead in its repayment program to the Federal Government for these expenditures.

Other cuts in construction and operating needs of the Bonneville Power Administration are so drastic as to cripple the efficiency of this important Administration. The total reduction proposed by the committee of \$16,800,000 from a budget request of \$55,200,000 is such a severe cut that it would prevent it from carrying on an efficient service to the Pacific Northwest area of our Nation. If the cuts in items for transmission lines are allowed to stand, when generators now under construction are completed, there will be no facilities for transmitting the power to the load centers. It will mean power can only be delivered to the consumers at the bus bar. Such a policy will be a death blow to the orderly development and sale of electric power. It will drastically curtail receipts for power by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Northwest is, I believe, a unique part of the United States, not only in its natural resources, but in its economy. This economy is largely based on the extraction or use of its natural resources—on timber and processing, on farming, on mining, on cattle and sheep, and on water- and hydro-power. Industrialization, which really began with the completion of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River about 15 years ago, is still in the initial stages.

Population is sparse compared with the industrialized regions east of the Mississippi. We have an area five times the size of New England but only a fraction of the people. Population is growing rapidly, however, in the Pacific Northwest. In the decade 1940-50 it increased 33 percent compared with 14 percent for the Nation as a whole.

In the decade 1950-60 it is estimated that the population of the region—which includes Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana west of the Continental Divide and that part of Wyoming drained by the Snake River—will total 5.7 million, or 1 million more than in 1950. As population increases the economy must be expanded. The best way to assure jobs to support all these people is, I think, to provide a basis for industrial expansion. And that means, as experience has shown us, the provision of adequate supplies of low-cost electric energy.

The Bonneville Power Administration has become the major source of electric power in the Pacific Northwest since it is now marketing 60 percent of the energy consumed in the region. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, BPA

sold 17 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity at the lowest wholesale rates in the country.

Bonneville is a growing agency, not in the sense customarily used to describe bureaucracy, but as a business operation. At the present time it sells energy generated at three Federal dams: Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse. Nine other Federal dams are under construction on the Columbia River and some of its tributaries. Bonneville will be the marketing agency for the power produced at all of them.

So it is in for considerable growth. The Federal system in the Pacific Northwest now has a January peaking capability of 2,573,000 kilowatts. Within 4 years, by 1957, January peaking capability will be 4,865,000 kilowatts, or almost doubled. Even with this increase the region will not have enough capacity to meet expected demands.

Bonneville must, therefore, plan transmission systems well ahead of the completion of the dams. It must build lines to take the power from the dams and deliver it where it will be most needed. A large part of the new power, I am happy to say, will go to new or expanding industries and to private and publicly owned systems serving industry, thus providing jobs for our growing population.

Bonneville requests \$54,300,000 for the coming fiscal year, of which \$47.2 million is for the construction of transmission and related facilities. Only \$1.5 million, by the way, is scheduled to go into my own district, the heavily populated Portland, Oreg., area.

I believe that all the money requested should be appropriated by the Congress, because only in this way will the people of the Northwest be assured that the transmission of electricity will keep pace with the growth in their power supply.

Mr. Chairman, in my recent discussion on the floor for the need for some additional authorizations for some Columbia Basin projects, I called attention to the power situation in the Pacific Northwest which is apropos in considering the budget of the Bonneville Power Administration now before us.

Every region in the United States must have an adequate energy base to support its economy.

The Pacific Northwest is deficient in oil and gas, and so far only a fraction of its coal deposits has been exploited. However, the region fortunately has a tremendous water resource. Thus, hydroelectric power is the region's supreme energy base.

Glacier-fed lakes high in the Canadian Rockies form the headwaters of the Columbia River. The Columbia River system, draining an area of 259,000 square miles—of which 85 percent lies in the United States—possesses characteristics unique among America's major streams. The river has an extremely high annual runoff with a rapid drop of more than 6,000 feet in its westward course to the sea through Canada and the heart of the Pacific Northwest. As a result, the Columbia lends itself readily to development for many purposes—power, irrigation, navigation, flood control, and recreation. It holds within its flow over one-third of the Nation's potential hy-

droelectric power—34 million kilowatts out of a total potential of 104 million kilowatts for the entire country. It can readily be seen that the Pacific Northwest depends on this unique hydroelectric resource as the energy base in its economy.

To utilize and conserve properly and to the fullest the natural resources of the Columbia River, we have a program for its comprehensive multiple-purpose development.

The maximum amount of power can be derived from a vast river by building run-of-river plants, such as Bonneville, along with power-and-storage dams like Grand Coulee. Operation of these projects independently of the balance of the system produces, in the aggregate, much less power than if they are operated as a unified whole. For this reason each dam planned for the Columbia must be viewed in relation to the system and not as an isolated unit.

Demands for electric energy in the Pacific Northwest have been growing swiftly. The average annual increase in requirements from 1940 through 1951 was 14 percent as compared with a national rate of 9 percent. Growth was particularly rapid in the early part of World War II, when new aluminum plants were built by the Federal Government in the region. Electric energy used in the region jumped from 7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1940 to 17 billion kilowatt-hours at the war peak in 1944. The aluminum industry accounted for most of the upsurge. By 1951 total regional use reached 30 billion kilowatt-hours. Since the war, the major expansion has been in residential and farm use, owing to growth of population, the extension of electric service to nearly every farm and home in the region, and augmented consumption by the average residential and farm customer.

In 1950 the census takers counted 4,700,000 persons in the Pacific Northwest, an increase of 33 percent since 1940, as compared with 14 percent increase for the Nation. By 1960, according to median estimates, the Pacific Northwest will have 5.7 million people. To provide jobs to support a million more people is one of the chief problems faced by the region. Industry, agriculture, and other economic activities must obviously expand in order to absorb the added manpower.

The anticipated growth in the region and greater dependence on electric energy for industrial expansion will require a proportionate expansion of power facilities to meet the demand. Potential power requirements are estimated to be 39 billion kilowatt-hours in 1953, 69 billion kilowatt-hours in 1958 and 93 billion kilowatt-hours in 1962.

Looking at the power development in the region, in 1940 the non-Federal public agencies and privately-owned utilities generated approximately 6½ billion kilowatt-hours with an installed plant capacity of about 1.7 million kilowatts, and the Federal Government, primarily from 2 generators at Bonneville Dam generated nearly one-half million kilowatts. By 1950, with all 10 generators installed at Bonneville and 15 generators at Grand Coulee, representing machine capacity of over 2.1 million kilowatts,

the Federal Government generated approximately 14½ billion kilowatt hours, and the non-Federal utilities with slightly over 2 million kilowatts of machine capacity generated approximately 12½ billion kilowatt-hours.

It is an established fact that without the power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams during World War II, this Nation's vast shipbuilding program and the enormous airplane production from aluminum produced from that power could not have been accomplished. Ever since the beginning of World War II the Northwest has made most significant contributions for the defense of this country. It is a critical defense area with very large military installations, including a navy yard, Army camps, huge airfields, the very important Hanford atomic energy plant, electrometallurgical plants such as aluminum, magnesium, ferroalloys, phosphorus, abrasives, chemicals, and the huge forest-products industries. Throughout this period the local public and private electric utilities in the region have been building all of the power projects that they could within the available sites and their financial resources. For example, from 1941 through 1946 these non-Federal utilities made capital expenditures totaling over \$104 million, from 1947 through 1951 an additional \$302 million, or put on a 15-year basis from 1941 to 1956, it is estimated that the non-Federal utilities in the area will have made capital expenditures for power projects totaling over \$1 billion—\$1,031,260,799. Unfortunately, this growth in power resources is not enough to meet the regional power needs to serve defense production and the national interest generally. The growth in power requirements in the region for the next several years will exceed 500,000 kilowatts each year—the equivalent of a hydroelectric plant the size of Bonneville Dam every year.

Because of the multiple-purpose nature of the development of the Columbia River system, the Federal Government has assumed a partnership and a responsibility to help meet the power needs of the region. The Federal program for generator installations at multipurpose projects contemplated the addition of capacity at times and locations necessary to insure orderly development of an economical power system consistent with the multipurpose development of the river as well as to satisfy total demands.

The existing Federal program consists of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, with power installations completed, and two of four generators installed at Hungry Horse Dam, installed in the fall of 1952. The two remaining generators at Hungry Horse will be installed by the winter of this year. Projects now under construction are the Detroit, McNary, Big Cliff, Albeni Falls, Lookout Point, Dexter, Chandler, Chief Joseph, Palisades, and the Dalles Dams.

Thus we have, at present, in the Northwest 2,614,900 kilowatts installed capacity on the Federal system and 2,345,000 kilowatts installed by local public and private utilities. There is now under construction or scheduled on the local utilities systems an additional 1,487,000 kilowatts, with total additional possibilities remaining of 573,000 kilo-

watts. The Federal program under construction, if the schedules are maintained, will add to the system in the period 1953 to 1957 nearly 2 million kilowatts of capacity. The total capacity for the region by 1957, accordingly, will be 8,392,900 kilowatts of capacity. This entire regional program will barely meet the known requirements in the year 1957.

In September of 1952, the Pacific Northwest experienced a critical power shortage. The shortage was the result of insufficient rainfall in the region during the summer and autumn. Many parts of the region had witnessed the driest period of record. Interruptible power, which is sold on an if and as available basis on the Federal system, was curtailed to its full extent of 383,000 kilowatts. Most of this interruptible power was going to the aluminum plants. Later as the regional power supply became more critical, the Defense Electric Power Administration found it necessary to issue an order providing a quota limitation on power uses by customers using more than 8,000 kilowatt-hours per week. This limitation cut by 10 percent the power use of large industries in order to assure continued service to essential residential and commercial consumers who were customers of utilities having a deficiency of power on their systems. Many other measures of conserving use of electricity, such as brown-outs, and so forth, were resorted to in order to alleviate the situation. The total curtailment in both interruptible and firm loads amounted to approximately 500,000 kilowatts, the equivalent of Bonneville Dam. In January of 1953, warm weather and heavy rainfall increased streamflows in the rivers sufficiently so that with the controlled use of water stored behind existing storage-dams such as Grand Coulee, along with use of the available steam-electric resources all the loads in the region were able to be carried and the curtailment order was lifted.

If the projects which are now under construction remain on schedule, current estimates of loads and resources indicate that all firm power requirements of the region can be met, even under critical water conditions, through the 1956-57 winter season, and provide about 120,000 kilowatts to meet new industrial requirements for the region. This is only a fraction of the estimated potential industry that would come to this area by 1956-57 if power were available. It is estimated that 1,200,000 kilowatts of firm power could be sold to expand the industrial economy of the region.

Beyond 1957, however, after the generators in the Dalles project are completely installed, the power supply picture will again worsen very rapidly unless new projects are constructed. At least 4 or 5 years are usually required from the initiation of construction to complete major multi-purpose structures of the type in the Columbia Basin which are needed to provide power in the Northwest.

Some of the projects should be upstream storage plants which will improve the production of plants now in operation and under construction.

Mr. Chairman, I have called attention to some of the drastic cuts in the budget of the Bonneville Power Administration for the ensuing fiscal year in the bill we are now considering, which, as I have said, unless restored will result in great hardship to the area served by this agency. We are suffering a great dearth of hydroelectric power in the area and I have taken occasion in these remarks to discuss the situation that exists in the Pacific Northwest with reference to power and the great potential we have in the area of this important commodity. Since we have no coal nor gas, hydro power is of prime importance to the area.

The Federal Government in conjunction with private utilities is working amicably and in joint cooperation to develop power in the Columbia River Basin and unless the Federal projects which are now in operation or under development are adequately financed by the Government great hardship will ensue.

I trust therefore, that before this bill is finally passed and sent to the President for his signature, most of these drastic cuts if not all of them will be restored so as not to leave the Bonneville Power Administration without the necessary finances to carry on and serve the public efficiently.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, coming from the western district of Montana which is draped over the Continental Divide I am, of course, interested in power and water resources. I come from the district that is at the headwaters of the two great rivers of this country—the Columbia River and the Missouri River.

The understanding of this great subcommittee has in the past brought to Montana a great deal of power. Your efforts in building the Hungry Horse Dam will bring 600,000 kilowatts to the State of Montana and it will bring to the Nation a new aluminum plant to develop light metals. We are grateful for the understanding this committee has shown and we assure you that the Canyon Ferry, Hungry Horse, and these other projects in Montana are welcome. We have cooperated in Montana along with the private utilities, the Montana Power Co.; however, the Montana Power Co. is not concerned in this specific amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho.

This terminal facility to the transmission line will be at Troy, Mont. It will run to the northern woods from Bonners Ferry, Idaho, to Troy, Mont. Troy is now served by a small independent power company, the Mountain States Power Co., a subsidiary of the J. Neills Lumber Co. The facilities of the Mountain States Power Co., are already overtaxed. Its transmission lines are taxed to the fullest extent. The city of Troy itself is supplied by a steam plant.

This steam plant was put into operation by the J. Neills Lumber Co. in order to utilize the bark and the edgings and the waste from their sawmills. Technological improvements have made it possible to use this waste material for more valuable purposes so that the steam plant now is operating at a lesser rate than it ever has in the past. There will be a

power shortage in this particular area in Lincoln County if this amendment is not passed. The gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Frost] told you that there is an important military installation in northern Montana that needs this power to supplement their diesel plant as a part of the national defense. The growth and expansion of the lumber industry in Troy and in Lincoln County is dependent upon the utilization and the supply of additional power.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. No justification was made to the committee that there was any defense plant involved.

Mr. METCALF. I assure the gentleman from Iowa that there is in northern Montana an important Air Force military installation that needs and is planning to use this power.

In addition to that there are 100 miles of REA line from the Northern Lights and the Lincoln Rural Electrification Administration lines that both rely upon power from this transmission line. Here is a power line that is 85-percent completed. The materials are purchased; the ground is clear; it is needed for defense installation; it is needed to develop the community in Troy and the lumbering communities in that area.

The other day the Committee on Appropriations in the supplemental appropriation bill—and God bless them—brought in an appropriation of \$5 million for access roads to clear out the spruce-infested forests of northern Montana and northern Idaho. That will mean that every lumber mill and every sawmill in that area will have to operate to full capacity if we are to save that spruce timber for the Government of the United States. We are going to need this power out there. We were planning on energizing this line in November. It started in 1950; the contract was ready to go in November. Here is a line that you are discontinuing right at the point where it would become the most beneficial to the people. It is not in competition with any power company, and I hope that every member of the Committee will vote for this needed amendment.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Frost].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAGNUSON) there were—ayes 55, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I know the House has spoken with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. It was an important issue. I hope it will not be indicative of the attitude of the majority in the future with respect to power and with respect to transmission lines.

I, of course, voted for the amendment. I voted for the amendment because I thought it would be to the best interest of the people of this country that do not have the facilities of electric power, which I think the past record shows the private utility interests would not supply in sufficient detail.

I voted that way, Mr. Chairman, because I thought it was the right way to vote. I am not going to cast any reflection on anybody in the majority for the position he has taken.

Mr. Chairman, I think that indicates that I represent more than the interests of my particular district in Pittsburgh, Pa., which needs no additional power to be furnished through the help of the Federal administration.

I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, that without any exception I have always voted, as far as I can remember, for price-support programs, in behalf of the interest of the farmers of this country, of which I do not have any in my district. I did that, Mr. Chairman, because I thought it was for the best interest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I might also say that more than 50 percent of my time spent in the office, and perhaps on the floor of the House also, is spent in conference with the industrial interests of the country and of my district, and with the financial interests and also with all types of business interests, which are very well represented in the way of diversity of industry in the Pittsburgh area.

Mr. Chairman, I represented as best I could in this House unorganized labor and organized labor, and I also represented the civil servants of this country, elective civil servants and those who were appointed.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those Members of Congress who because of perhaps personal frustration tries to deride other Members of Congress or tries to belittle their efforts in any position they take.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those Members who practically every primary election are faced with a very, very difficult primary contest from their own party members and on occasion by efforts of the official party itself to defeat my candidacy. I am also not one of those Members who are faced with very vigorous opposition from the Republican Party in my district because, Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to represent that district fairly and justly.

So when a Member steps up here and attempts to ridicule and deride me, I think in my own defense I have the right to take the floor and say what I am saying now. I have no sense of personal frustration, as was indicated, in my opinion, by one Member here this afternoon, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can testify that of the great number of Members of this present Congress and the preceding Congresses that the gentleman has served in, there is no more progressive-minded, sound-minded, and no more visionary-minded or courageous-minded

Member of the Congress than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. There is no one who more ably or more courageously represents his district than the gentleman from Pennsylvania who now has the floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. For whatever value my opinions might be worth to the people of his district, all I can say is I highly commend them for their judgment—the Democrats in nominating him on primary day, and the people of his district in electing him on election day.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] describe in detail the hardships and the drudgery and the lack of facilities both for human beings and manufacturing and every other type of facility which we are enjoying today. I heard him describe with great joy the period through which he went as a young man. I do not want to charge him and I certainly do not charge him with the responsibility for speaking the philosophy of the Republican Party or of the leaders of the Republican Party or of the President of the United States. But, it seems to me when he describes with such obvious satisfaction that time 50 years ago, or 40 years ago, or 60 years ago, I do not know which, and enjoys such obvious relish in describing that period that he is advocating to the people of this country and to the Congress that that was the most joyous time that the country ever had, and we should go back to that time. I know the people of this country do not want to go back to the time when they had no electricity, and when the housewives went through all the drudgery and all that. But that seems to be the selling point that he made when he was speaking. Mr. Chairman, as I want to say, the Democratic Party believes in progress. We believe in taking advantage of all that is new in scientific inventions and all the new improvements, and everything that goes along with that and that such progress can bring to us. I do not think we will subscribe to the so-called good old days and want to go back to them. That seems to me to be the policy that he wants to pursue. Actually, he is speaking because he is so disappointed in life lately, you know, and the only satisfaction he enjoys these days is to think of the old times many years ago—it is too bad, my friends, it is too bad.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: On page 3, line 19, after the word "expended", strike out "\$38,300,000" and insert "\$42,608,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the appropriations for Bonneville Power Administration construction in fiscal 1954 by \$4,308,000.

Many millions of dollars more were eliminated from the budget request by the Appropriations Committee, but I am asking the restoration of this \$4,308,000 as the absolute minimum which the Bonneville Power Administration must

have to do the job which legislation of Congress directs it to do.

We in the Pacific Northwest, and particularly in my State of Washington, are dependent upon the United States Columbia River Power System for electric service. Sixty percent of the power used in my region comes to the people over the system of the Bonneville Power Administration from the Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and Hungry Horse Dams. My amendment would restore four construction items deleted from the budget by the committee. I would like to call your attention to the serious effect which these four recommended reductions will have upon electrical service to the people in my State.

The Bonneville Power Administration has under construction a transmission line from its Snohomish substation to its Kitsap substation near Bremerton, Wash. Part of this transmission line will be a 230-kilovolt submarine cable underneath Puget Sound. Over \$3.5 million were appropriated by the last Congress to construct this cable in order to avoid the construction of a transmission line all the way around the southern portion of Puget Sound. This decision meant a saving to the Government of \$2,500,000. A large share of the funds appropriated have already been obligated for the construction of this transmission line. All of the engineering for the facility is completed. It is too late to construct a substitute facility even if that were desirable. If this transmission line is not completed by the winter of 1955, the loads in Mason, Jefferson, Clallam, and Kitsap Counties in the State of Washington, including service to the Bremerton Navy Yard, will have to be curtailed. There is no way of getting adequate power to these people other than the completion of this transmission line. There is no explanation in the report of the committee as to why funds for this line have been eliminated. The sum my amendment would restore for this item is \$2,605,000.

The committee has also recommended the elimination of appropriations for transformers to be installed at McNary substation, adjacent to the new McNary Dam which will begin generating power this fall. These transformers are vital to the service in the Kennewick-Pasco-Richland area which has been growing so rapidly because of the expansion of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plutonium works. If the proposed transformers are not installed on time, service to this vital defense area will be in jeopardy. My amendment would appropriate \$1,538,000 for this project.

Another rapidly growing area in my State of Washington is the coastal area of Pacific County. In order to increase power deliveries to the Pacific County Public Utility District which serves this area, the Bonneville Power Administration plans to construct a short piece of 115 kilovolt transmission line from Naselle to Ilwaco and a new substation to serve the Long Beach area. Failure to construct these facilities will impose a serious hardship upon the customers of the Pacific County Public Utility District. The amount involved here is \$109,000.

Near Spokane, the Vera Irrigation District and the Inland Empire Electric Cooperative both obtain power at Bonneville's Valley Way substation. Loads of these customer-owned systems will overload the existing transformers at Valley Way if additional capacity is not added as proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee's report recommends deletion of this item, amounting to \$56,000. My amendment would restore it.

The people in Washington and the other Pacific Northwest States through their publicly and privately owned power distribution systems are more than paying the full cost of operating and maintaining the Federal Government's Columbia River Power System. The rates they pay the Government for power include interest and amortization payments on the Government's investment. To drastically reduce the grade of electrical service to these people, as the proposed cuts would do, would not only be poor economy, but also a breach of faith and contract with the Government's customers.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I was paying particular attention to the gentleman's statement concerning this transmission line around the McNary substation. I am watching that matter very closely in relation to this same legislation. I want to thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the State of Washington has embarked on a new program of State development through their last legislature to have a State Power Commission to tie in with the Federal program, and that we need a little time in the State of Washington to develop that program. If the Federal Government cuts us off, then we will have a very drastic power shortage about 1960.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the items which are included in this amendment, which the gentleman seeks to reinstate in the bill are items which the group which attended this meeting I spoke of earlier in the day has recommended for deletion from the bill. Regarding the transmission line from Snohomish to Kitsap, of which the gentleman speaks, the investigating staff which was employed by the Appropriations Committee of the House had this to say:

There is considerable question as to the justification and the reliability of service over the proposed transmission line, and a widespread belief that an alternate method of service to the area in question would be preferable. The staff is advised that a delay of 1 year in the construction of this or an alternate line could be had with little effect on service to the area in question. The staff

suggests that the committee deny fiscal year 1954 funds for this purpose and requests the Bonneville Power Administration to hold up any further work or obligating of funds from prior-year appropriations pending an independent and thorough study and report on the need for this line and whether an alternate method would be more reliable and economical in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, all of these items which the gentleman from Washington has included in his amendment and which he seeks to restore to the bill have had much consideration by the group that was here and by the staff which has been employed to investigate the Bonneville Power Administration's request for funds. Hence the committee went into this matter quite thoroughly. We asked many questions, as you will note in reading the hearings, and consequently the committee is obliged to oppose this amendment for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended; \$2,000,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 10, line 20, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,400,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to allow \$100,000 for investigations in the Territory of Alaska. Actually there are no dollar changes made in the bill by this amendment. As I say, it is simply to permit the Interior Department to expend the sum of \$100,000 for investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Territory of Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGREGOR). The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$18 million, of which \$15,820,290 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$2,179,710 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund, including (notwithstanding the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, relating thereto) operation and maintenance of Palo Verde weir: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 13, line 14, strike out "\$15,820,290" and insert "\$14,016,290."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment permits the Department of the Interior to expend \$1,804,000 out of the general fund of the Treasury instead of taking it out of the reclamation fund. It results in no dollar changes in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 12 percent of the construction allotment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation" contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for construction work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, under the heading of the Missouri River Basin, I am particularly interested in two projects. They are the Bostwick project and the Frenchman-Cambridge project. The committee has very kindly provided for the greater portion of the budget request for each of these projects.

It is my hope that the Bureau of the Budget, together with the Bureau of Reclamation will, however, take a further look at the situation in the Republican Valley. We either have completed or have about completed all of the dams necessary for these two projects. This has been at the cost of many millions of dollars.

The sooner that this water is distributed to the farmers the better it will be for all concerned. It will cut down the administrative overhead, and will hasten the increased production in the area, and the repayment to the Government. The budget recommendations of the outgoing administration were such that the ultimate completion of these projects will be delayed a full year longer than

they should be. This is not the economical way to proceed.

I hope that before this bill becomes law we can have a budget recommendation for sufficient funds for the Bostwick project and the Frenchman-Cambridge project to complete their entire distribution systems.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the committee on this Interior Department appropriation bill. It adequately provides for the continued rapid construction of bona fide reclamation projects. It increases the appropriations for Indian Health and Welfare Services. It will permit accelerated surveys of the public domain, so necessary to States such as my own, in order that they may receive a share of revenue owed them by the Federal Government through land allotments.

Many of my friends from across the aisle are attempting to make us believe that this bill will set back the reclamation program. In evidence they point to the cuts and consolidations proposed by the bill.

I say to them at this time, that such cuts and consolidations will advance the program. The bureau on the local level has had a fine reputation in my home State. The Regional Director and most of his employees have earned and merited the support our people give to the bureau. However, this is not the case in many areas and particularly in Washington, D. C. Here in Washington and often in district offices throughout the rest of the reclamation States, we hear continued reports that overstaffing of bureau personnel is adding unduly to the cost of repayment of reclamation projects. It has even been reported that the overhead cost chargeable to the bureau has been the cause of some projects being uneconomical and unfeasible.

The criticism of any office of the Bureau affects the future of the program. As criticism mounts, the people of the nonreclamation States begin to doubt the value of the entire program. It is up to representatives of the reclamation States to support a general reduction in administration expenditures when this reduction will produce greater efficiency, save the taxpayers money and—what's more important—heighten the reputation of the Bureau in those areas where the benefits—while great—are not so visible and direct as they are in the States in which the projects are constructed.

There will be the usual Jeremiahs who for personal reasons will travel up and down the land howling that the new Congress has—by making these cuts—doomed the reclamation program. But I cannot defend, and my people back home would not want me to defend, continued high or increasing administration appropriations to a Bureau whose personnel has increased from a total of 7,000 employees in 1945 to nearly double that

this year. I cannot defend continued high expenditures for airplanes to a department which already has 64 operating aircraft. I cannot defend increased appropriations for a department which now has 6,700 motor vehicles for Government officials and employees to ride around in.

The appropriations that I can defend are those which the committee has left virtually intact. The appropriation for Weber Basin project which is vital to the defense of the Nation and to the continued growth of my district was cut by \$1,700,000 under the budget request of the former administration. On examining the effects of the cut—and after consulting with reclamation officials in my State—I find that the committee has allowed all the funds for the next fiscal year that the Bureau needs and could profitably expend. In fact, I have been informed, should the entire amount requested in the Truman budget have been appropriated, the Bureau could not have used the funds during the next fiscal year anyway. Evidently, they were set too high to embarrass the new administration; to make it appear that Congress by setting them at the level they have in this bill, was attempting to delay the construction of the project.

The other project under construction in my district has been cut \$200,000. This represents the amount the former administration had set up for a power plant at Deer Creek Dam. The question of who is to build this power plant—the association which has contracted to repay the Government for the cost of the project or the Federal Government—is still under consideration. Certainly, I feel that the association should be given the chance to designate the builder of the facility.

This bill does not, of course, give Utah everything it would like. We feel that the committee perhaps cut a little too deeply into advance investigation funds. However, we expect that much of this cut can be compensated for by increased efficiency in operation and I am sure the committee—if time proves that the cut has been too drastic—will consider a supplemental appropriation bill.

The people of my State realize that they must not expect to get all they want in the way of appropriations. They know we must balance the budget and they expect a tax reduction. I am sure they are willing to go along with reasonable economy measures affecting their direct interests and they will expect the people of the other States of the Nation to do the same in instances where their special interests are hit.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private lands, with the consent of the owner; \$12,178,814: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment of a sum equal to not

less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds provided under the authorization of this act except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation and supervision.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 20, line 5, strike out "\$12,178,814" and insert "\$13,395,918."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 20, line 5, strike out "\$12,178,814" and insert "\$15,842,222."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday this item was discussed at considerable length. You will recall that during the discussion it was brought out that certain funds were eliminated for the demonstration plant at Rifle, Colo.; at the same time funds were eliminated to put in standby the plant at Louisiana, Mo.

During the debate I realized that there was considerable merit in the argument advanced that maybe we did go a little bit too far as far as Rifle is concerned. The administration and the Bureau of the Budget had allowed some funds for the continuation of Rifle. The committee, however, in their deliberations in the markup of the bill, taking into consideration the argument of the administration and the Bureau of Mines that the reasons for putting Louisiana in a standby condition was simply because they had reached that stage in research, felt that it was no longer necessary to go to the additional expense of that great plant, that had done so much in research for developing oil from coal.

However, the committee was told that the plant at Rifle had advanced even further in their research of developing oil from shale, so we thought that plant, too, could be put in standby and we allowed funds for that plant to be put in standby. I took it up with the Secretary of the Interior and asked him whether or not they were really anxious to keep that program going at Rifle for a year or two longer and they, of course, said they were. They thought it would be a great disservice to discontinue it at this time. So, I am simply restoring the amount that the administration wishes for the functioning of that plant for this coming fiscal year.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for information. The gentleman proposes to restore money for the operation of what plant?

Mr. FENTON. Rifle, Colo. So, it is the committee wish to reinstate this item, and it has the consent of all the membership of the subcommittee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the committee on reconsideration realize they have gone too far. Of course they have gone too far, and it is to be hoped they will not become weary of well doing and stop half way on the way back.

Oil is the most indispensable commercial commodity in the world today. It is as a matter of fact merely a matter of time, war or no war, before the great reservoirs of oil will be exhausted. Already in every oilfield wells are being pumped dry, and the demand for fuel grows.

In order to meet this situation the Government established a number of plants, only two of which need be mentioned here. One was the plant at Rifle, Colo., which the gentleman proposes to reinstate. It deals only with shale. It does not deal with coal. He merely wishes to continue the study of oil processed from shale at the Rifle plant and abandon the study of coal at the Louisiana plant, the Government simultaneously established a plant which is studying the processing of oil from coal, low-grade coal, much of it ineligible for commercial quotation. So he is presenting the rather remarkable proposition here of discontinuing the processing of coal for oil and substituting the processing of shale for oil. Of course, so far as oil is concerned, the source of it is not material. Oil from either shale or coal is.

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

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman's amendment also restore the funds to continue the experimental work at Gorgas, Ala., in underground coal gasification?

Mr. CANNON. This proposes to carry on simultaneously the study of oil processed from shale and oil processed from coal. Certainly we should not overlook this possibility of providing a great industry with natural resources.

I may say also in connection with this that in addition to oil we provide something that has not been mentioned before but something that is very essential. All through the Central West there has been a famine of electric power.

We had at this plant at Louisiana a standby generator. This one generator was capable of developing power sufficient to supply many cities. It was not intended for commercial service. It was a spare tire to be used only in case of emergency. But power was greatly needed through the area. After considerable discussion we got through the committee a proposition to start up this generator, and sell the power wholesale to both private and public power agencies, with no distinction. It has been supplying the last 2 or 3 years this much needed amount of electric power. It has been marketed and the Government has received a very substantial sum, whereas the generator would otherwise have lain idle rusting out and the people over a vast area would have been without sufficient power.

This situation which has proven of such benefit to the United States Treasury and to the consuming public in need

of power, will have to be discontinued if the pending amendment is defeated. The bill authorizes a continuation of production and distribution of current by the plant but the funds necessary to keep the revolving fund at work and keep the generator running have been taken out by the committee and cannot be restored unless you approve this amendment.

It should not be difficult to reach a decision on this amendment. On one side, it provides oil in limitless quantities both for peace and war. In the second place it rehabilitates a great industry and starts the mines and provides employment for the miners. In the third place it brings into the Treasury a large amount of revenue it would never get. And last, it provides power and light for a great famine area where electric energy is needed for both public and private utilities and by both resident families and large business enterprises.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, had the gentleman been here yesterday during general debate, during the entire time, because I know he was here during part of it, he would not have missed my remarks on this particular bill. I believe, if he will recall, that the reason advanced by the administration and by the Bureau of Mines for putting in standby position the plant at Louisiana, Mo., was a very good reason, in my opinion. They have been experimenting there with two types of research. It has been found that they have reached the point with those two particular types of research that they have pretty nearly come to the commercial price of gasoline and oil. So they have discovered another type of research which they call the one-step research method. I believe it is the Pelipetz process, and they can go right down the line at less expense. Certainly, it is more modern. Of course, we do not want to continue types of research that will be becoming more or less obsolete. That is the only reason that the administration is asking that this plan be put in a standby status for the time being. Certainly, the gentleman has no reason to worry about the government continuing its research and development of oil from coal. I happen to come from the coal fields and I am very much interested in the coal mines, and in the development of oil from coal. So I hope the gentleman will not infer that anyone on this committee, or infer that I, particularly, am trying to throttle research and development of synthetic fuel.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says we have almost reached the point where oil can now be produced and sold at the current price of gasoline. Is not that the reason why we should go ahead and finish the work and reach the point of actual competition? Why should we stop just short of success and let these private industries who are anxious to control this plant get the patents? Why

should we not go ahead and let the Government finish it and hold the patents? It is a question of who is going to control this monopoly—the private industries or the people?

The gentleman has proposed only one plant that confines the recovery of oil to one source. It does nothing for the coking coal industry. It deals only with shale.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the gentleman knows that private industry certainly would not want to get obsolete patents. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri and support the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman spoke on this amendment several times yesterday. Certainly the gentleman has had plenty of time. He can develop his argument in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. It is now 5 minutes after 5. We passed daylight saving time yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is not well taken at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, you will note that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] proposes to restore funds to operate the Rifle, Colo., plant—oil shale to oil plant. The gentleman has changed his mind in this connection since yesterday. The oil shale in this country is very much concentrated. In fact, 1 State has one-half of the total, 2 States 80 percent, and 5 States 98 percent. Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Nevada are the States where the shale is concentrated. We find some oil shale down in Indiana and Kentucky.

I have nothing against scientific research in this field. In fact, I feel that the funds should be restored for the Rifle, Colo., plant. On the other hand, coal is our most abundant mineral fuel, and scattered throughout the United States. In fact, the coal reserves are so abundant that they have more than 100 times the energy value of all known petroleum and natural-gas reserves combined.

I cannot go along with this line of reasoning. Here we are willing today to restore funds to operate the plant, making oil from oil shale. On the other hand, we have the plant in Louisiana, Mo., which has proved successful in making oil from coal that is being closed.

Where would we get our oil in the event of an all-out war and all of our supplies were cut off from the Near East? We cannot afford to let any selfish group

endanger the defenses in this country. Yesterday I asked the committee the question whether any assurance could be given that the Communists are also scuttling their research programs. We can with profit recall that it was not until the German scientists had perfected the synthetic ammonia process to take nitrogen from the abundant supplies in the air to make explosives, thus freeing them from the faraway Chilean nitrogen deposits, that they were ready to start World War I.

I regret to see this committee scuttle the coal-to-oil program here today. This proposal to put the plant on a standby basis is all a camouflage. The Department has the authority to dispose of the plant, and undoubtedly will dispose of it. Let us not destroy our progress made at this plant. Let us support the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. The United Mine Workers of America are vitally interested in the welfare of the coal industry just like numerous Members of Congress here today. The continuation of this demonstration process will contribute immensely to the welfare of the coal industry.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman. I cannot quite understand the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] to the effect that the research into the reduction of oil from coal is proceeding. Now, where is the plant that is making it?

Mr. PERKINS. It is not proceeding; they are destroying it. They eliminated the funds, and they are going to dispose of this plant.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is what I want to make plain.

Mr. HAGEN of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice in protesting cuts in those budget items of the Department of Interior which would have made provision for a logical, orderly, timely, and economical development of the power benefits to be derived from Federal reclamation projects.

The action of the Appropriations Committee in virtually eliminating appropriations for construction of features for firming up and delivering public power is truly false economy and is a repudiation of a policy established under the urging of Theodore Roosevelt, a truly great Republican President.

Federal reclamation policy is based on the premise that we cannot afford the wastage and nonuse of valuable resources of land and water and the opportunity for productive activity by our citizens. Our present war crisis adds a military significance to this premise. The premise that such wastage or nonuse will occur in the absence of Federal activity by reason of the scope of the task and the need for a skilled directing agency completes the circle of reasoning

which has traditionally justified Federal expenditure in the reclamation field.

Assuming the validity of these premises and the necessity for action established thereby, and I may say parenthetically that no one challenges the premises or the necessity, the question arises how can the job be done with the utmost resource conservation and a minimum cost, if any, to the taxpayer, who receives no direct benefit therefrom. We westerners who are the chief beneficiaries of the reclamation program recognize that this question is a crucial one because Congress will not vote huge subsidies for the benefit of a few selected areas. The principle of some acreage limitation and the public power preference clauses are a corollary recognition of the principle that Federal activity is only justifiable on behalf of that sufficient number of people with respect to whom it can be said that the impact of their successes or failures affect the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Costs and benefit studies reveal the answer to this question. The job could be done without cost to the taxpayer by complete utilization of hydroelectric potentials in irrigation projects by the building of multipurpose dams and related power facilities.

It was a further conclusion that the economics of the average farm did not permit purchase of irrigation water by the farmer at a price which would be a complete repayment of his irrigation benefit and that in the absence of a solution permitting the charge of a lesser subsidized cost without cost to the taxpayer no reclamation projects could be authorized by the Congress. A lack of solution to this question would have been the rock that foundered these projects for the reason that lack of a large class of farmer beneficiaries would have tipped the scale against project justification.

Fortunately it was discovered that the production and sale of hydroelectric power by the Government was so profitable that a part of the return therefrom could be used to amortize costs attributable to irrigation benefit and permit an assigned lesser water cost for farmer beneficiaries without endangering the solvency of the projects.

In the case of the Central Valley project in California the irrigation subsidies amount to 23.8 percent of every dollar collected from power sales. Cost and income studies show with respect to this project that all irrigation and power costs will be repaid in a period of 50 years with interest at 3 percent on costs allocable to power development paid into the Federal Treasury. At the end of that period the Government will own a source of revenue which could be used to sweeten the Federal Treasury or further reduce the cost of irrigation with Federal water and the farmer will be receiving a bargain water supply.

The Central Valley project in California has been the subject of much controversy. It has been under constant attack by the power lobby and by corporation farmers who want more of this subsidized water than the average farmer can use and is entitled to. In addition, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation has

made mistakes which have justified criticism.

We representatives from rural California who have a sincere interest in the welfare of the majority of our farmers and who refuse to be subsidized at election time by the power companies and the corporation farmers—at a price—recognize the validity of the complaints of bureaucracy and inefficiency. At the same time we are not ready to turn our backs on Federal reclamation during a time of growing water shortages. We recognize the necessity of these justifications of Federal expenditures and conclude that Federal water development will cease without any sure prospect of local agencies filling the breach if historic justifications are violated.

In this connection we farmer legislators conclude that—no less than eastern legislators our California colleagues from the cities—would oppose projects which are of sole benefit to our farm people. We recognize that reclamation would fail if the dwellers in the cities and city industries would fail to receive some benefit. At the same time we recognize that benefits transmitted to our city people in time benefit the farmer through increased development of industry and increased markets for farm products.

Attacks have been made on contracts executed between the Government and preference agencies in California with respect to power costs. The fact is that the price charged permits the amortization and subsidy I have mentioned and carries out the principle of the broadest public benefits in justification of Federal activity. The same price will apply to any irrigation district desiring to transmit to its people the maximum benefits from Federal reclamation.

The argument of free enterprise posed against Federal power development has little validity. The Government is not seeking to eliminate privately owned utilities in disposing of Government power according to the standards I have mentioned. The fact is that such power development would not have been authorized for the benefit of a monopoly corporation and the farmers would have been deprived of a needed supply of water. I believe in free enterprise and the utmost competition, but as a taxpayer I do not believe in public activity for a select category of persons or corporations well able to provide for themselves.

A power utility is in that category of public activity which is on the fringe of free enterprise in that it occupies a monopolistic position and is virtually guaranteed a profit by regulatory bodies and the fact of its monopoly, regardless of how efficient or inefficient is its operation.

Truthfully, the development of public power introduces a measure of competition into this field and this measure of competition has resulted in greater standards of efficiency and lower prices to the power consumer. No doubt it also has exercised a salutary effect on State regulatory bodies which are subject to coercion and political pressures generated by an industry which does not hesitate to spend money in an election and in lobbying activities.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about this Louisiana, Mo., plant, and one would think to hear the statements made by those who propose to put this money back in the bill for the Louisiana plant that experiments now going on to process oil out of coal would stop completely if this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] were not adopted. Here are the facts in just a few words: There is a new hydrogenation process which is known as the one-step process, which has been developed, and experimentation with it is going on at Bruceton, Pa., and Morgantown, W. Va. The new process makes the old process now in operation at Louisiana, Mo., obsolete.

We have allotted \$767,600 for the new method of processing which is being carried on at Morgantown and Bruceton. That is the full amount which the Department of the Interior in the newly revised budget requested for that purpose. They have recommended that the Louisiana, Mo., plant be put in a standby status for the present time. Hence the committee had no other recourse than to delete the request for this money for the Louisiana, Mo., plant from the original budget estimate, as did the Eisenhower budget. I say again that it would be a waste of money to appropriate this sum for the Louisiana, Mo., plant because of the fact that it has been found, without question of doubt, that the process there used is obsolete and that the one-step hydrogenation process carried on at Bruceton and Morgantown will be much more effective, much cheaper. Therefore this committee cannot be justified in expending this huge sum of money to carry on the Louisiana, Mo., plant.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any figures as to the amount of shale oil that is to be found in the Utah-Colorado area?

Mr. JENSEN. I may say there is no limit to the amount of oil shale that can be processed in the Western States.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I understand there are millions of acres available.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; millions and millions of acres.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I want to state that the laboratories at Bruceton, Pa., and at Morgantown, W. Va., are quite different from the plant at Louisiana, Mo., and that the plant in Louisiana, Mo., is not obsolete. It has proven successful, and more progress has been made at the Louisiana, Mo., plant in the last year than in all previous years.

Can the gentleman tell the committee whether or not any scientist has recommended the closing down of the plant at Louisiana, Mo.?

Mr. JENSEN. If there are scientists in the Government employed in the Interior Department, then, certainly, there has been such a record established for

the benefit of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PERKINS. Can the gentleman tell us why the scientists did not testify?

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Strike out "\$15,842,222" and insert "\$15,977,622."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to add \$135,400 with which to carry on the experimentation in underground coal gasification at Gorgas, Ala., which experimentation has been going on since about 1949.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Government, acting through the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines, has spent \$1,348,000 at Gorgas, Ala., on this experiment. In addition, the Alabama Power Co., cooperating in the experiment, has spent another quarter of a million dollars. They have gone to a great deal of trouble to gather a fine scientific team with which to carry on this experiment. They have learned to control to some extent the burning of coal under ground; they have learned how to extract a gas from the burning coal which can be used for the manufacture of chemicals, for the manufacture of gasoline, or for the production of electric power. There are possibilities that the knowledge which they have gained may be used to aid the depressed coal industry in many ways, in addition to adding to our fund of scientific knowledge.

I have had the privilege since coming to Congress to be in close touch with this experiment and to have visited it and observed it on many different occasions. The scientists and officials there tell me, Mr. Chairman, that they have made very, very great progress with this experiment or, more correctly, with this series of experiments at Gorgas, Ala. They need another year, perhaps a year and a half, and at the outside 2 years, in which—to use their language—to establish the engineering factors on which those same scientists can calculate the costs of the various steps in the process of underground gasification by the various methods used, to the end that we may approach a result which can be used by the Government in times of national emergency, and which can be picked up by private industry and turned into good account in developing a stronger economy.

Now to close down this experiment at this time will have the effect of more or less casting aside the knowledge which has been gained through 5 years of experimentation; it will dissolve and dissipate the experimental team that has been gotten together and this knowledge will be lost.

Mr. Chairman, this unwise action comes at a time when we should certainly keep in mind that the Russian Government is going full speed ahead with its experiments in underground coal gasification. The little information that seeps from behind the Iron Curtain indicates that the Russians are

probably much ahead of us in this field and that they are now operating several large electric power-generating plants with the gas that they make through their process of underground gasification of coal.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the only experiment of its kind now being operated in the entire free world and, as I see it, it is a great mistake and very disadvantageous to our country to shut the experiment down when we have \$1,348,000 invested in it and when no provision is being made, as was so well pointed out in a recent editorial in the Washington Post, that the important research work will be carried on by private sources. Success in this experiment is near. The fields have been plowed, planted, fertilized, cultivated, and harvest time is near.

I have made some inquiry but have found no inkling whatsoever that any private source is now ready to pick up the threads of this experiment and carry it to its logical conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, the coal industry is depressed throughout the United States. Demand for production of coal has been falling for some years. The coal industry in the Warrior coal field, where this experiment is located, is particularly depressed. This experiment is a ray of hope to those who must depend on coal for their sustenance.

I share the hope of all Members of the House that we may be able to balance our budget and reduce taxes. If my amendment is defeated we will thereby cut \$135,400 from our spending in the next fiscal year. However, I wonder if we will make any actual saving in so doing. Someone has pointed out that this country is blessed with a supply of coal to last us thousands of years. We will have much coal left when we have used every drop of our natural petroleum.

Should we become involved in an all-out war our known reserves of natural petroleum could not be called upon sufficiently to roll the war machine, and fly the planes which we and our allies would have to put into the field and in the air.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the House to adopt this amendment and let this great experiment go forward. This is not a matter, or at least should not be a matter of partisan politics. Scientific advancement knows no partisanship.

Carried to a successful conclusion, underground gasification of coal will do much to give us an alternate supply of energy for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, our entire country has become dependent upon gasoline and oil. We all remember the inconvenience and downright injury to our economy during the last war when the war effort caused rationing of gasoline. Our civilian economy is even more dependent upon gasoline now than it was at that time. Our war economy has now become even more dependent upon oil than it was during the last war.

I believe that any well-informed person today realizes that another war of the magnitude of the last one would so tax our oil supply that the civilian use of automobiles would of necessity be critically curtailed. This would be true even if the seaways remained open. If submarines prevented the oil of the Near East and South America from reaching us, even our war effort could be dangerously handicapped.

However, a standby solution to this danger is available if we care to use it. Our Government wisely prepared for the day when we must have more oil than is available from the oil wells. All of us know that this day will come within a relatively short span of years.

We have in America coal to last 2,000 years and a productive capacity to supply the world with coal. Oil can be made from coal. Our Government now has six small plants experimenting with this. The most important of these is located at Louisiana, Mo. Seventy-five million dollars have been spent on these plants. The cost of continuing this work is relatively small. Our Government in the operating of these small plants is not competing with natural oil. The plan merely increases the knowledge of how to quickly, economically, and efficiently commence the commercial making of oil from coal and shale when the need arises.

Our Government has, in these projects, brought together a small group of scientists and technicians who are exploring the best methods of producing oil from coal and shale. They have already made progress in this field, but we are still far from perfection. I have discussed the progress in this field with unbiased experts on the subject. I only very recently discussed it with Dean Briscoe of Indiana University. If these projects are discontinued at this time, these scientists and technicians will naturally go into other fields, and then the progress which is sorely needed in this field will be curtailed. Then, when the times comes that we must rapidly produce more oil, years of time will be lost. We will spend billions of dollars in a frantic effort to repair the damage which our shortsightedness had caused. Our civilian economy will suffer greatly. The family car which means so much to America will be grounded and our war potential could be gravely damaged.

We had a similar situation which took place at the beginning of World War II. Although our Government had been repeatedly warned to be ready to make synthetic rubber in the event the rubber supply from the West Indies and Malaya would be denied to us, we adopted a "penny-wise, pound-foolish" attitude in carrying out our synthetic-rubber program. Because of necessary haste and no previous preparation millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money went uselessly down the drain, and necessary rubber was denied to our civilian economy and our war effort was impeded.

We are at present confronted with a similar but more serious situation. A shortage of oil could injure our civilian and war economy far greater than the shortage of rubber. This shortage need not happen if we will use common sense, and not a "penny-wise, pound-foolish"

philosophy. We must restore to this appropriation bill the necessary funds to permit for this so badly needed research in the making of oil from coal and shale.

Let us see that our Government continues the worthwhile work in the experimentation that has been going on at these pilot plants that are trying to discover better and more economical methods of producing oil from coal and shale.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Alabama. I know something about that experiment down there; in fact, I was there a few years ago and crawled into the mines where they had just completed a test. I think I know something about it.

Being a professional man, I am of course more or less research-minded. However, last night I talked to the Bureau of Mines, as I did on the Rife proposition, and they told me that they did not want this project continued at this time. While I am research-minded, I do not possess such ability as to cast my opinion against theirs.

I know the gentleman from Alabama, Milton Fies, is very much interested in this experimental work at Gorgas, Ala. He is a great fellow. I like him. He has done a good job. But as to my supporting this project at this time, I must say that I cannot go along until we get the "go" sign from the people who are responsible for assisting in that research; that is, the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, with the last 2 minutes reserved to the Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend my motion to provide for 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes with the last 2 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 2 minutes reserved for the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that time cannot be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, it has not been made clear to me, or at least it has not been categorically answered, whether or not this so-called one-step process proposes to continue these investigations into the utilization of coal in the production of oil. That has not been answered. If I could have a categorical answer to that, I think it might help toward a compromise on this matter, but so far nobody has said that this so-called one-step process will continue experimentations into the utilization of coal for the purpose of producing oil.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. We have the word of the scientists and the Bureau of Mines that they have this experiment already in operation and they are functioning and they are going to continue to function, and it is on coal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And there will be sufficient money for them to continue the experiments for the coming fiscal year?

Mr. FENTON. They received every nickel they asked for, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then why was it necessary to cut down on the request of the Secretary of the Interior. That is the point: The Secretary of the Interior is not being allotted the money that he first requested.

Mr. FENTON. He is getting everything that he wants on coal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. On coal he is getting everything he wants?

Mr. FENTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania was given to Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.)

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this report regarding this one-step process. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will tell me what is the name of that process?

Mr. FENTON. I will be glad to. The name is the Pelipetz process.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Why is there no mention in the report about it? You pay great tribute to the work accomplished at Rifle and also at Louisiana, Mo., and yet you say nothing about this new process. How far have the experiments gone? Have they been able to determine whether they can produce this cheap enough to compete?

Mr. FENTON. I want to say to the gentleman in answer to his query, on page 20 of the report you will find this language:

In addition, the committee has disallowed other funds programed for the synthetic liquid fuel program with the exception of \$767,600 needed for laboratory and pilot plant research on a new refinement in the hydrogenation process which is reported to hold great promise for the future in production of synthetic liquid fuels.

That is the process they referred to.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. How far has the process gone?

Mr. FENTON. It is in the laboratory state.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. In the laboratory state. It will probably take years to accomplish anything.

Mr. FENTON. Well, I do not know how long.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It has taken many, many years to develop the hydrogenation process to this point. Many, many years ago the Germans started this hydrogenation process, the Bergius process.

Now, after all the year of experimentation, since the beginning of the war, we have developed the process where it can be produced at almost competitive prices. There was a joint committee set up during the war, when we were losing so many oil tankers, to make this investigation. The joint committee recommended that we take up experimentation in order to assure ourselves that we would have a source of oil and gasoline, and this is the result of it. I hope the committee does not think you could market these plants with the price not competitive. Nobody would buy them.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whether or not there are any funds carried in this bill to take care of placing this plant at Louisiana, Mo., in a standby position.

Mr. FENTON. Yes. There is \$250,000.

Mr. PRICE. It was testified before the committee that it would take from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 to place it in a standby position. It would take just about the same amount to continue the operation of the plant for a year.

I would also like to point out that the subcommittee was just as vigorous in its defense of its position yesterday on the plant at Rifle, Colo., as it is this afternoon with reference to the plant at Louisiana, Mo. Of course, I think they acted wisely in agreeing to place funds back into the bill for the Rifle plant. It is a very successful operation. The Louisiana plant is a successful operation.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] hit the nail on the head when he answered the gentleman and stated that the Bruceton proposition was still in the laboratory stage. The laboratory stage is very, very far from a demonstration plant. It will be many, many years before it gets to the point of a demonstration plant. Perhaps 20 or 25.

As I have pointed out the subcommittee was wrong yesterday in its defense of the closing of the oil shale plant at Rifle, Colo. In my opinion, it is just as wrong now in its defense of the closing of the Louisiana, Mo., coal-to-oil demonstration plant.

I am glad the subcommittee today acknowledges its error in judgment in regard to the Rifle project. I wish it would be just as honest in conceding its error in connection with the coal-to-oil project.

The fact remains that the subcommittee had called for the closing of the Rifle oil shale demonstration plant with-

out so much as hearing the regional director of the Bureau of Mines in whose area the plant was operated. News of the attempt to close it hit him like a bombshell and he frankly told the Colorado press the action looked like false economy.

Federal experts believe they are close to proving that oil shale and coal can eventually compete successfully with the petroleum industry. For this reason the projects should be continued to the successful conclusions indicated by demonstrations up to date. They are important to our natural resources. Just when they are to the point of furnishing concrete information, Congress seeks to end the demonstrations. This most certainly is false economy.

More than that, it is failure to recognize the importance of these projects to our national security. In the interest of national defense these experiments should be continued. This certainly is no time to throw them out the window without thinking of the consequences.

To say the Louisiana, Mo., plant is obsolete is sheer nonsense. Nowhere in the hearings does the Bureau of Mines substantiate a position. Nothing is shown in the hearings to indicate that the Louisiana plant has been other than a very successful operation, and if allowed to continue, can produce additional evidence of the feasibility of developing oil and gas from coal.

The House should adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Elliott amendment. I would like to call to your attention today a very important letter which I have just received from Mr. Milton Fies, of the Alabama Power Co. You may know that this project that has been carried on down at Gorgas, Ala., is an international proposition. It has been participated in not only by the Alabama Power Co. and other private industries, but it has also been participated in by the Federal Bureau of Mines and by organizations and individuals from overseas.

Mr. Fies says in his letter:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 27, 1953.

HON. LAURIE BATTLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BATTLE: I am enclosing herewith copy of a teletype message received from the Bureau of Mines station in Knoxville at the Gorgas gasification project. The telegram originated in Washington and relates to the possible discontinuance of the underground gasification experiment there. Dr. McCabe is Chief of the Fuels and Explosives Division of the Bureau of Mines.

I should like to say at the outset that I am in complete sympathy with any measure that seeks to put an end to appropriations for those things which are not essential, and I appreciate further that every project in which a man has an interest and which is sponsored by the Government is considered by that individual to be essential.

The gasification experiment at Gorgas, Ala., has been conducted by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Division of the Bureau of Mines. If it is decided to abandon the Synthetic Fuels Division's efforts, I respectfully suggest that sufficient money be appropriated to the Bu-

reau to carry on the work at Gorgas for another year or two. The amount involved is exceedingly limited. Congressman ELLIOTT has introduced a bill to extend this work on an enlarged scale, and if his bill is passed, my apprehension about abandonment of the work will not exist.

Great progress has been made in this highly important matter of recovering energy from coal by burning it in the ground. The Bureau of Mines has reached a stage in its thinking where plans and estimates have been made for a commercial installation. A comparatively recent visit to the Gorgas experiment by a French engineer, sent to this country by the French Government, resulted in a report to his Government in which he stated:

"The experiments at Gorgas during 1952 have furnished regular and reproducible results from which one could, without too much uncertainty, make large-scale preparation for a preliminary project for industrial operation."

The President's Materials Policy Commission in June 1952 had this to say:

"Underground or pithead gasification provides another possibility of revolutionary improvement in the competitive position of coal. . . .

"In the Commission's view, the experimental work of the Bureau of Mines in underground gasification merits strong and continuing support."

Mr. Eugene Ayres, technical assistant to the executive vice president, Gulf Research & Development Co. (Gulf Oil Co.) in a meeting in December 1952 of the National Industrial Conference Board, estimates that by 1975, if not earlier, 470 million tons of coal will be required annually to manufacture liquid fuels. The underground gasification of coal offers the most economic method of obtaining that coal to convert to liquid fuels.

If you can, without deviation from the policy of economy in Government, support a small appropriation to continue this work and use your influence to this end, it will be very much appreciated.

With personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

MILTON H. FIES,
Consulting Engineer.

BUREAU OF MINES,

Washington, D. C., April 24, 1953.

Due to indicated reductions in synthetic liquid fuels appropriation as reported out of House committee, need information amount of terminal leave Gorgas as of May 1, number of personnel needed and length of time required to close plant at Gorgas. Reduction in synthetic liquid fuels appropriation is not final, repeat not final. Debate on floor of House follows next week. Senate has not reported on appropriation. Information requested is needed to meet further actions on appropriation. Please teletype reply.

LOUIS McCABE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the longer this debate proceeds the more evident does it grow to those who are observing that if this process is completed, and it is on the point of being brought to completion, it will be competitive with the natural oil industry of this country.

Yesterday I made the statement, and I want to reiterate it now, that as a boy in high school I learned one of the immutable laws of nature: That liquids always find their own level. Here we find ourselves in the process of reversing the laws of nature, and we find crude

oil creeping out of the cleavages between the strata of upper levels of the administration competing with those in the lower level; and the level of the liquid has risen so high that it has flooded all of the soft-coal mines in the State of West Virginia.

That is the issue here: Shall these processes go into private hands and into the hands of those who do not want it to become competitive with natural oil?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the chairman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, Walter S. Hallanan's Petroleum Council set up to counsel the Interior Department, recommended in February this year that the coal-to-oil plant at Louisiana, Mo. should be closed. Mr. Hallanan is head of the Plymouth Oil Co. of Pittsburgh, and is the Republican national committeeman from West Virginia. This gentleman, as we all recall, was chairman of arrangements of the Republican National Convention in Chicago last July.

I do not think we should make a decision for oil or coal but that we should proceed with our demonstration processes in both fields without being discriminatory. We have a process that has proved successful and has reached the point of being commercially competitive with crude oil. Yet, because of that fact, we want to destroy that process in favor of the oil lobby, and at the same time, endanger the defenses of this country. That is all we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this has been a most enlightened afternoon; we have all understood what is before us; there is no confusion in our minds regarding this issue. I suggest we now vote.

Mr. BYRD. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT]. His amendment would restore funds sufficient to provide for the continuation of production of synthetic fuels from coal and oil shale at experimental plants of the Bureau of Mines.

It would seem to be a sound conservation policy and in the national interest to go forward with the development of this program which would shift as much demand as possible from our limited petroleum supplies to our very large coal reserves. The development of synthetic-fuel processes offers a means of doing this.

Coal has not held its output level since 1920. Instead of sharing very much in the new markets, it has lost its old markets, such as ships, railroads, and homes. In many areas the coal industry is in a depressed state, some mines are working only a few days a week, and in other cases shut down.

In the years ahead coal can provide the answer to America's liquid-fuels problem, and I believe that in view of

the remarks which have been offered here today the fundamental research that has been conducted paves the way toward the consummation of this objective.

We would, therefore, in my opinion, be pennywise and poundfoolish to discontinue funds at this time providing for the continuation of a program which promises within a few short years to perfect processes whereby synthetic fuels and valuable chemicals may be derived from a raw material virtually unlimited in its supply.

I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

(By unanimous consent Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. JENSEN yielded their time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and in accordance with the Chair's calculations he is entitled to be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to oppose a lot of amendments offered by my very good friends, at the same time I think we will have to do that at this time. Something has been said here about our defenses going to be throttled by the relinquishment of certain or these facilities for research. Nothing could be further from the truth. We know that the Secretary of the Interior is a member of all of these great defense committees that have to do with our fuels, gas, oil, metals, and all that sort of thing.

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

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

Mr. PRICE. Has the Secretary of the Interior ever informed your committee that this matter was discussed with the National Security Council?

Mr. FENTON. No; I do not think the Secretary went that far but certainly we have to have some confidence in our administration. I do not think that the Secretary of the Interior would take it unto himself to do away with some very, very important functions of government at the expense of our defense. The Secretary of the Interior has the welfare of our country at heart, as well as I have the welfare of the country at heart. We certainly would not want to do anything that would scuttle or endanger our national defense.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman knows I consider this a matter of interest to our national defense. Does he not think it would have been advisable for the committee to have asked for a recommendation by the National Security Council?

Mr. FENTON. Of course, we might have gone to that extent, but having confidence in our Bureau of Mines and the Secretary of the Interior we did not think it was necessary to go that far.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. In the gentleman's opinion does he believe that under the present cost of oil, private industry would take it up or buy it from the Government? They would if the price were competitive, but now you leave it hanging in the air.

Mr. FENTON. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that certainly it is not the intention of the Government to do research to the point that we are going to drive private industry out of business.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. You would not do that because you do not have the facilities to produce that.

Mr. FENTON. I think the functions of Government is to go so far and no further.

Mr. CHENOWETH. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, for offering this amendment which will provide for the continued operation of the oil shale experimental plant at Rifle, Colo. It is recognized that this plant has done a splendid job in perfecting the process of producing synthetic fuel from oil shale. This is a project in which the people of Colorado are very much interested. We are indeed gratified over the action taken by the committee in offering this amendment.

I wish also to mention that Colorado has large deposits of coal, and we are intensely interested in the experiments that have been carried on to produce synthetic fuel from coal. I am happy to hear the chairman of the committee [Mr. JENSEN] assure this House that the experiments will be continued. We have been following the experiments up to this time with keen interest.

We feel in Colorado that we have excellent sites for the location of a synthetic fuel plant for the use of coal. My home county is the largest producer of coal in the State. There has been a great deal of discussion over the possibility of locating a plant in southern Colorado. I certainly hope that this committee will continue to make the necessary funds available for this experimental work to continue, so that the time may be hastened when private industry will look with favor upon the production of synthetic fuel and byproducts from coal.

The Colorado State Legislature has had a special committee working on this matter for some years. At the session of the legislature this year this committee was continued. Every effort is being made to interest private industry in locating a coal synthetic fuel plant in Colorado. We have the coal and our people are anxious to cooperate in every way possible.

Mr. Chairman, I again wish to express my appreciation to the committee for continuing the oil shale plant at Rifle, Colo., and to Dr. FENTON for offering his amendment, which should receive the unanimous approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I might say that a number of Members have told me of dinners that they have with people from their home States this evening. There has been some suggestion that we might conclude the bill tonight. I move that all debate on the bill and all amendment thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at the point where the Clerk had read down through line 4 on page 18, and I further ask unanimous consent that the balance of the time allotted me be yielded to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer 3 amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the first 2 be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 29, line 1, after "or otherwise" strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,400,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 29, line 5, after "and trails" strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,400,000."

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. BARTLETT.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, considering all the circumstances, I think the amendment asking for an increase of \$2,400,000 in the Alaska road construction fund is a very modest one. I recognize the circumstances that led the committee to reduce the request for road construction in Alaska, but I should like

to express the hope that the committee will agree to this amendment because it would permit continued construction of the Copper River highway. It is a very important highway that has already been started, and for which \$650,000 has been heretofore appropriated, leading from Cordova to the interior of Alaska. It is an essential arterial highway system.

The other amendment pertains to an increase of \$400,000 in maintenance money for the Alaska Road Commission. I dwell upon that point particularly because the people of Valdez, a community which might be affected by the reduction made by the committee, have passed an ordinance to enact a gasoline tax, and all the money collected from that sales tax will be turned over to the Federal Government to help in keeping Thompson Pass open.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the committee and the Congress of the United States have been very liberal with Alaska in providing funds not only for the construction of roads but for most every other function which is carried on by the Territory of Alaska and for which this Congress appropriates funds.

The reason the committee saw fit to reduce these funds for the construction of roads and for operation and maintenance of roads was that the Territorial legislature, which adjourned just recently, did not raise their revenues through increased taxes on gasoline, trucks, and many other things. The fact is that they reduced taxes, yet expect us, the taxpayers of the mainland of America, to provide all the money they request for such things as construction and operation and maintenance of roads.

I am sure the gentleman from Alaska does not expect his amendments to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 29, line 19, after "until expended," strike out "\$2,715,000" and insert "\$16,307,000."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the Alaska delegation is solidly behind this amendment, I judge that it will not carry. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks an appropriation of \$16,307,000 covering two major items, \$2,715,000 for rolling stock for the Alaska Railroad and \$13,592,000 for rehabilitation of the Seward-Portage section of the railroad and certain installations at Seward, including a new dock.

Both former Under Secretary Karl R. Bendetsen, Department of the Army, and Lt. Col. William E. Kepner, former commander in chief, Alaskan Command, in appearances last year before both the

House and Senate committees strongly urged rehabilitation work.

Secretary Bendetsen speaking for the entire Department of Defense:

The Whittier-Portage rail link is extremely vulnerable to enemy action through either overt or covert attack. It is, in fact, so promising a strategic target that no intelligent enemy could reasonably be counted upon to overlook it. For this reason it would pose an unacceptable military risk to rely solely upon the port of Whittier and its rail link for the supply of military garrisons in the interior. * * * Thus, if the port of Whittier were denied to us through enemy action, the problem would be to provide for the combined military and essential civilian needs through the port of Seward. * * * However, if the Seward-Portage line were abandoned rail movement of military cargo would come to an abrupt and ominous halt. Sole reliance would have to be placed for a protracted and vital period of time on highway movement inland from Seward. Completion of the Seward-Anchorage highway considerably improves our situation in this respect but it is not enough to insure the defense of Alaska. This is true not only because truck transportation cannot carry certain types of essential military cargo which depends on rail haul for proper and expeditious movement, but also for the reason that truck transportation requires a greater amount of equipment and personnel for movement of the equivalent tonnage than does rail transportation. * * *

From a strategic standpoint, therefore, the Armed Forces cannot place sole reliance on the rail connected port of Whittier nor on the port of Seward if served by highway transportation only. Military prudence dictates dispersion of facilities and this applies to transportation routes as well as to other types of military facilities. Especially considering that the port of Seward and transportation routes to the interior are also vulnerable to enemy action, from a military standpoint, we must continue to plan on the continued availability and use of all present means of land transportation in Alaska.

Furthered by Bendetsen:

We are saying that, in our sober and our considered judgment, to abandon this civilian facility would place in jeopardy our military capability there. We place reliance in the military on all sorts of civilian facilities and to every degree that we can we try not to ask for things which can provide us support out of the civilian economy.

General Kepner:

I am of the firm opinion that the abandonment of a major rail line now in existence in Alaska is extremely hazardous. There is no practical alternative to rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad line between Seward and Portage and the providing of adequate dock facilities at Seward that can meet the strategic requirements imposed by the magnitude of the Alaskan defense effort. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Alaska Railroad line between Seward and Portage be rehabilitated with adequate dock facilities at Seward so that the railroad may continue to take advantage of the existing labor market and community facilities, and, further, that military operation of the port of Whittier be continued. We can hold Alaska if we prepare to do so before hostilities start. But we cannot expect to construct or prepare sorely needed logistic lines of communications after a war starts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous items deleted by this bill from the original recommendations of the

various departments and bureaus of government. We are told this has been done to achieve economy. My purpose is to cite a few examples which clearly show the action will not achieve any economy in government but, on the contrary, well might bring increased costs. It is a policy of fiscal procrastination.

I specifically object to the deletion of funds to continue construction of a transmission line tying in Folsom Dam with the rest of the Central Valley project in California. In addition, cutting out \$6 million for work on the Folsom Dam power facilities and deleting money for facilities to meter power sold to preference customers is highly questionable.

The distinguished Republican Governor of California, Earl Warren, sounded a warning on the folly of such a policy as is proposed by the committee. He stated withholding of funds causing slowdowns in the scheduled completion of projects such as the Folsom Dam is in no way a sound policy and should under no circumstances be followed.

The committee attempts to justify deletion of \$656,636 for continued construction of facilities to transmit power generated at Folsom Dam on the ground that work on the dam itself will be delayed a year because of construction difficulties. Work on the transmission line should, according to engineers of the Department's Bureau of Reclamation, continue independent of construction of the dam. Footings for the transmission line towers already are being built. Steel for the transmission towers has been ordered and some of the towers are about to be erected.

A telegram received by me today indicates the delay due to a faulty foundation for the dam will not be as prolonged as originally anticipated. I quote the telegram from the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento:

By letter to District Engineer C. C. Haug, Sacramento district engineer, April 27, 1953, I inquired as to the present estimate of delay in Folsom Dam construction. Colonel Haug promptly replied by letter same date in part as follows:

"However, on basis information now available, appears that during spring of 1955, Folsom Dam will be completed to point that controlled water releases could be made through the penstocks."

Present condition of the fault underlying a portion of left abutment is not at this time expected to be as serious as first contemplated with result that Army Engineers feel during spring of 1955, dam will be completed to point where Bureau could generate power at Folsom powerplant. To be in such a position it is necessary work continue on present contract for powerplant and that completion specifications for installation of unembedded equipment be awarded during next fiscal year. For powerplant to be ready for operation in spring of 1955, relaxation of House committee actions will be necessary.

If work on the transmission line is halted now, the contractor can claim, and get, possibly large liquidating damages from the Federal Government. The useless tower footings and steel beams will be idle for a year. At the end of that time a complete new contract will have to be renegotiated—possibly at a higher cost. The committee's recommendation that the Secretary of the In-

terior begin a search for benefits of control of the transmission line by the private utility serving the area—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—is an indication that the delay in work on the transmission line is the first step toward turning the line over to the private utility.

The committee even has elicited an agreement from the Pacific Gas & Electric to take over the part of the transmission line already constructed by the Government with public funds. If this were done, Folsom Dam no longer would be an operating part of the Central Valley project. Except by wheeling Folsom Dam power over a line owned by the Pacific Gas & Electric—and paying the private utility to wheel that power—it would not be possible to operate the integrated project authorized by Congress. And that wheeling would cost about \$400,000 a year. Compare this to the \$1,880,000 total cost of the work and the \$656,000 necessary to complete the line which is already half finished.

The Appropriations Committee, in its report accompanying the bill, expresses deep concern over reports of lower revenue from the sale of Central Valley project power under contracts recently executed with certain public agencies in the project area. The major public agency referred to is the Sacramento Municipal Utility District which will become the largest single customer for Central Valley project power. The committee report urges the Secretary of the Interior to suspend further action under the contract to sell Central Valley project power to the municipal utility district. The reason given is that the rate to be charged the public district may impair the ability of the project to pay off its costs and reduce the subsidy to irrigation provided for in legislation authorizing the Central Valley project.

I can assure the committee that the rate set in the contract will not only pay off the project costs and provide the authorized subsidy to irrigation but also, even under the most unfavorable financial conditions, will leave a \$42 million surplus for the Federal Treasury. In addition to this surplus and in addition to sufficient money to bear part of the burden of paying for irrigation water, the power rate in the contract will provide funds to replace worn-out equipment; to pay power operation costs, and to pay all the other costs which have been allocated by legislation to power revenue. The repayment program even provides funds for interest payments to the Federal Government which will not be applied to costs of the project but will go into the Federal Treasury. Thus, at the end of the 50-year repayment period, the Central Valley project will pay all reimbursable costs and put a healthy sum in the Treasury.

This repayment program is based on a new study of CVP revenues just completed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The program is made possible, the Bureau reports, by a contract to purchase firming power from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Bureau reports this plan would cut the Government's investment for the hydroelectric power phase of the CVP to as low as \$129 million. If the investment

were raised even to \$140 million by building an additional transmission line, the Bureau reports the project would pay off as proposed and leave a large surplus for the Treasury.

These facts certainly show the committee's fears the project would not pay off under the rates negotiated in the new contract were groundless.

We also should look very carefully at the proposal to cut \$6 million from the budget for authorized construction of the power plant at Folsom Dam. Nearly all the major contracts for the construction of the plant and its equipment have been awarded. The committee's explanation for the \$6 million cut is that this will allow the schedule for construction of the powerplant to match the delayed schedule for construction of the dam itself. Bureau of Reclamation engineers report it may be better to follow the regular construction schedule for the powerplant in spite of the delay in the dam construction. Cutting out the appropriation this year, they report, may mean not 1, but 2, or possibly 3 years' delay in the operation of the power facilities. This fact, considered with the possible increased cost due to halting work already under way, necessitates a closer look at the \$6 million deletion.

Further indication that the committee was not reducing actual costs to be borne by the users is the cut of \$220,119 which had been budgeted to purchase facilities to meter power for preference customers of the Central Valley project. The committee suggests the metering facilities be rented—presumably from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. according to testimony before the subcommittee. The present rental agreement between the Government and P. G. & E. would call for a yearly payment of \$40,000 to the power company for metering of energy to be delivered to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. If metering facilities for service to the utility district are rented from the P. G. & E., the rental charge in less than 7 years will amount to the entire cost of the facilities—the \$220,119 cut out of the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: On page 20, line 6, immediately following the semicolon and preceding the word "and", insert the following: "not to exceed \$10,000 for the leasing and management of the lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer, 16 U. S. C. 661."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do it, but I must make a point of order against this amendment. It is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LANTAFF. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The reference to the United States Code authorizes the leasing of lands by the Department of Interior and is so cited for that purpose. This specific authorization is to authorize the leasing of land in this particular area for this particu-

lar project and classifies it much the same as the authorization contained in the bill for the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and for the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge. In the bill you will find the statutory authority cited the same as the statutory authority is cited in the amendment which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I have to say is that when the gentleman appeared before the committee, he said that an authorization bill had been introduced to authorize this.

Mr. LANTAFF. No, sir; that was an entirely different project, Mr. Chairman, from the project involved here in that that called for an appropriation of approximately \$100,000. This amendment does not cost anything. It is not increasing the appropriation authorized by the committee. It is my understanding the committee is willing to accept this amendment. Mr. Chairman, this is a little old amendment just to take care of a few little, old deer. There are only a few of them left, and unless we do this, I am afraid that the automobiles will get rid of the last remaining few of the species.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mcgregor). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has inspected section 661 of title 16 of the United States Code, the provision which the gentleman from Florida cites as authorizing the proposal contained in his amendment. That code section gives fairly broad authorization to the Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife conservation, but it does not authorize leasing of lands or the protection of key deer. The gentleman's amendment would earmark funds for a narrow, specific purpose, a purpose not mentioned in the code section which is general. Reference is made to volume VII, section 1452, of Cannon's Precedents, under which the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 37, line 22, after "\$600,000", insert "No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

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

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

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

"(d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, soil and moisture, activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel;

"(e) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(f) to employees of the Bureau of Mines;

"(g) to employees of the Geological Survey;

"(h) to employees in grades GPC 1, 2, and 3:

Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total provided for in this act, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year, this provision shall again become operative."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized in behalf of his amendment.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from Iowa accept the gentleman's amendment? It is an old friend of his.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I would like to make a statement, Mr. Chairman, before I yield. I have only 1 minute. I am sorry I do not have 5 minutes to talk on this amendment.

This is what is known as the Jensen amendment that we had in effect and that was the law during 1950, 1951, and 1952. It is the exact wording. I wish I had 5 minutes so I could quote Mr. JENSEN's speech which he made in 1952 on March 27.

If you were for this amendment in 1950, 1951, 1952 and not today you were playing politics instead of economy. If you want economy, this is how you can get it and help balance the budget. Of course if you want to let politics come before economy then vote your own amendment down, now I yield to the gentleman, and I hope he will accept this amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course Mr. Eisenhower has gone one step further than the Jensen amendment. He has given orders to all department heads that there would be no vacancies filled. The amendment is therefore not necessary this year.

Mr. SUTTON. Then the gentleman has no objection to this amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes I do, because of the fact that were this amendment applied to this bill, it would permit some employment contrary to the President's order and could possibly make an expenditure of several million dollars necessary. I want to call the gentleman's attention again to the fact that the committee has cut personnel approximately 18 percent in the reductions it has made. This is more than the amendment would accomplish.

Mr. SUTTON. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. Mr. SUTTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Tennessee had 10 seconds left and the gentleman from Iowa took it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets very much but the gentleman's time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 52, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, 1 minute is a short time to expound not only the question I want to ask the Chairman but to get his answer. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and then ask this question, which the gentleman understands very thoroughly:

Am I correct in believing that it is the desire and intent of the subcommittee that the water presently arranged to flow through the canal into the Coachella Valley should be delivered to the farmers now or withheld from the farmers pending delivery of an opinion by a Federal court which has already been delivered as a pretrial opinion?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to say to the gentleman from California that the committee has taken the position that the water will be made immediately available to the water users in the Coachella Valley; and, as chairman of the committee, I have written a letter to the Secretary of the Interior to that effect.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I will ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, when the House reconvenes, to include with the above comments a copy of the letter to the Secretary of the Interior from the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. The letter follows:

APRIL 24, 1953.

HON. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior, Department
of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the hearings on the Interior appropriations bill on March 25, there was discussion of the subject of delivering water through facilities of the Coachella Valley County Water District's distribution system constructed with funds appropriated under provisions in Interior Appropriation Acts for fiscal year 1952 and fiscal year 1953. The provisions stated that the funds should be repayable by the district unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor. The question came up in connection with presentation of a memorandum opinion by Judge Westover in the United States District Court at Los Angeles in the case of the *United States v. Coachella District*.

Judge Westover held for the Coachella district in the opinion, but no formal order will be entered until after April 25 when the district is to submit findings of law and fact.

In the light of Judge Westover's opinion and all of the circumstances surrounding this case, which have been spread on the record, it was the unanimous view of this subcommittee that the Bureau of Reclamation should be instructed to deliver irrigation water through the facilities in question as rapidly as same are completed under appropriate operation and maintenance arrangements with the district. The view of the House committee coincides with that expressed in a joint letter to you under date of January 21 from Senators KNOWLAND and HAYDEN, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, that "our view, as stated in our letters, is that the Congress by the provisions in the Interior Appropriation Acts of 1952 and 1953 intended that the facilities were to be completed and placed in operation pending court decisions as to the liability of the district for expenditures beyond the present repayment contract coverage." Senators KNOWLAND and HAYDEN in previous

separate letters to Secretary Chapman had expressed the same view.

Should the Department so desire, it is suggested that the Coachella district might be advised that the delivery of water through the facilities in question would be without prejudice to the interests of the United States or the district in the event an appeal should be taken from Judge Westover's decision.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa to close the debate and use the balance of the time.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not care to use the time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Interior recognizes the need for providing power from the Missouri Valley into Minnesota. This action on the part of the committee is commendable.

Mr. Chairman, the plan advanced by 20 REA cooperatives and 3 private power companies to bring Missouri Basin hydroelectric power to central and western Minnesota is a fine demonstration of cooperation for mutual well-being.

The farm electric cooperatives, the private utilities, and the Bureau of Reclamation are joined in support of a plan that will give the greatest distribution of power to the greatest number of customers at the lowest cost possible to both the Government and the customer. The market is there. The power will be generated. This commonsense plan will bring the power to the market for the benefit of the people whose tax dollars have helped to construct the Missouri Basin powerplants.

The plan developed and agreed upon in good faith by the cooperatives and utilities for efficient and economical distribution of the power is worthy of the consideration of this Congress. The Congress itself instructed these groups to go back to Minnesota and agree upon a common plan in the interest of all. This they have done and they have brought the plan back to us. The heart of the plan, which has united support, is simply this: A 230,000-volt line to bring power from the Missouri dams to the Minnesota substations to be delivered over the lines of the cooperatives and power companies to the users. Connected to the Fort Randall and Garrison powerplants, the loop will serve substations at Fergus Falls, Benson, Granite Falls, Mankato, and Jackson—all in Minnesota. This loop is part of the main grid backbone transmission system and has been declared sound in the engineering studies undertaken by the cooperatives, the utilities, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The plan is designed not only to make full use of the power developed in the Missouri Basin but also to make the most efficient use of the existing distribution

facilities of both the power companies and the REA cooperatives. It is an integrated plan in which each agency makes the best possible use of all of its resources without duplication or waste. After exhaustive study, it has been declared economically feasible and sound from the engineering standpoint. To my knowledge, no one has questioned the value of the engineering and economic studies made by each of the public and private groups who have advanced this common plan.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that neither the cooperatives nor the power companies are asking for a Government grant. They are asking for a loan to be repaid in full at 3 percent interest—a \$43,614,000 loan to be repaid within 50 years. They are asking this year for funds to complete plans and specifications and other necessary preconstruction planning so that the transmission system will be built by the time the Army completes the powerplants now under construction. The Fort Randall and Garrison powerplants are expected to be in full operation in 1956 and 1957. Initial power will be available in 1954-55. It would be foolhardy to leave the generators idle and the plants operating below capacity simply because the power could not be brought to market without this vital transmission system.

The people of central and western Minnesota who pay taxes and who live in a high-cost fuel area have a right to reap the benefits of their tax dollars already invested in the dams of the Missouri Basin. The power will be generated. We need the power. We are helping to pay for the generation of the power. We will repay the Government for transmission of the power. It is only commonsense that we be permitted to benefit from the power.

The 20 farm electric cooperatives are serving 80,000 Minnesota families. Another 100,000 families in the area are served by municipalities and others. If these 180,000 Minnesota families can benefit from a great national development without eventual cost to the Government, we in Congress have an obligation to assist them in every way possible.

The 20 cooperatives now buy more than 200 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy at a cost of \$2,700,000 a year. This is power produced at very high cost in fuel-burning plants. If this same amount of power could have been purchased at Bureau of Reclamation rates in 1952, it would have meant a saving of \$1,600,000 to these farm cooperatives. This demonstrates clearly the effect of high fuel costs on the cost of electric power in Minnesota. It is estimated that the same 20 cooperatives will have to purchase 480 million kilowatt-hours in 1960. Using the same comparison, a saving of \$3,600,000 can be made in that year if the Missouri Basin hydroelectric power which will be generated is made available to these cooperatives.

Neither the cooperatives alone nor the power companies alone can do the job. Even if adequate financing could be obtained by either of the two groups, the cost would drive rates up so high that there would be no saving to the ultimate consumer, which is the purpose of this plan. Only by integrating all of their

facilities can the job be done for less money and material and at the same time assure adequate and reliable service at a reasonable cost to the consumer. After a system study was made of the operations of the combined systems, it was definitely determined that the proposed 230,000 volt loop provides the absolute minimum needed for the most efficient operation.

The need for power in the area to be served by the loop is increasing at the rate of 15 percent a year. But even more important is the market already existing, waiting to be served. This is important because it means immediate repayment on the loan because the market already exists and will yield an immediate return when the power is ready for distribution. It is reasonable, therefore, that the line be placed in operation at the earliest possible date.

In further demonstration of the need for early action, it should be pointed out that 4 of the 7 municipal systems now serving the 20 cooperatives not serviced by private utilities have asked to be relieved of their REA loads. In each case, the REA load has become greater than their own. The Northern States Power Co. has undertaken a major construction program to meet the needs in areas it serves and has indicated its willingness to deliver the hydroelectric power from the transmission loop to the preferred customers in the area. The company's facilities are part of the integrated operation devised to avoid duplication in bringing Missouri Basin power to the people of Minnesota. In addition, the power companies have agreed to interconnect their systems to alleviate severe shortages until the entire plan is in operation.

When the transmission loop and substations are completed, the power companies have agreed to enter into wheeling contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation to wheel power to the load centers of the preferred customers. They will also build the required low-voltage transmission lines to wheel power from the substation points to the load centers.

It is important to note that the success of the plan is dependent upon the integration which makes best use of all of the facilities of the cooperatives, the utilities, and the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not a piecemeal plan; instead it is a united and cooperative effort in which each part is necessary to the whole if we are to achieve the most efficient system at the least cost to all concerned. It is sound economy, therefore, to proceed with the plan as a whole in order to benefit from the reductions in cost and material which only an orderly, overall development promises. If Congress will support the cooperative effort made by these groups, we can demonstrate the benefits that can be shared by all of the people when they work together to arrive at the best possible solution to a common problem.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McGRIGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 4828 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2 strike out all of lines 22, 23, and 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$3,736,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and for the payment of rentals for the use of transmission facilities."

And on page 3, line 19, strike out "\$38,300,000" and insert "\$42,728,000: Provided, That such sum shall include for the following items the respective amounts as follows:

"For Snohomish-Kitsay project, \$2,605,000;
"For McNary substation, \$1,538,000;
"For Ilwaco-Long Beach area service, \$109,000;

"For Valley Way substation addition, \$56,000; and

"For Idaho Panhandle, \$120,000."

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 212, not voting 53. as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—167

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Battie
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik

Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Burdick
Burlison
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Campbell
Cannon

Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Colmer
Condon
Cooper
Cresser
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dodd

Dollinger
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gentry
Granahan
Grant
Gregory
Hagen, Calif.
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Heller
Holifield
Holmes
Holtzman
Horan
Howell
Ikard
Jarman
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan

Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lesinski
Long
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Kans.
Mills
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Preston

Price
Priest
Rains
Rayburn
Reams
Regan
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Steed
Sullivan
Sutton
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thorberry
Tollerson
Trimble
Watts
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Winstead
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—212

Abbt
Adair
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andresen,
August H.
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barden
Bates
Beamer
Becker
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Bolton
Bonin
Bosch
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cariyle
Carrigg
Case
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clardy
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Coon
Corbett
Cotton
Cretella
Crumppacker
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux

D'Ewart
Dies
Dolliver
Dondoro
Dorn, N. Y.
Durham
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fenton
Fino
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gary
Gavin
George
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen, Minn.
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Heseltun
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoever
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Hope
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger

Laird
Landrum
LeCompte
Lovre
Lucas
McConnell
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McNey
Mailliard
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Meader
Merrill
Morrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Mumma
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
Oakman
O'Hara, Minn.
Ostertag
Patterson
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Shuford
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.

Springer	Van Zandt	Wheeler
Stauffer	Velde	Widnall
Stringfellow	Vorys	Wigglesworth
Taber	Vursell	Williams, N. Y.
Talle	Wainwright	Wilson, Calif.
Thompson,	Walter	Wilson, Ind.
Mich.	Wampler	Wolcott
Tuck	Warburton	Wolverton
Utt	Weichel	Young
Van Pelt	Wharton	Younger

NOT VOTING—53

Baker	Gamble	McCulloch
Barrett	Gathings	McMillan
Boggs	Golden	Mollohan
Bolton,	Gordon	O'Konski
Oliver P.	Green	Osmer
Boykin	Haley	Polk
Brooks, La.	Hart	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Hays, Ohio	Rabaut
Buckley	Hébert	Riehlman
Camp	Herlong	Scherer
Chatham	Hoffman, Ill.	Sheehan
Cooley	Hosmer	Sieminski
Coudert	Hull	Staggers
Cunningham	Jackson	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Vinson
Dingell	Keogh	Wilson, Tex.
Doyle	Klein	Withers
Forrester	Latham	Withrow

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Boykin against.
Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Kearney against.
Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Gamble against.
Mr. Polk for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Haley for, with Mr. McCulloch against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Green for, with Mr. Osmer against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Baker with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Golden with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Withrow with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Cooley.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL ACT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1767) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 31, 1953."

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1767. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, following the business of the day and other special orders I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the House Ways and Means Committee opens hearings this week on the question of the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I wish most strongly to emphasize not only the importance of the committee extending the act but also to urge that the measure be extended without the adoption of crippling and nullifying amendments to the provisions of the law.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been one of the most important and far-reaching statutes put on the books in the last quarter century. It has served to promote the prosperity of our own people and to promote peace by providing an effective means for engaging in foreign trade and commerce between the people of the United States and other nations of the world.

I have the honor and privilege of representing the district in Tennessee which our beloved and distinguished friend, Judge Cordell Hull, represented so ably for so many years. He was a true apostle of peace and prosperity established on a sound basis of mutual agreements with other nations. While a member of the great Ways and Means Committee, Judge Hull long advocated a new national policy of international relations. After he became Secretary of State, he sponsored the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Under this act trade agreements with more than 50 nations have been negotiated, thereby reducing substantially tariff barriers and removing foreign obstacles to the freer flow and exchange of American goods with other nations. When I speak for the reenactment of this legislation, I speak not only

for the people of Tennessee, but for the people of the Nation, whose best interest this law serves. It should be passed, I wish to reemphasize, without crippling amendments.

In this period of international tension and crisis we cannot risk turning back to the isolationist economic policies of Hamilton, McKinley, and Smoot-Hawley. During the early centuries of our history our infant industries needed protection from the destructive competition of older European countries. The world economic situation has radically changed since those pioneer days. Today the United States has developed in all major industries the highest productive capacity of any country in the world. It has changed from a debtor Nation to the chief creditor Nation of the entire free world.

Debtor nations cannot repay the United States, as creditor, unless tariffs are kept at lower levels and simplified. The economies of our democratic allies must be maintained at a certain minimum level of stability and productivity so that they too may contribute their maximum potential to the defensive strength of the free-world community. The only way to reach this goal is to open our American markets to wisely selected imported goods which will not weaken the position of our own producers. People of other nations cannot buy our goods and services unless they have the economic strength with which to purchase them. Europe's position in the world economy has progressively deteriorated and will continue to deteriorate, unless the United States imports more manufactured goods on a larger scale and on a steadier basis. We must design our trade and tariff policy in the national interest so that our country's export markets will greatly expand as export dollars increase. It will be in our national interest to promote the widest possible trade in all manufactured merchandise and American agricultural products. We should not erect barriers against the nations of the free world to the extent of forcing them by necessity to increase trade with Communist countries. Such a policy could become a dangerous threat to the strength and solidarity of the United Nations.

It seems timely to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was during the administration of President McKinley that the high-tariff law was enacted which raised our tariffs to the highest level in the history of our Nation. Yet it is known that President McKinley saw some error in this policy, for he declared in one of his last speeches that the United States cannot "forever sell everything and buy little or nothing from other nations of the world." Trade, Mr. Speaker, is a two-way street, and roadblocks should not be thrown in the course of world trade and commerce.

It seems well, Mr. Speaker, to reemphasize the position that General Eisenhower took during the 1952 campaign. At the time he declared that America should maintain "tariff policies that operate in the interest of our agriculture and industry," and that we as a nation "should seek out opportunities to include imports of commodities, goods, and

services which will improve our economy and help make our allies self-supporting." In his inaugural address, the President emphasized that "the Congress take the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under immediate study and extend it by appropriate legislation." I applauded his position at this time. More recently, the President sent a message to Congress calling for only a 1-year extension of the act, and at the same time authorizing amendments to the law.

The President should recede from his recently stated position of allowing weakening amendments to this most meritorious law, because it is contrary to his former strong position advocating the reenactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I stand for the full extension of the Trade Agreements Act without amendments. Furthermore, I believe the extension of the act should be for a minimum of at least 2 years as in the past. I hope the committee and the Congress will take affirmative action and reenact the Cordell Hull reciprocal-trade law without crippling amendments.

We must continue to design our trade policy to promote the widest possible trade for our American manufactured and agricultural products which will, in turn, augment our foreign and domestic policy of promoting peace and prosperity among the nations of the free world.

HIGHEST INTEREST RATE IN 20 YEARS—RECORDS BEING BROKEN—IS DEPRESSION ON THE WAY?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a news item from the Wall Street Journal of today. It is as follows:

NEW YORK BANKS BOOST PRIME RATE TO 3½ PERCENT, HIGHEST POINT IN 19 YEARS

NEW YORK.—New York City banks yesterday raised the interest charge on loans to borrowers with the best credit ratings to 3½ percent from 3 percent—to the highest point in 19 years.

Among the banks to act were Bankers Trust Co., Chase National Bank, Hanover Bank, Irving Trust Co., Manufacturers Trust Co., Bank of New York, National City Bank, and Chemical Bank & Trust Co.

The move spread quickly to Chicago and Philadelphia. Banks in other major cities were expected to follow.

Yesterday's rate increase—the first since December 1951—will mean higher interest costs for all business borrowers, since rates for less well-known concerns are scaled upward from the prime rate.

Bankers hope the interest rate increase may induce some concerns to postpone borrowing until a later date. The banks' lending reserves are just about exhausted.

BORROWINGS ABNORMAL THIS YEAR

The trend of loans so far in 1953 has been abnormal. The first half of each year usually is a period of seasonal decline in busi-

ness loan demand. Retail stores, which borrow to accumulate Christmas inventories, begin paying off after the end of the year. And commodity dealers and food processors, who borrow to finance purchases of fall crops, also reduce their loans during the first half.

This year, however, the seasonal decline has been much smaller than usual. Loans to business by major New York City banks last Wednesday totaled \$8,625,000,000, only \$96 million below the record high reached last December 24. During the like period a year ago, loans of these banks fell by \$248 million.

The still-heavy demand for loans, of course, is only part of the story. The Federal Reserve System, as part of its anti-inflation policy, has been keeping a tight rein on the banks' funds.

The present tightness is illustrated by the status of the banks' reserves. Member banks of the Reserve System are required to keep on deposit in a Reserve bank funds equal to a specified percentage of the deposits in their own institutions. Last Wednesday, reserve deposits of all member banks combined were \$12 short of the required level. A year earlier, their reserves had been \$788 million in excess of requirements.

BOOST LATEST OF SERIES

The prime rate increase is the latest in a series of actions which have brought higher borrowing costs for all business concerns and the Government. In the last 2 months, interest rates on commercial paper—short-term, unsecured notes of business concerns—have been increased twice, raising the minimum rate on this type of borrowing from 2¼ percent to 2½ percent.

New York banks in the last 3 weeks have raised the interest charge on call money on corporate securities from 2¾ percent to 3 percent. Call money is borrowed by brokers and dealers to purchase and carry inventories of securities.

Other developments which set the stage for the prime rate increase were the Government's recent issue of bonds at 3¼ percent, the highest rate since 1934, and last week's sale of 91-day Treasury bills at 2.320 percent, the highest rate in 20 years.

It also is necessary to go back 20 years to find a business loan prime rate that tops the new 3½ percent figure. In 1933, during the depression, it was as high as 4 percent, but it drifted downward gradually to a low of 1½ percent in 1935, where it remained until December 1947. In that month it went to 1¾ percent. Then it eased up gradually until 1951, when it was raised in three stages to 3 percent.

LOANABLE FUNDS SHORT

NEW YORK.—Major New York City banks still were hard pressed for loanable funds yesterday, as they have been almost without interruption since mid-1952.

The banks on Thursday and Friday of last week changed their reserve position from a deficiency of \$175 million to an excess of \$20 million, but this apparent improvement was more than accounted for by \$225 million of borrowing from the Reserve System during the 2-day period.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I intend shortly to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next; but pending that, so far as the legislative program is concerned there is a bill that has been reported on which we expect a rule to be granted on tomorrow, H. R. 4654, to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government and for other purposes. I do not understand there is any great controversy about the bill, but if a rule is granted on it tomorrow we expect to take it up Thursday and dispose of it.

Beyond that, there is no further business for the week. There is a bill dealing with certain authorizations for the disposal of certain cotton coming from the Committee on Banking and Currency, but the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] has a matter of the highest personal importance to him and must be away for the balance of the week. So that bill will not come up this week.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Several Members have asked me about next week. Has the gentleman any idea of what we may expect next week?

Mr. HALLECK. The Appropriations Committee will file a report on the State Department appropriation bill—and there are certain departments included with that—which we will bring on for general debate next Monday with the view of reading the first section on Monday, then beginning the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday. I may say to the gentleman that is a little far off, I cannot be too sure about it, but that is my best judgment now.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GORDON, for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1419. An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. LANE and to include a letter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an article appearing in Harper's magazine.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include results of a poll taken in the First Congressional District of Arkansas.

Mr. LONG and to include an article that appeared in this week's American magazine.

Mr. WILSON of Texas in two instances and to include articles.

Mr. HEBERT (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana) and to include an editorial from a New Orleans newspaper.

Mr. GRANAHAN and to include an address made by him at the Dimmer Beeber Junior High School, Philadelphia.

Mr. MOULDER in two instances and to include a house resolution passed by the Missouri State Legislature, and in the second instance to include a statement by Clyde Ellis, Director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. FINE (at the request of Mr. PRICE).

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous material.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FORD and to include an address delivered by Hon. Roger M. Kyes, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech by Senator MONRONEY at an Indiana Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner Saturday evening.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. CRETILLA and to include a resolution received by him.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an address delivered by Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT and to include an address delivered by Councilor Dr. Han of the Korean Embassy, delivered before the University of Kentucky.

Mr. PHILLIPS to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter.

Mr. VELDE.

Mr. REED of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include therein certain statements by General Gray and Admiral Boone at a fine and moving ceremony at the Veterans' Administration rewarding a staff of workers for their fine performance in saving more than \$300,000 for the Government.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include an editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Week.

Mr. BUDGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 30, 1953, 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:

664. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

665. A letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting a report for the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 6 of the act approved October 26, 1949; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

666. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4465. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2696. A bill to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4364. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and

Marine Corps forces in foreign countries", relative to the composition of claims commissions; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 140. An act for the relief of John W. McBride; without amendment (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 365. An act for the relief of Albert E. Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Kaczmarczyk; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; with amendment (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; with amendment (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder; without amendment (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Arthur Staveley; without amendment (Rept. No. 328). 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. HOLMES:

H. R. 4898. A bill to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4899. A bill to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4900. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on power lawn mowers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4901. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of chemical additives in food to insure that such chemical additive has been adequately pretested and declared safe; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4902. A bill to revise the procedure in the district courts relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and

deserting seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4903. A bill to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal irrigation projects and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4904. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on electric floor polishers and waxers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4905. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim May 1953 as National Thanx Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the protection of parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation outlawing the Communist Party in the United States and making membership therein unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4906. A bill for the relief of Generoso Paglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4907. A bill to reimburse the South Dakota State Hospital for the Insane for the care of Indian patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 4908. A bill for the relief of Pietro Petralia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 4909. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Ali Sadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4910. A bill for the relief of Christiaan Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 4911. A bill for the relief of Remzi Gurcay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4912. A bill for the relief of Maria Softerios Sergiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4913. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Khalil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4914. A bill for the relief of Stanislaus Joseph Radwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4915. A bill for the relief of Alex Grosinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Linda Yacoub Beyda and Cohen Alfred Beyda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4918. A bill to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers and payees with respect to certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Ralph S. Pearman and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Francis P. Meehan, trustee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Manuel Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shiro and Samuel Stackman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Charalampos Socrates Iossifoglu, Nora Iossifoglu, Helen Iossifoglu, and Efrossini Iossifoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4924. A bill for the relief of certain American employees of the former Shanghai Municipal Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

207. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Joseph R. Dix, East Providence, R. I., and 36 other signers, relative to the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

208. By the Speaker: Petition of the secretary, Consolidated Building Trades, Metal Trades, Central Labor Council, of Solano County, Vallejo, Calif., relative to legislation now before the Congress affecting the tideland oils; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

209. Also petition of Willis Sherrill and others, of West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

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

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

We praise Thee, our Father, for this world and its witness of Thee: For sunshine, wind, and rain; for the boundless sea and the everlasting hills; for high sailing clouds and clear shining stars; for springing grass and flowers; and for stately trees that lift their leafy arms to pray. Help us to drink to the full of the beauty and strength of the world and to know that they come from Thee as the gifts of Thy love to us.

We praise Thee for the sacrament of life: For its great adventure, its glorious opportunities, its zeal, its triumph, even its seeming defeats; for the things that point beyond ourselves to a spiritual realm from which they take their rise;

for the failures that quicken better hopes; for unfulfilled desire that anchors us to Thee; and for all ministries of the infinite, as the beauty of common things and the light of heaven upon daily tasks lift our climbing feet to the vestibule of Thy glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, April 28, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 28, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITIONAL USE OF GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES AT CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.