To be assistant sanitary engineers, effective December 15, 1953

Melvin W. Carter
Lawrence C. Gray
Herbert H. Rogers

To be assistant sanitary engineer, effective December 21, 1953

Jerrold M. Michael

To be senior assistant nurse officers, effective November 3, 1953

Ruth E. Simonson
Grace E. Mattis

To be senior assistant nurse officer, effective November 16, 1953

Marjorie E. Jantho

To be senior assistant nurse officers, effective November 27, 1953

Elizabeth C. Kuhlman
Jay C. Wertman

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant surgeon

Laurens P. White

To be sanitary engineer

Richard P. Lonergan

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

David E. Barry

To be nurse officer

Adele L. Henderson

FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTIONS

To be medical directors, effective November 16, 1953

Abraham Wikler
Richard F. Boyd
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith
Paul W. Kabler
James G. Telfer

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective July 1, 1952

John L. Eicholz, Jr.
Hugh A. Storrow

To be senior assistant surgeon, effective July 1, 1953

Donald L. Toker

To be dental directors, effective November 16, 1953

George E. Jones
William P. Kroschel
Henry F. Canby
Norman F. Gerrie
Robert M. Stephan

To be sanitary engineer director, effective November 16, 1953

Walter N. Dashiell

To be sanitary engineer, effective February 2, 1952

Gerald Dyksterhouse

To be sanitary engineer, effective June 4, 1953

Lloyd W. Gebhard

To be assistant pharmacists, effective July 1, 1953

Albert D. Ripley
John W. Toole
Mario C. Baratta
Joseph N. Salvino
Bertram J. Baughman

To be nurse director, effective November 16, 1953

Rosalie I. Peterson

To be nurse officers, effective November 16, 1953

Tabitha W. Rossetter
Gladys M. Ray

To be dietitian, effective November 16, 1953

Frances M. Croker

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. BURKE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12, 1954

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, throughout our Nation during the coming weekend, Americans of Hungarian descent will commemorate the declaration of Hungarian independence, and will pause in solemn tribute to the man who constructed it—the legendary Louis Kossuth, who gave his lifetime in a fight against tyranny.

It is fitting that we join with our fellow citizens of Hungarian origin in memorializing Hungarian Freedom Day. On Sunday, in Lorain, Ohio, I expect to participate in special observances marking this great Hungarian anniversary; and I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared for the occasion.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. THOMAS A. BURKE, OF OHIO

Little more than 100 years have passed since Louis Kossuth unfolded his plans for a perpetual rupture with the Austrian dynasty and brought forth his famous declaration that "the House of Hapsburg, perjured in the sight of God and man, has forfeited the Hungarian throne."

That was the birth of Hungarian independence, proclaimed by the great statesman and patriot whose flaming spirit has burned through the decades, blazing a message of liberty.

Louis Kossuth is gone some 60 years now, and once again his beloved Hungary lies piteously beneath the oppressor's heel, as tyranny stalks the land.

The Russian invader holds forth today in Louis Kossuth's Hungary, and freedom-loving people everywhere are saddened at the bitter spectacle.

But the descendants of Louis Kossuth, in Hungary and across the seas, well remember the traditions of liberty and justice which he established in his lifetime fight against the tyrants.

The memory of Louis Kossuth is the spur, and the people of Hungary the driving force which one day soon, God willing, will put the invader to rout, and reestablish freedom in the Carpathians.

The time is coming—and coming swiftly—when godlessness, hate, and prejudice will be swept aside. Then Hungary once again will resume its rightful place in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

The spirit of Louis Kossuth—courageous, fighting, never-say-die—is the inspiration that will liberate Hungary and restore to that nation the honor and glory of which it was robbed.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

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:

Our Father God, again at the beginning of another week's deliberations in this forum of a people's hope, we crave a sense of Thy direction and Thy benediction as we pause in contrition at this mercy seat of prayer our fathers built. So many things our finite minds cannot fathom, yet one piercing thing about Thee searches our very being, that it is only the pure in heart who really see God. Take Thou the blindness of our souls away. We would so lift our hearts and our minds into the light of Thy presence that as we go hence no deceit may mislead us and no temptation corrupt us. In every age men have heard Thy voice, and we can hear it still. Beneath the hum of the world's vast work and beyond all the clamor of man it soundeth, and we catch the accents of the Divine. In this moment we would hush all the divisive voices which daily assail our senses, and realize now in the quietness our unity in Thee.

For these thy servants of the public welfare we ask special gifts of wisdom and understanding, patience and strength, that, upholding what is right and following what is true, their words and deeds and decisions may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom: And Thine shall be the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 12, 1954, 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. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 12, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder;

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony; and

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the finance, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR ACADEMIC DEAN OF UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT TO STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the secret semiannual statistical supplement to the stockpile report, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in the cases of several aliens who have been found admissible to enter the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Servicemen's indemnities" for the fiscal year 1954 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE STAFF CLUB

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the United States Senate Staff Club, signed by Otto J. Dekom, chairman, enclosing a resolution adopted by that club, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
March 13, 1954.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: By the order of the newly organized United States Senate Staff Club and as chairman of the committee designated to prepare the attached resolution, I am submitting herewith, in duplicate, a resolution which was passed by the United States Senate Staff Club at its regular meeting on March 1, 1954.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OTTO J. DEKOM,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED STATES SENATE STAFF CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 1, 1954

Whereas the Senate of the United States is the outstanding legislative body in the world, serving as an example to freedom-loving men and women everywhere; and

Whereas the examples of achievement in devotion to public service set by Members and officers of the Senate serves as a guiding example to all of us who comprise the Senate staffs; and

Whereas we wish to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to the Members of the Senate and its officers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate Staff Club, as provided by its constitution and bylaws and by unanimous vote, respectfully extends to the Vice President of the United States, the Members of the United States Senate, and the officers of the United States Senate, honorary membership in the United States Senate Staff Club; be it further

Resolved, That a committee of three members be instructed to respectfully transmit this resolution to the Vice President of the United States.

OTTO J. DEKOM,
Chairman.
MELVIN L. RUTT,
Member.
ANN B. KENDRICK,
Member.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution urging congressional action against injurious foreign imports

"Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

"Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price-cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

"Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

"Whereas pressure that comes from imports of residual fuel oil, having risen from an average of 50 million barrels in the 1946–48 period to more than 125 million in 1952, or the equivalent of 31 million tons of coal; from imports of pottery, watches and parts, glassware, lace, carpets and other textiles, hats and millinery, chemicals, scientific apparatus, cutlery, dairy products, wall paper, luggage and leather goods, and many other articles, will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus contained; and

"Whereas a maximum of such trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs)*, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"[SEAL] G. HAROLD WATKINS,
"*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*

"Approved the 28th day of July A. D. 1953.

"JOHN S. FINE,
"*Governor.*"

A resolution adopted by Parkway Council 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to an amendment of the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Letters and petitions from sundry citizens and organizations in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali) (Rept. No. 1065);

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Aloisia Schlotter (Rept. No. 1066);

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson (Rept. No. 1067);

S. 1850. A bill for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan (Rept. No. 1068);

S. 2198. A bill for the relief of (Sister) Jane Stanislaus Riederer (Rept. No. 1069);

S. 2411. A bill for the relief of Ruth Berndt (Rept. No. 1070);

S. 2438. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Rossi (Rept. No. 1071);

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola) (Rept. No. 1072);

H. R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Manfred Singer (Rept. No. 1073); and

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote (Rept. No. 1075).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendent:

S. 856. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States (Rept. No. 1074);

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Albina Sicas (Rept. No. 1076);

S. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rev. Ishai Ben Asher (Rept. No. 1077);

S. 1808. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Monti (Rept. No. 1078); and

S. 2308. A bill to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1079).

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERIM REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1064)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit an interim report of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which report was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at this morning's meeting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 15, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point 2 citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis 2 citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3128. A bill for the relief of Antonio de Olieveria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3129. A bill for the relief of Parashos Georgios Spanolios;

S. 3130. A bill for the relief of Socrates Pappadimatos; and

S. 3131. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 3132. A bill to promote the prevention and control of pollution in the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3133. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3134. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3135. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3136. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the national encampment of the Sons of Union Veterans to be held in Duluth, Minn., August 8 to August 13, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 3137. A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3138. A bill for the relief of Wakako Niimi and her minor child, Katherine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 3139. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2540, RELATING TO REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS USED IN COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 25, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate office building, on the bill (S. 2540) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert Tieken, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, vice Otto Kerner, Jr., resigned.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas Ramage Ethridge, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Noel H. Malone, resigned.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Claims, vice Evan Howell, resigned.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF A NOMINATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President the Senate received today the nomination of George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for a term of 3 years expiring December 1, 1956 (reappointment). I give notice that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation anxiously awaits final action in the House of Representatives on the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway legislation.

The resounding victory of the Wiley-Dondero bill in the Senate and in the House Public Works Committee demonstrates the desire by people in all sections of our country for American co-ownership of this great resource. I am confident that when the bill reaches the House for final vote, it will be overwhelmingly approved.

I do not, however, for one moment underestimate the tactics of stalling, of submitting crippling amendments, which seaway opponents are using, and have been using in a last-ditch effort to hold back the forces of progress. They are not going to succeed.

I know that the White House is determined that seaway legislation shall pass, and I know that a majority of the House of Representatives is likewise determined.

I present an editorial which appeared in the March 11 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, and append to it the text of a letter to the House of Representatives from the Wisconsin Governor's Committee for the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, whose chairman is the Honorable Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee. I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT,
STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 5, 1954.

We respectfully urge your support of S. 2150, to assure United States participation in the St. Lawrence Seaway project on a self-liquidating basis.

Development of the navigation and power resources of the St. Lawrence has been urged by every President and by all Chiefs of Staff ever since World War I. The question is no longer whether a seaway will be built, but only whether we shall have a voice in it. The seaway will be an important transportation facility, and it seems to us imperative that this country have a share in a project so important to our well-being and defense.

Participation will enable the United States to have a voice in the seaway's administration and in fixing tolls on shipping, which it is estimated will be 80 percent of United States origin or destination. The related power project will be built by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, without Federal participation. The navigation project will be self-liquidating, with toll revenues to retire its cost.

The seaway will provide a great new transportation resource; will open a large new source of waterpower; will stabilize the steel industry; and will strengthen the national security. Its underaking as a public-works project would be most timely at this transition point in our economy.

Affirmative action on the seaway has been recommended to you by President Eisenhower, his Cabinet, the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This committee, representing a broad cross section of agricultural, industrial, veteran, labor, and civic interests joins them in recommending and requesting your support of S. 2150 in the national interest.

Cordially and respectfully,

HARRY C. BROCKEL,
Chairman.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 11, 1954]

HOUSE STALLING SEAWAY ACTION

Time, which daily becomes a more vital element in the question of United States participation in the St. Lawrence Seaway, has never been of much importance to the House Rules Committee.

The seaway bill is awaiting action in that committee—waiting for a "rule," which amounts to permission for the House to take up the matter. The current excuse for committee inaction is that Representative FALLON (Republican, Maryland), a seaway opponent, wants to be present to fight against the bill when the committee takes action. FALLON is one of the Congressmen who was unfortunately shot down by Puerto Rican fanatics.

The committee must not wait long. Quick House action is essential, for each passing day brings new Canadian determination to get on with the job—the United States cooperating or not. Canada is determined and committed to the seaway and is even becoming reluctant to include us.

The arguments which won Senate support for the seaway and the 23 to 6 approval of the House Public Works Committee decisively call for favorable and quick action by the House.

The seaway is going to be built. Nothing Congress does can stop it. The question this last year has been: Will we allow it to be built without our participation? Will we allow one of our longest water borders to be developed without retaining an equal voice in that development?

Will we lack the vision that has helped in so many past instances to make America grow—the vision to take full advantage of our resources? Only with such vision is it possible to continue our economic and industrial development.

OPPOSITION TO NATURAL GAS EXEMPTION BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote in opposition to House bill 5976, whose effect, I believe, would be to deprive the Federal Power Commission of necessary jurisdiction for protection of consumers of natural gas.

I believe there is real merit in the views of Commissioner Doty, of the FPC, in opposition to the bill, as presented to the Senate by our associate, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. President, I have consistently held to the position that consumers are entitled to be protected from being gouged in natural gas rates. My State of Wisconsin is a heavy gas-consuming State. There is a severe shortage of natural gas. My State has suffered from rise after rise in the price of natural gas. My State has taken the leadership in fighting in the courts for protection of consumers.

It would be utterly inconsistent for me, I believe, to take any position other than opposition to the present version of House bill 5976.

WISCONSIN'S GREAT REGULATORY RECORD

In taking my position, I wish to make it very clear that I have the very highest regard for regulation at the State level, as performed by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Wisconsin has always been a pioneer in the field of fair State regulation. Wisconsin has a vital "affiliated interest" statute which prevents "phony" corporate structures from being devised to frustrate the interests of regulation.

However, the State of Wisconsin is limited in its regulation of prices which have been established long before the natural gas reaches Wisconsin's border. In other words, if the Federal Government has not handled its phase of the work, it is expecting too much that a single State, hundreds upon hundreds of miles from the natural gas fields, will be able to protect consumers completely.

It is wholly understandable, therefore, as pointed out by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], that the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers so strongly opposes the Hinshaw bill.

At the present time, I present a telegram which I have received from Mayor Frank Zeidler, of Milwaukee, opposing House bill 5976, and I append it to the text of an editorial which appeared in the October 8, 1953, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, likewise opposing this exemption bill. I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 12, 1954.*
Hon. ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

We are informed H. R. 5976 is before the Senate. In our view, the effect of the bill could be that avenues may be opened to entities selling natural gas, resulting in their escape from necessary regulation through the rearranging of their corporate structures the creation of several affiliated corporate entities selling natural gas, each regulated by a separate State body, avoiding regulation by the Federal Power Commission, possibly could subject consumers to substantially higher natural gas rates. Uninterrupted regulation by the Federal Power Commission over sales of natural gas in interstate commerce is in our view imperative in the public interest. The creation of several such corporate entities to remove regulation by the Federal Power Commission, even though permitting State regulatory bodies to regulate such entities, seems to us inadvisable. The city of Milwaukee has long urged that jurisdiction by the Federal Power Commission be exercised over all sales of natural gas in interstate commerce up to the time when such gas is delivered in the State in which the local utility sells the natural gas to the consumer directly. This regulation is essential to protect the public against discriminatory and unreasonable rates. We urge your opposition to H. R. 5976.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of October 8, 1953]

NATURAL GAS FIGHT STARTS AGAIN

Consumers are again threatened with higher natural gas prices. Laws and the courts seem unable to keep them under control.

Several years ago a bill sponsored by Senator KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, to exempt a large share of the gatherers and producers of natural gas from control by the Federal Power Commission was jammed through Congress. The consumers were saved by former President Truman, who vetoed the bill on the justifiable grounds that it would put the gas-using public entirely at the mercy of the natural gas and oil interests.

It made no sense, the President said, to attempt to control retail sale of gas at the State level and pipeline prices of gas in interstate commerce if no control could be exercised at the source.

The FPC immediately gave the gas interests what they had failed to get by law when it ruled that it had no control over the gathering and production of gas in the case of the Phillips Petroleum Co. Milwaukee and Wisconsin fought the ruling in the courts and won. The Circuit Court of Appeals felt just the way Truman had felt—that it was a duty of the FPC to protect consumers.

But the fight isn't over. The Phillips case has been carried to the Supreme Court. There is no reason to believe that, if the Court does agree to hear the appeal, it will change the ruling. The gas interests seems to sense this, so they are back working on Congress. Two bills are now before Congress. One duplicates the Kerr bill and would exempt the gathering and production of gas from FPC control. The other bill would exempt from FPC control any gas bought at a State line and used in the State.

This measure would make it possible, in the view of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, for pipeline companies to escape Federal control by setting up affiliated corporations to handle State business or to transport it for resale to similar affiliates.

In either case natural gas controls would become a fiction. State controls would become meaningless because of the lack of control in the production and transmission stages. Prices could go as high as the producers desired.

The municipal law officers at their recent meeting warned consumers over the Nation of the threat of rising gas prices that faces them in the natural gas bills before Congress. The gas fight has to be fought all over again.

ANTI-COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES OF JOHN A. BURNS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on March 4 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] spoke in opposition to Hawaiian statehood; and in the course of his speech he made several statements severely criticizing one John Burns, who is chairman of the Territorial Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii. The inference of those statements was that Mr. Burns had some connection either with Communists or with fellow travelers serving their cause.

I had no reason to believe that those statements were true, and having met Mr. Burns, I was strongly inclined to believe that they were incorrect.

Since then I have received from Mr. Burns a letter in which he strongly denies the charges. I now ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 13, 1954.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: In a statement to the Senate of the United States on March 4, 1954, Senator EASTLAND repeats certain statements about John A. Burns made by witness Paul Crouch before a subcommittee of the Senate Internal Security Committee. The statements of Mr. Crouch were repeats of statements made by Mr. Frank Fasi, announced candidate for nomination for mayor of Honolulu, Hawaii, and Democratic national committeeman.

In Honolulu where the charges were first made and where others of a character assassination type have also been made by Mr. Fasi, who was defeated for the Democratic nomination in 1952 by incumbent Mayor John H. Wilson and who has announced his intention of again seeking the same nomination, the political reasoning responsible for such statements were obvious. Mr. Fasi was elected national committeeman in 1952 prior to the 1952 primary elections. I have opposed his use of his party office to further his candidacy for nomination in 1954. This, coupled with my long-standing friendship with Mayor John H. Wilson and my position in the party, leads Mr. Fasi to believe that I am a threat to his ambitions. I would not dignify them with a reply which would recognize them. However, since they have been made on the floor of the Senate of the United States of America where the local political connotations peculiar to Honolulu are unknown the truth should be told.

Therefore, I, John A. Burns, chairman, Territorial Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii, make the following statement:

I am not a Communist nor am I a fellow traveler; I have never been a Communist nor a fellow traveler; I will never be a Communist nor a fellow traveler. I am not a dupe or stooge of Communists; nor have I ever been; nor will I ever be.

My social, economic, and political principles and ideals are a matter of conviction and certainty with me and they are diametrically opposed to those of Communists, Marxists, or dialectic materialists. I have, and will, oppose unequivocally and with all the ability and force at my command the philosophy of Marxists, Communists, and dialectic materialists as well as Fascists and all other forms of tyranny over the minds of men. My whole political activity has been devoted to this end with no thought of self-aggrandizement.

I did not refuse to testify against Jack Hall in the Hawaii Smith Act trial. In fact, I was ever ready to cooperate with the Department of Justice and met with them on details of the case with which I was familiar. The decision not to call me as a witness was made by the prosecutor. I am not "working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the territorial conventions."

I will continue in my belief and conviction that the laws of the United States and the prosecuting forces, as well as the courts, are the place for the trial and conviction of those dangerous and inimical to our Nation and institutions. By serving my God and my country in the use of my knowledge and ability to the end of making our republican-democracy a working reality I know that I am combatting communism and any other un-American philosophy. I will not make nor will I advise or permit others with whom I may have influence to make any trades or deals with known or admitted Communists or other un-American forces which will in any way contribute to increase of their prestige and enhancement of their cause—and I never have.

I would be very willing to testify as to the above or any pertinent information as to my life or activities before any properly instituted body.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BURNS,
Chairman, Territorial Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Mr. LONG. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have had occasion to look into this matter. I find that in the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities hearings on Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii were held; and certain testimony these developed indicated that Mr. Burns, far from cooperating with the Communists, was playing a hand in uncovering the Communists and leading to their conviction. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the testimony of one of the star witnesses against the Communists, in the trials held in Hawaii, Mr. Jack H. Kawano, as given before the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities, appearing on page 52 of the record of that hearing, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything else you desire to say?

Mr. KAWANO. I have just one short statement.

I would like to have the record show that I want to offer my thanks and deep appreciation particularly to Judge Chuck Mau; Representative Mitsuyuki Kido; Mr. John A. Burns, chairman of the Oahu County Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii; Dr. Ernest I. Murai, who so patiently and insistently worked on me and constantly preached Americanism to me.

They worked on me without knowledge that I was a member of the Communist Party. It was they who convinced me in such a fashion that led me to the determination to break my ties with the Communist Party.

Later on other good citizens, through discussions on community problems and through friendly association, gave me further encouragement to become a good American. Among these are Capt. Sakal Takahashi, now a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, and formerly president of the famed 100th Infantry Club; Mr. Dave Benz, secretary of the Democratic Party of Hawaii; Mr. Daniel Aoki, former president of the 442th Infantry Club; also Capt. Daniel Inouye, and other good citizens.

Also, I thank your committee for granting me this opportunity to testify before you in order that I may be able to make my contribution to my country by bringing to light whatever I know about Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii.

Thank you.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kawano, the committee is indebted to you for coming this great distance in order to give us the benefit of your deep knowledge of the machinations of this group of international conspirators.

If more people would come forward now and aid this committee in its effort to bring to the American people an appreciation of what is going on, I don't think there would be any real danger from communism after a very short time.

I don't think the hard-shell corps is so strong as to in anywise affect our free institutions, but when they can influence the thinking and the actions of well-meaning but misguided people, then the whole movement does present a very serious menace; and you have aided us immeasurably.

It is unfortunate that you did not feel you were able to make the statement you have made today in Hawaii, because I believe others would have been encouraged to come forward, because I believe yours is the best testimony we could have gotten.

Again, in behalf of the committee and myself, I express my sincere appreciation of your contribution.

Mr. VELDE. May I add my congratulations to you, also.

Mr. LONG. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have before me photostats of three letters commending Mr. Jack

Burns for his work against subversive activities in the Territory of Hawaii. One of the letters is from George W. Bicknell, lieutenant colonel, General Staff Corps, assistant A. C. of S., G-2, contact officer, dated April 3, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HEADQUARTERS, HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT,
Honolulu, T. H., April 3, 1943.

Lt. JOHN A. BURNS,
Honolulu Police Department,
Honolulu, T. H.

MY DEAR MR. BURNS: At this time it is my desire to express to you my personal appreciation for the very fine assistance which was rendered by you in your official capacity as an officer of the Honolulu Police Department, especially during the early days of December 1941.

It was very helpful indeed to have you in your capacity as liaison officer between this office and the police department, and your assistance in carrying out the various assignments which were turned over to you, has been very deeply appreciated. I am sure that we would not have been able to carry on as much of the work as we did had it not been for the assistance of you and your associates.

I look forward to seeing you again sometime in the near future, and in the meantime, please accept my very best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BICKNELL,
Lieutenant Colonel, General Staff Corps, Assistant A. C. of S., G-2, Contact Officer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, another one of the letters is from Mr. R. L. Shivers, special agent in charge of the FBI in Honolulu, dated April 14, 1943, commending Mr. Burns. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HONOLULU, T. H., *April 14, 1943.*

Mr. WILLIAM G. GABRIELSON,
Chief of Police, Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR CHIEF GABRIELSON: I want to take this opportunity, before leaving Hawaii, to express my appreciation for the very valuable assistance which Lt. John A. Burns has rendered this office. Under his supervision and direction, the Espionage Bureau of the Honolulu Police Department developed into a valuable asset in the field of counterespionage. Through his leadership, the members of the Espionage Bureau became thoroughly trained in the fundamental features of counterespionage and were thereby able to afford valuable assistance in this field.

In addition to his services as head of the Espionage Bureau, Lieutenant Burns has been most cooperative with myself and members of the Honolulu office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have found him to be a man of sound judgment and keen intelligence with a commendable enthusiasm for his work. It has been a pleasure to have been associated with Lieutenant Burns and I have found at all times that his conduct has been pleasant and courteous.

Very truly yours,

R. L. SHIVERS,
Special Agent in Charge.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the third letter is from Brig. Gen. Kendall J. Fielder, General Staff Corps, assistant chief of staff, G-2, commending Mr. Burns for his activities against subversives. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

HEADQUARTERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES,
MIDDLE PACIFIC,
APO 958, March 5, 1946.

Mr. JOHN A. BURNS,
Kailua, Oahu.

DEAR JACK: On the eve of my transfer from Hawaii I desire to express to you my great appreciation for all that you did in making my job and that of counterintelligence an easier one. During the early days of the war in particular I considered you one of my principal advisers in connection with the various racial problems. Your judgment was always sound and you were never unwilling to assist in any project that the military intelligence attempted.

I hope that some day our paths may cross again and until then I wish you every success and happiness.

Very sincerely,

KENDALL J. FIELDER,
Brigadier General, General Staff Corps, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2.

Mr. LONG. Futhermore, Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the proceedings in the trial of the Communist leaders in Hawaii, in which the leading witness against some of the Communists testified that Mr. Jack Burns was the person who played the greatest part in persuading him that he should renounce communism and should testify against the Communists in Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that testimony be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF *v.* CHARLES KAZUYUKI FUJIMOTO, AND OTHERS, DEFENDANTS—VOLUME NO. 57, CRIMINAL NO. 10,495

(Witness: Jack Haruki Kawano. Cross-examination by Richard Gladstein.)

Question. Wasn't there—weren't there some people who were urging you to contact the FBI for some considerable time before you or Mr. Doyle had your first conference?

Answer. There were some; yes.

Question. Now, that is what I tried to find out. Now, who were those people?

Answer. Well——

Mr. WALSH. I am going to object to this as immaterial, if Your Honor pleases, and irrelevant and collateral.

Mr. GLADSTEIN. It is showing the state of mind and bias, Your Honor.

The COURT. The objection is overruled.

Answer. Well, this went way back to just about that time the House Un-American Committee had a hearing.

Question. (By Mr. Gladstein). You mean in the Territory?

Answer. In Honolulu, yes. I don't know what date it was but most likely the early part of 1950. And when they got news that the Un-American Committee was coming here, some news, maybe in January or February or sometime around that——

Question. Of what year?

Answer. 1950.

Question. All right.

Answer. Quite a few individuals talked to me and, of course, they stated, well, we cannot say definitely whether you are a Communist or not, but from all indications you seem to be a Communist. And if you are a Communist, here is a good chance for you to come out and clear yourself and have all doubts about you as to whether you are or are not a Communist cleared. And one of those, in fact, most vigorous in expressing opinions and impressing me along that line was Mr. Burns, Mr. Jack Burns, who was then one of the leaders of the Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Question. Who else?

Answer. Mr. Mau.

Question. Which Mau?

Answer. Mr. Chuck Mau.

Question. Who else?

Answer. He was also one of them. Mr. Kido.

Question. Full name, please.

Answer. Mr. Mitsuyuki Kido. He was one of them.

Question. Who else?

Answer. Mr. T. Matsuo, manager of the theater where I was working, was one of them. Mr. Murai, Dr. Murai, he was one of them. Mr. Inouye——

Question. First name, please.

Answer. I believe Daniel Inouye, he was connected with the 442d outfit. He was one of them. And then to a little lesser degree, Mr. Takahashi, Sakae Takahashi. Mr. Ernest Heen. Those are all I remember now.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, today, March 15, is celebrated throughout the world where freedom exists as Hungarian Independence Day. I wish to read to my fellow Senators a short statement I have prepared in connection with this celebration:

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

"Through this long time, amidst all adversities, there was not a period when the people of Hungary did not resist despotism"—with these words the Hungarian apostle of world democracy, Louis Kossuth, addressed an enthusiastic American audience in Faneuil Hall in Boston. This was more than 100 years ago, but the words ring as true today, the anniversary of Hungarian independence, as they did then.

Kossuth had many occasions to warn against the danger of Russian absolutism. Then it was a lurking menace, now it has become a tragic reality. The Magyar people have not accepted the Soviet tyranny. The cry "For God and country," is heard through the land, as it was when the fearless Kurucs rode into battle. With confirmed belief in the righteousness of their cause and its inevitable triumph, the people of Hungary carry on the struggle for the day when peace and liberty shall again be restored to the land of St. Stephen.

I hope and pray that day is not too far distant.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF POLLUTION IN THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the prevention and control of pollution in the Potomac River.

Mr. President, I have a very brief statement of explanation which I wish to make in regard to the bill.

The report of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin presents to the Congress a challenge so serious it can no longer be overlooked.

Last September 29, on an inspection trip by boat, I saw first-hand what the Commission describes in its report, released Sunday, as "a natural sewage

lagoon." That is exactly what the Potomac, in the heart of the Nation's Capital, has become.

That is why I said at that time that I would propose Federal action to help alleviate this disgraceful condition.

Today I am introducing in the Senate a bill to authorize the kind of Federal assistance and leadership which I believe is needed to accelerate abatement of pollution in the Potomac—in line with the recommendation of the Commission that, "What is needed is a full-scale assault, aimed to cleanse the Potomac at the earliest possible date."

The bill will provide that $8 million a year for 5 years may be appropriated from Federal funds to match money provided by the District of Columbia, the States or local governments and agencies on a 60–40 basis, with the Federal share set at 60 percent.

The bill will provide that the funds will be administered and allocated by the present Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin on projects approved by it. This is in recognition of the fact that this agency, with a dozen years of experience behind it, and consisting as it does of representatives of the States involved, is probably best qualified to get maximum results from the money spent.

Until now, the Commission, though only advisory and limited to a small staff and budget, has done a remarkable job in stimulating local corrective action. Much progress has been made.

But with the continued rapid growth of the Washington metropolitan area, where the problem is most acute, and the heavy impact on this area of the Federal establishment, local efforts alone are not sufficient enough.

The Commission recognizes this when it states in its report:

> The heart of the problem, however—the greatest pollution load and therefore the greatest need—lies in the District of Columbia itself. As the seat of government, Washington is the Nation's showcase city. The Potomac is the Nation's river. For these reasons, and because it occupies—tax free—such a large proportion of the metropolitan area, the Federal Government has an undeniable responsibility to assist in the cleaning up of the Potomac. Both the executive and legislative branches of Government must recognize the importance of a healthy environment for the Nation's capital and enable the Federal Government to contribute its share to the cleanup tasks which face the District of Columbia and the adjacent areas.

As the Commission also points out, present plans are excellent as far as they go. But the presently programed construction in this area will not clean up the Potomac before 1965 or 1970. By then, if the population should increase more rapidly than now estimated, or if local efforts falter for lack of necessary Federal leadership, increasing pollution may have overtaken the remedies and left us where we are today, on the shores of an open sewer.

I digress long enough to say that I am satisfied, as a result of my study of this problem as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that the Potomac will never be cleaned up by any such so-called long-range program as is at present contemplated. It can only be done by drastic action which calls for the appropriation now of funds necessary to do the cleanup job at this time. I am satisfied that the program which has been outlined would merely maintain the Potomac as a continuing cesspool as the population in the area increases.

Immediate construction needs are estimated at $62 million. No Federal help, even in the District of Columbia, is presently in sight or even proposed.

My bill would authorize the Federal Government to assume 60 percent of this program over a period of 5 years. This would permit communities to spend local money available for this purpose at a faster rate than now proposed and in some instances to expand their control programs.

Washington, for example, now has plans to expand its treatment facilities and intercepting sewers. But it can do little about one of its biggest pollution sources—the ancient combined sewer system. One who makes a personal inspection of this ancient combined sewer system, as I did, cannot fail to be reminded of the sewers of ancient Rome, the remnants of which can still be seen when a trip is taken through the great Roman city.

There is no overall program now to prevent frequent discharge of raw sewage from these old mains into the river. With Federal help, this problem could be tackled.

While the Federal Government has a special responsibility to curb river pollution in this area, I believe Congress could well examine again its duties in this respect nationwide.

It has been 6 years since the Water Pollution Control Act went on the books. Unfortunately, appropriations under the act have been meager, and this first Federal effort in this field has accomplished little.

The Senate Public Works Committee, in reporting the 1948 act, commented:

> The information developed at the hearings furnished ample proof that water pollution has become a matter of grave concern in many areas, and that its damaging effects on the public health and natural resources are a matter of definite Federal concern as a menace to national welfare. The committee is convinced that further progress in pollution abatement must be undertaken in order to control this menace to the public health and natural resources. The committee agrees with the views of many witnesses that the Federal Government should take the initiative in developing comprehensive plans for the solution of water-pollution problems in cooperation with the States.

The experience that could be gained in the Potomac Basin under the type of Federal-aid program I am proposing could well point the way to a renewed countrywide attack on this national shame.

I hold in my hand an article published about 2 years ago by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, on the subject Tainted Waters. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> Standing on the veranda of a lovely home, looking out on the entrancing vista of the glistening river, a visitor exclaimed: "What a glorious location." Surely, it seemed that every prospect pleased. But the owner replied sadly: "There is a fly in the ointment of this delectable scene. The river so close to our door is polluted, its water is tainted."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article 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:

TAINTED WATERS

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

Standing on the veranda of a lovely home, looking out on the entrancing vista of the glistening river, a visitor exclaimed: "What a glorious location." Surely, it seemed that every prospect pleased. But the owner replied sadly: "There is a fly in the ointment of this delectable scene. The river so close to our door is polluted, its water is tainted."

Industrialism has its price. Factories take their toll. In every bustling city beauty and health are sacrificed in the altar of commercialism. Black smoke and yellow fumes pollute the air. Noxious odors offend and strangle. Even the coal which shakes its grimy curtain over darkened streets demands human life as part of its cost. But no pollution which accompanies so-called civilization is more sadly tragic than the contamination of our rivers.

If time in its flight could be rolled back to the days of Indian wigwams pitched on verdant banks, where now are the wharves and belching smokestacks of the white man, the contrast with streams, then pellucid, now putrid, would cry in shame to high heaven. Flowing in its crystal purity from out the silent solitudes from which it goes forth on its winding quest, the river just keeps rolling along its broadening way, bringing wheresoever it flows life and joy to man and beast. But, alas, in modern landscapes, however pure a stream may be at its fountainhead it tends to become clogged by impurities in the course of its journey—especially if man erects his homes, constructs his factories, and paves his streets along a river's pleasant banks.

As a city expands and its marts of trade increase and its manufactured products pour forth in greater volume, so often a once proud river, the joy of the pioneer who reveled in the lordly loveliness of the site, becomes a polluted sewer of contamination in which even fish scarcely can live. Thus the very springs of the city's life are poisoned.

That modern state of affairs suggests a report in Holy Writ, made thousands of years ago, about an ancient city. Jericho had every outward sign of prosperity. But there was a jarring discord spoiling its municipal music. Its water supply was tainted. That is a fatal blight to any city. Jericho's city fathers, alarmed at the situation which threatened the health of every man, woman, and child in the town which seemed so fair and fortunate, came to the Prophet Elisha. "Behold," cried the members of the city council—"behold, the situation of the city is pleasant but its waters are tainted." That is the accusing consciousness now in America the beautiful, as we look out upon many of our broad streams, or gaze down at the swift currents from some point of vantage along a spanning bridge: The waters are tainted.

The biblical story declares that the prophet healed the poisoned waters by casting salt into the spring. In that incident is mirrored a fundamental service of salt. Were it not for the salty ocean the pollution of our rivers would soon turn them into dead seas. One authority has declared: If the sea were to lose its saltiness, the earth would soon become uninhabitable. The salt sea receives the tainted waters and, by its magic

alchemy, they are sweetened and cleansed. That is not only a saving fact regarding the earth. It is a parable about life on the earth.

A river is the symbol of all the beautifying, satisfying, fertilizing forces that enrich human life as they pour themselves through all its relationships. Yet there is not a stream that flows through the land of man's dreams, desires, activities, expressions, and aspirations which cannot become poisoned and polluted. That is true of the river of music, of literature, of art, of sport, of government, and even of religion. Music savoring of the jungle may arouse the lowest instincts. Literature which sells out to salaciousness pollutes the imagination. Art may pander to the lewd. Sport whose chief aim is to win, rather than to excel, destroys rather than builds high character. Public posts, as is painfully evident in past and current scandals, can be used by sinister practices to feather the nests of the officeholder rather than to further the interests of the people he has sworn to serve. Democracy's chief menace always is that the waters of freedom shall become contaminated. And, surely, the ages prove that the stream of religion can be saturated with incongruous corruption.

Now, what can be done for the cleansing of these rivers flowing through the crowded cities of our modern life? It is significant to remember that the ancient prophet did not denounce the poison which tainted the water. He healed the water by putting in cleansing salt. What the corruption of our day needs is not so much a piece of our mind as a bit of our hearts. Practicing the Presence, by Brother Lawrence, as he worked in his monastery kitchen, and The Imitation, by Thomas a'Kempis, as he meditated in his cloistered cell, have done more to heal the waters of life than the denunciations of all the fiery reformers put together.

You cannot save a city or a society by scolding it. One cannot help his age much by denouncing it. The stream of public life cannot be purified by screening out the things that defile. There must be poured into the hearts and minds of the people some gracious and potent influence that will sweeten and strengthen and save. That is exactly that Christianity is sent and set to do.

Legislation can do something about keeping poison out of food and out of streams. But police are never the final cure for pollution. A prophet greater than Elisha, who healed the tainted waters, one who knew by bitter experience that even religion can degenerate into a racket and its streams become corrupt, declared that only the salt of a pure heart will suffice to heal the poisoned streams of human life. Never did that Supreme Teacher utter anything more pertinent to His followers across all the centuries than "Ye are the salt of the earth." Only by being salt in ourselves can we as individuals become part of the solution, rather than a part of the problem, of this tainted age.

Mr. MORSE. Unfortunately, a great many of the rivers of America are tainted. It seems to me that in the interest of national health, in the interest of national recreation—yes, in the interest of national decency—the Congress ought to proceed to help solve this very serious domestic problem by the appropriation of Federal match-money funds to help clean up the rivers of America.

Mr. President, I close by issuing a challenge—an interesting challenge, because it calls for a searching of the facts. I issue it in the form of a question. Is there a single river in the world more polluted than the Potomac? I doubt it. Frequently we hear reports from visitors to foreign lands who bring back stories about the pollution of the rivers in India and in other parts of the world. I am inclined to believe—and experts have told me that the answer I have given to my hypothetical question is the accurate answer—that one will look in vain for a river in the entire world which carries a greater quantity of human sewage than does the Potomac, rolling by the Capitol, within sight of this building. It is a slow-moving cesspool of human sewage. I say that the time has come for the Congress to remove that blight from the reputations of the Capital City and of the Nation.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am glad to see that the Senator from Oregon has taken an interest in doing something about this problem. I am one of those who have always felt that we should try to make the National Capital the showplace of America, which visitors can view with pride and admiration. This city should be the most beautiful in the entire Nation, and Congress should take steps to see that it is made so.

It is unfortunate that the Potomac River should be an example of the worst in America, rather than the best. This being the Nation's Capital, it would be appropriate for the Federal Government to demonstrate that something can be done to control stream pollution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his support. If he would like to do so, I should be honored to have him join me in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to join the Senator in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I am introducing at this time be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3132) to promote the prevention and control of pollution in the Potomac River, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of promoting an effective program for the prevention and control of pollution in the Potomac River, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, established by the Potomac River Sanitation Compact as approved by Congress in the joint resolution of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), is authorized to assist State and local governments or agencies thereof within the Potomac Valley Conservancy District, as established by such compact, in establishing projects most effective for such prevention and control by making payments, out of funds appropriated to such Commission, for the purposes of this act and in accordance with the provisions of this act, to such governments or agencies thereof.

SEC. 2. Payments authorized under the first section of this act shall be made only if—

(1) the State or local government, or agency of such State or local government, agrees to pay 40 percent of its pro rata share of the cost of the project for which any such payment is made; and

(2) the Commission determines that the project for which any such payment is made is necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

The Commission shall give priority to payments for projects which it decides would be most effective in carrying out such purpose.

SEC. 3. The term "State government" as used in this act shall include the Government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. Such amounts, not in excess of $8 million per year, are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin for the fiscal year following the date of the enactment of this act and the 4 succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Vice President of the United States on last Saturday evening be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Before I get into my talk tonight I want to thank the radio and television stations for providing time for me to reply to the attack which was made by Mr. Stevenson over these same stations on President Eisenhower and his administration last week, to give both sides a chance to be heard is in the fair, best American tradition.

At the outset I must confess this hasn't been an easy talk to prepare, not that I haven't had plenty of advice. All week long the wires and the letters, the telephone calls have been pouring into my office in Washington. The trouble is, of course, they haven't agreed.

For example, I brought a few down here. Here is a batch that says to attack McCARTHY.

And then here's a batch that says to attack Stevenson.

And over here is a group of people who say to attack both of them.

And then over here is a group that says, 'Don't take on either one."

But after talking to the President we decided this issue is too important to answer in kind with a rip-roaring political tirade, before a cheering partisan audience.

The President believes, and I agree, that the best answer to an attack any time is the facts, and that is why I am sitting in this studio alone tonight. I want to talk to you just as if you were sitting across this desk from me. That is why I don't have a prepared written text. I find that when I feel very strongly on a subject I speak a little more effectively when I just refer to notes I have made myself.

Well, to begin, what did Mr. Stevenson say? Cutting away the quips and the fancy adjectives and the cheer lines you usually find in political speeches, he has criticised the Eisenhower administration on three counts.

First, he raised the question about military foreign policy, which has been referred to as the New Look. Secondly, he criticised the administration's handling of the problem of communism in the Government. Third, he claims that President Eisenhower is not providing the leadership he should to his party and to the country.

I want to take each one of these charges up in order of their importance. First one

in order of importance, of course, is his criticism of our foreign and military policy—because nothing is more important than developing the policy which will allow Americans to live at peace with their neighbors. What is this new policy and why was it adopted? How does it differ from the old? I think I can tell you something about that because I was there when it was made.

Every Thursday morning since Eisenhower's administration has been in Washington there has been a meeting of the National Security Council. For two and a half to three hours, the President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and other top advisers in these fields have discussed our foreign and our military policies. They had only one objective in mind in those discussions: What is the best policy for America?

We began by asking ourselves the question—Was the policy we inherited from the previous administration good enough? And our answer was no, because of its results. What were those results?

We found that in 7 years of Truman-Acheson policies 600 million people had been lost to the Communists, and not a single Russian soldier had been lost in combat. We found when we went to Washington that we were still involved in a war in Korea that had cost us 125,000 American boys as casualties. Again not a single Russian soldier was lost in that war. We found that we inherited a budget, a policy which if continued as recommended by the Truman administration would have added $40 billion to the national debt. This would have meant had we approved that policy, more controls and higher prices for all Americans. We found that despite record spending for military purposes, that, in our efforts to be strong everywhere, we weren't strong enough anywhere. So, since our former policy had failed, we then asked ourselves the question: What kind of a new policy should we adopt?

In determining what that policy should be, we decided to find out what the men in the Kremlin were up to. We found that militarily their plan, apparently, was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites, and where, due to our inability to bring to bear our great, superiority on the sea and in the air, we would be unable to win those wars. We found that economically their plan, apparently, was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth, to be prepared to fight anywhere, in the world that they, the men in the Kremlin, chose.

Why? Because they knew that this would force us into bankruptcy, that we would destroy our freedom in attempting to defend it.

We decided we would not fall into these traps. So we adopted a new plan, which summed up, is this: rather than let the Communist nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely, in the future, primarily on our massive, mobile retaliatory power. This we could use at our discretion against the major source of aggression, at times and places that we chose.

We adjusted our armed strength to meet the requirements of this new concept. What was just as important, we let the world and and we let the Communists know what we intended to do. Right now the question is how has that policy worked?

Well, what has happened in the first year of the Eisenhower administration? First the Korean war has been brought to an end.

Second, two American divisions have been brought home because under our new policy we have decided that we will not fight the Communists on their terms if they engage in aggression again in Korea.

Third, our budget is approaching a balance and this means that controls have ended, that taxes can be reduced, and that inflation has been stopped.

Fourth, and this is vitally important, we have finally seized the ideological offensive from Communists all over the world.

The President in his magnificent speech of April 16th before the U. N. Assembly, Secretary Dulles in his superb performance at Berlin, have finally placed the responsibility where it belongs—on the Communists—for blockading the road to peace.

Incidentally, in mentioning Secretary Dulles, isn't it wonderful, finally, to have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists, who stands up to them?

We can be sure now that the victories our men win on the battlefields will not be lost in the future by our diplomats at the council table.

Finally, during the one year of the Eisenhower administration, in not one area of the world have the Communists made a significant gain, and in several areas we have.

Well, that's the New Look—and those are some of the results.

Now, since Mr. Stevenson objects to this policy, and since he hasn't said what he's for, I would like to ask him some questions:

First, does he think the Korean war should not have been stopped?

Second, does he think the two divisions that were brought home to America because of the New Look policy should be sent back to Korea?

Third, does he think that the Soviet Union and Communist China should not be held responsible when they commit aggression against a free nation by using one of their satellites?

Fourth, does he favor having more Korean-type wars all over the world?

Fifth, does he favor a return to the Truman-Acheson foreign policy?

And finally, in discussing this subject, may I add just two things: The best way to avoid war is to let the great aggressive powers who threaten war know that if they begin one they will be held responsible for their acts.

That's what we've done. I think the great majority of the American people will agree with the decision of this administration in doing just that.

Then I would like to say this: I am not a military strategist, and, for that matter, neither is Mr. Stevenson. I don't imagine many of you listening to this program are military experts either. But, fortunately, the man who is President of the United States is one of the greatest military leaders in the world today. He is an expert. He is the one who made the final decision on this policy. I believe that we can and should have confidence in his decision, and in that policy, particularly when the nonexpert who criticizes it offers nothing but return to a policy which failed, and was rejected overwhelmingly by the American people in the elections of November 1952.

So much for that criticism.

Now, to the second criticism Mr. Stevenson makes—the administration's handling of the problem of Communists in Government.

Here again let's see what the administration's policy is, and also let's see how it differs from that of the previous administration.

The first great difference is that this administration recognizes the danger of Communist infiltration in the United States.

We don't agree with Mr. Truman in kissing off that danger by calling it a red herring, nor do we agree with Mr. Stevenson, referring as he did to the investigations of that danger as chasing "phantoms among ourselves."

We know from studying history of the past 10 years that men like Alger Hiss and Harry White turned over secret papers to the Communists, and we know also that they were in a position to exert influence—for the Communists—on policies of the United States.

We know that our atomic experts say the Russians got the secret of the atomic bomb 3 to 5 years before they would have gotten it otherwise, because of the help they received from Communist spies right here in the United States. Consequently—because we recognize this danger—under the President's direction the executive branch of this Government has developed a program to deal with this problem.

Now, this program does two things. First, we make just as sure as we can that we don't put Communists on the payroll. Second, under a new security-risk program, we recognize that it is a privilege, not a right, to work for the Government, and that we should remove from the payroll those who are undoubted risks, and those who might be easy prey to espionage agents because of their personal habits or their backgrounds.

How does this policy work? Now, since May, when the policy was adopted, fairly and effectively, under this program we have been weeding out individuals of this type. To give you an idea, I have here a breakdown of the files of over 2,400 people who have left the Federal payroll either by resignation or discharge under this program since May. A great majority of these, incidentally, were inherited from the previous administration.

This is what their files showed: 422 of the files showed that they contained information indicating subversive activities or associations; 198 of them showed information indicating sexual perversion; 611 showed information indicating conviction for felonies or misdemeanors; 1,424 of these files showed information indicating untrustworthiness, drunkenness, mental instability, or possible exposure to blackmail.

I think all of you will agree that people with information like this in their files shouldn't be working for the Federal Government. That is what we think, and that is why they aren't working for the Federal Government today. Now, that is what the administration in the executive branch has done.

In addition, the President and this administration recognize the right and the responsibility of congressional committees to investigate in this field. Here I want to make a statement that some of you are going to agree with, and some of you are not, but which should be made.

The President and this administration, the responsible leadership in the Republican Party, insist that, whether in the executive branch or in the legislative branch of the Government, the procedures for dealing with the threat of communism in the United States must be fair and they must be proper.

Now, I can imagine some of you who are listening will say, "Why all this hullabaloo about being fair when you are dealing with a gang of traitors?" As a matter of fact, I have heard people say, "After all, we are dealing with a bunch of rats. What we ought to do is go out and shoot them."

I agree they are a bunch of rats. But just remember this, when you go out to shoot rats, you have to shoot straight, because when you shoot wildly, it not only means that the rats may get away more easily but you make it easier on the rats. Also, you might hit someone else who is trying to shoot rats, too. And so we have got to be fair for two very good reasons:

1. Because it is right; and
2. Because it is the most effective way of doing the job.

Why is it right? Well, why do we fight communism in the first place? Because communism threatens freedom, and when we use unfair methods to fight Communists, we help to destroy freedom ourselves.

Now, why is the most effective way to fight Communists to do it fairly?

I have had some experience in this field. I think I know what I am talking about. I know that even when you do it fairly, you will get criticism from some of those who object not to how you are investigating,

but to what you are investigating. When you do it unfairly, and with irresponsibility, all that you do is give ammunition to those who oppose any action against the Communist. When, through carelessness, you lump the innocent and the guilty together, what you do is give the guilty a chance to pull the cloak of innocence around themselves.

In recent weeks we have seen a striking example of the truth of these principles I have enunciated. Men who have in the past done effective work exposing communism in this country have, by reckless talk and questionable methods, made themselves the issue, rather than the cause they believe in so deeply. When they have done this, you see, they not only have diverted attention from the danger of communism, but have diverted that attention to themselves. Also, they have allowed those whose primary objective is to defeat the Eisenhower administration to divert attention from its great program to these individuals who follow those methods.

Now may I make a personal reference on this subject? I have fought Communists all my political life and I am proud to say that they have fought me all my political life, too.

I believe in congressional investigations because I know that if it had not been for the investigations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, Alger Hiss would be free today. And it is because I believe in congressional investigations, that I know the President is right in insisting on fair procedures in those investigations. I would also like to say something else on this subject. I can assure you this administration, under President Eisenhower, will never tolerate disloyalty in any place we find it, and that when mistakes are made, we will admit them rather than to try to cover them up.

Don't you agree that is the best answer to this problem? I believe it is. Because, you see, we must remember that the extremes of those who ignored the Communist danger or who covered it up when it was exposed, have led to the extremes of those who exaggerate it today.

Well, I think that is enough on that subject.

Now let us go to the final criticism Mr. Stevenson made. In a way, it is related to the issues I just discussed He says that President Eisenhower is not giving proper leadership to the Republican administration and to the country.

My answer to that one is pretty short, and it is very simple. President Eisenhower is not only the unquestioned leader of the Republican Party, but he has the confidence and the support of the great majority of Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike. And both his leadership and their support, believe me, are undivided.

Why would anyone raise such a question? Well, I think possibly because they mistake abuse and rhetoric for leadership. It is true that President Eisenhower does not engage in personal vituperations and vulgar name-calling, or promiscuous letterwriting, in asserting his leadership, and I say thank God he doesn't. I think the American people have had enough of that kind of leadership in the White House. Let us never forget that no really great American President ever resorted to such tactics.

How does a great man lead? How does President Eisenhower lead? He leads by example, by what he is for—and President Eisenhower is for the greatest, positive program presented to Americans in a whole generation. Its very simple objective is that all Americans can have peace and prosperity, and have peace and prosperity at the same time. That is something we haven't had in this country for 20 years.

And so I say that it is time to get behind the President's program. Let's quit being diverted from the business of putting that program into effect by fighting, and by controversy over an issue we ought to be together on.

Incidentally, you know Mr. Stevenson was good enough to give some advice to President Eisenhower and the Republican Party last week.

I am sure that he won't mind if I give a little advice to him. It is this: As the recognized leader of the Truman wing of the Democratic Party I advise Mr. Stevenson that if he has a better program to offer to the American people, either in the foreign field or in the domestic field than President Eisenhower has, to offer it and let's debate it. But if he hasn't, then I say come along with the rest of the American people and support the President's program.

And now I am going to say a final word. I believe in America's destiny, as I know all of you do. I studied America's history and I recall in our periods of great crisis America has always been blessed by having great Presidents. This may surprise some of you for me to say this, but some of those great Presidents have been Republicans and some of them have been Democrats.

Today we need the very best leadership that America can provide. I believe that we have that leadership in President Eisenhower.

I say that because I've had the opportunity of working with him.

I say it because I know not only is he respected in the United States, not only is he respected in Europe, where he has worked, but he's also known and respected and loved in countries on this earth which he's never visited.

May I tell you a little story? When Mrs. Nixon and I were on our trip around the world, we went to Bangalore, India. It was the first stop we made in India, and I remember, as we were driving through the streets the crowds were very, very heavy. So I had the car stopped at an intersection and we got out of the car to shake hands with some of the people. But the press of the crowd was so great I asked Mrs. Nixon to get back in the car, and I jumped up on the hood to make a little talk to this group of people.

Now, get the picture. Only 25 to 30 percent of these people, I imagine, even understood English.

I said two things. I said: "I want to thank you for welcoming Mrs. Nixon and me as graciously as you have on our visit to your country."

And: "I bring you the greetings not only of the people of the United States, but I bring you the greetings of the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower."

And then a wonderful thing happened. At the mention of the word "Eisenhower," that whole tremendous crowd broke into applause. And so we have a leader who is not only an American leader; he is a world leader, and he is a man who is mobilizing world opinion for the free nations and for us.

I have seen him make some great decisions during this past year. I see him make them day after day. But no matter how tiring the conferences have been, no matter how long, I can tell you that when he has made those decisions, I have never seen him mean; I have never seen him rash; I have never seen him impulsive; I have never seen him mad; and I have never seen him make a decision which was motivated by political purposes. His only test was the one that he said he was going to use all through the campaign—what is good for America.

I think we are lucky to have this man as President of the United States.

You know this is a great and good country.

Let's quit fighting among ourselves about an issue that all Americans should be united on. Let's join together and get behind our President in making the American dream come true.

Well, I see my time is up, and to all of you who have listened and agreed with me, my appreciation. To all of you have listened and disagreed with me, my respect—and to everybody who on a busy Saturday night took the time to hear this program, thank you, and good night.

OPEN HEARINGS IN THE McCARTHY CONTROVERSY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes on a question of Senate procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the majority leader is on the floor, I wish to register my objection to any suggestion or proposal that any hearings in regard to the controversy which has arisen over the conduct of the McCarthy committee be held in executive session.

I believe the subject has become a matter of the public's business. The American people are entitled to have the hearings held in public. When citizens are brought before Senate committees the usual practice is to hold public hearings, even though sometimes some dirty linen must be washed in public. The same policy should be followed when Senators and members of a committee staff have become involved in a public controversy. I believe there is plenty of dirty linen involved in the controversy, and the American people are entitled to have all the facts brought out in public.

Therefore, let the chips fall where they may, but give the American people an opportunity to observe who is responsible for the controversy now raging, and who is telling the truth in regard to it.

I quite agree that, so far as the question of the power of the McCarthy committee over its own personnel is concerned, it is for that committee to decide it; but I say the investigation of the charges and the countercharges ought to be conducted in an open, public hearing, with the press present. The press will have to act as the sentinel, the guardian, and the informer of the American people as to what the facts are. I for one shall stand on the floor of the Senate and oppose any proposal to clear up this matter by way of executive sessions in committee.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5976), to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act.

THE NEW LOOK IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the newspapers of our country, both in their editorial pages and in their news columns, have reflected varying degrees of interest and speculation on the administration's announced New Look defense policy for the United States. This same curiosity has been echoed in the Halls of Congress, and it is in an attempt both

to stimulate interest in this program and to present a truer picture of it that my remarks are offered at this time.

Naturally, it would be futile for one man to attempt to include in a single discussion all the ramifications involved in the application of the term "New Look" as it relates to our Armed Forces. Such an attempt, also, would lead to much confusion. Because of this, and in view of the essential nature of the subject, my remarks will be confined to that branch of the service with which I have the most intimate knowledge, the Air Force.

Any New Look in the defense program for the United States implies a New Look in the program for the United States Air Force. Is there, then, really a New Look in the Air Force setup and, if so, what is it?

The use of this Nation's Air Force as a retaliatory weapon, one that would, by its strength, dissuade our enemy from attack, is far from a new concept in the field of air strategy. General Vandenberg, who for 5 years was Chief of Staff of America's Air Force, held strongly to this concept, and all his efforts were directed to such an objective. At this point, it should be noted that it was evident as World War II came to a close that the use of airpower as a preventive force, preventive by its very power capacity, was inevitable; and, as the Air Force gradually came of age by virtue of its recognition as a separate arm, this concept was the strong rock of its foundation. To a great extent, of course, this consideration was hastened and strengthened by the advent of atomic weapons capable of delivery by the Air Force. Hence, if we were to confine our description to this one idea alone, and say that the Air Force has a New Look because it is a force of retaliation, and, a deterrent to enemy attack, we would be in gross error. Furthermore, if this were the only basis for the use of the term New Look, we would also be doing a great disservice to Hoyt Vandenberg, and his associates, because of their pioneering efforts in this field.

Where, then, lies the New Look in the Air Force? It could, perhaps, be stated most simply by saying that it lies in aircraft, in equipment, in training, and in planning. Or, it could be described by citing the fact that we have now trimmed much of the fat off the Air Force program as it stood last year, and that the entire Air Force has been pulled together more tightly into a strong and effective military weapon, whose blade has been honed to a war edge by the correct application of these factors of aircraft—equipment, training, and planning. Such a statement could be made, as it often is, and might be acceptable to some; but I do not believe that the basic question involved can thereby be correctly answered for those who have expressed a genuine interest in the New Look in the Air Force.

A proper explanation of the Air Force New Look program requires a view both into history, what has happened, and into the future, what we believe will happen. It requires what the military calls an "estimate of the situation." This methodical approach to a problem is one of the military's finest contributions to our processes of thinking and should be used more often in our deliberations. It involves looking at the enemy and his capabilities and looking at ourselves and our capabilities, and then, by an evaluation of all existing factors and circumstances, reaching a conclusion as to our best course of action. Let us, then, apply this method to our present discussion.

For the first time in our history, we know who and what our enemy is. We know that he is represented by Bolshevik communism and that his intent is the substitution of his philosophies for those which are basic to our Republic, as well as to those of other governments whose strengths lie in freedom by military, psychological, or economic means. Furthermore, we know that the seat of this enemy is the Soviet Union.

With these two important acknowledgments, we can proceed to look at the capabilities of our enemy and plan, with military skill, to meet them. I stress the military aspects of this effort, though I well recognize that there are other weapons which we must use with equal adroitness in this conflict. The use of psychology in our war thinking and planning is rather a new tactic, but it is an increasingly important one, for as we plan our military approaches we must also plan our approach to our enemy's mind.

In that connection, Mr. President, psychological warfare as employed since its inception by this country has not been equal to the task, and it is hoped that in the future we will apply ourselves more diligently to this important and ancient, although new to us, feature of military strategy.

Today, then, we know who our enemy is and we know what our enemy's intentions are. I think it was George Washington who said, in 1776, in effect, that we have the kind of people to deal with who are not aware of danger until the bayonet is at their very breast, and then, truly, they are susceptible of it. Thus it is, also, today. The American people now see in the Soviet Union their greatest enemy, and they regard Communist Russia as the bayonet at the breast of freedom. They are vitally concerned with what we in Congress and those in charge of our military affairs are doing to remove that threat. There is today no complacency of peace such as has always accompanied the end of hostilities in the past. There is an acute awareness of our dangers, and a determination to see us through to a successful conclusion so that freedom will be the victor in this worldwide struggle between the ugly idea of communism and the clean and bright idea of liberty.

We know our enemy, but in the development of our military plan we must go back and look at the evolution of the strong nations in the history of the world and see why they acquired their strength. We must do this now, for without this understanding we can easily underestimate our enemy's potential to destroy us.

Civilization began in the river valleys of Asia. Men assembled there in small villages and towns, and, almost at once, the desire to communicate with one another led to traffic up and down the rivers of that vast and mystic continent. Their transportation was confined to the rivers, however, because, when the tiny and primitive boats reached the mouths of the rivers, they were turned back by the heavy and awesome seas. Asia grew, then, within itself, its development being confined to the length and breadth of the valleys. Men did not dare to venture past these confines, and this restrictive influence of Asian geography is still reflected in the backwardness of the Asiatic countries. While it is true that their cultures flourished, the lack of contact with the outside world brought about a narrowness and provincialism in their ranks which persists even to this day.

Turning, next to Egypt and her great Nile River, we find that there men also assembled in towns along that river; but as they approached the mouth of this one, they found a small, quiet sea whose islands were easy points of recognition for navigation and whose nearly always placid waters offered no great obstacle to commerce between the countries which bordered upon it. Hence, great countries like Greece, Egypt, and the Roman Empire came into being. As the means of transportation gradually improved, commerce flourished, and these Mediterranean countries became the great powers of the then known world.

The ability which man acquired in the navigation of the Mediterranean made it only natural that he should venture even farther into the unknown vastness of the deep oceans. With the advent of deep sea navigation and transportation, the countries whose harbors bordered on the Atlantic in Europe began to grow into world powers. In the logical course of such events, Spain and Portugal became the first of there countries to assume power through their mastery of the ocean. It followed, then, that little England, heretofore only an island kingdom, would assume a world leadership through her inheritance and dominance of the seas. Through sea power, England became the master country of the world, not only politically, but also economically; and it is interesting to note that, until the advent and development of aviation, she successfully retained that position.

Before coming up to the present day to discuss the new transportation era in which we find ourselves, we should look briefly at the impact which the advent of the railroads made on the inland empires of the world. Until the railroad chugged across the American scene in the 1830's, the economic dominance was confined to those countries controlling the seas. The railroad, however, made it possible to develop our own country, and it is probably the greatest single contributing factor to the economic growth of the United States outside our basic free enterprise system.

The railroads opened up the power of Germany. Even Russia began to construct a railroad system, but fell short of

its needs; and today, much of the Soviet Union's backwardness, up until the air age, can be blamed on an inadequate railroad system. In China, likewise, we find a large interior country whose commerce has been stagnant because no proper means of inland transportation has been developed and maintained. The iron horse moved the people away from the rivers, across the plains and mountains, and interior countries began to compete on a more equal basis with the sea-bound countries in the race for world power.

Mr. President, a new method of transportation came into prominence during the period of the Second World War, however; and, particularly since that time, it has risen in the extent of its impact upon the course of human affairs. Air power has completely destroyed the transport barriers of yesterday, and today we live in a world whose wide and far-flung points can be visited easily and quickly for business, pleasure, or, sadly, and more significantly, for the purposes of war.

Now where, it might be asked, does Russia, our enemy, the bayonet at the throat of freedom, fit into this picture with any advantage? We cannot deny some of her backwardness in past years. We recognize our own ability to out-produce her. Where, then, are the facts which justify putting our enemy in a dominant position in this new and gigantic age of air transportation?

During all the years of earlier transportation methods, we grew to know the world from east to west and from west to east. The Mercator projection charts which have guided our navigators around the globe and between its various points were laid out only with regard to the east-west and west-east conception. This was so much the order of the day that now, if one asked a friend which direction France is he would point to the east. If he asked him in which direction China lies, he would point westward. Ask him, then, "Which way is Russia?" and again he will point generally, and only generally, either east or west. The advent of airpower, with the lessening of distances and times between countries, and particularly between the country wherein our enemy has his stronghold, and our own, requires a complete and drastic revision of our sense of distance and direction. We must now think from north to south and from south to north, as well as in eastward and westward lines. We must think globally, because the great land masses of America and Eurasia are closer together across the poles than around our old and established ocean routes. For the sake of information and clarification, I suggest we consider a few distances via the pole or Arctic route:

From eastern Siberia, 3,500 nautical miles encompass all of the United States except the Southeast.

From Murmansk, 3,700 nautical miles reach our industrial Northeast.

From Spitsbergen, 3,200 nautical miles include Washington and Chicago.

From Iceland, 2,700 nautical miles give the same coverage.

From Point Barrow, Alaska, 2,400 nautical miles reach Murmansk and 2,800 to 3,700 nautical miles reach the industrial areas of central Siberia, the Urals, Moscow, and the Ukraine, with 4,100 nautical miles reaching the Baku area.

From northern Maine, 3,100 to 4,600 nautical miles give the same coverage.

From Thule, Greenland, 1,600 to 3,300 nautical miles reach these same areas.

From Iceland, 1,300 to 3,000 nautical miles encompass all these regions.

Mr. President, we now have some idea how, just as England was geographically favored during the deep-sea era, Russia is geographically favored in this new era of airpower by virtue of her Arctic frontier. Our own exposure on the Arctic is not an inviting one. There is only one navigable river flowing north into the Arctic Circle from America. The largest town in the Arctic Circle on our side is Aklavik, Canada, whose population is approximately 200. Compare this bleak situation with that on the Soviet side of the Arctic. There we find, thanks to our own Gulf Stream, many ice-free ports and several navigable rivers, which, when they are frozen over, offer great sledge routes into the Arctic interior of the Soviet. Russia has long been exploiting this vast country by aviation, whereas aviation has not succeeded, to any great extent, in opening up our own Arctic areas. In fact, Russia has long been working at the production potential of the Arctic, and it is necessary, in this appraisal of our enemy, that we look at some of her Arctic cities:

Murmansk, the largest city in the world north of the Arctic Circle, grew from about 3,000 at the beginning of the Soviet regime to 117,000 in 1939. Since that time, it is estimated that its population has increased to nearly 200,000. Murmansk is an important naval base, a large commercial port, and a growing industrial city.

Petsamo, just to the west of Murmansk, is another Soviet Arctic port on ice-free Petsamo Bay.

Archangel is a city of more than 280,000 on the White Sea, whose port is kept open by ice-breakers during the winter.

The Pechora River Basin, to the east, is the principal source of coal and oil for the Leningrad, Archangel, and Murmansk areas.

Ukta, with a population of more than 40,000 is the oil-producing center, where, also, radium has been produced since 1940.

Vorkuta, a city of more than 30,000, is the coal-producing center.

Kara is another Arctic port where coal is shipped from the Vorkuta mines inland by rail.

Sale Kard and Navy Port are the Arctic ports for the Ob River of western Siberia. This is the largest of the Siberian rivers, with 12,000 miles of navigable waterways in use. The second great Siberian river is the Yenisei of west-central Siberia. It also serves a large timber and grain area, and its basin contains many valuable mineral resources. Its navigable waters reach 3,500 miles from the Arctic to Lake Baikal, where another new industrial area is developing.

Igarka, the chief port of the Yenisei, is north of the Arctic Circle. It grew from one house and three people in 1920 to a population of 20,000 at the beginning of World War II.

Dudinka is another growing Arctic port on the lower Yenisei. It serves the mines at Norilsk, a city of more than 35,000, 50 miles inland by rail, where coal, nickel, copper, lead, and zinc are mined.

The third great Siberian river is the Lena of east-central Siberia. Tiski is its Arctic port.

Petropavlovsk is an old fishing and sealing port with a fine harbor, shipbuilding facilities, and miscellaneous industries, and has a population of 100,000.

Magadan, a new city on the north coast of the Okhotsk Sea, has a population in excess of 65,000 and a wide variety of industries.

In July of 1947, the last period for which accurate figures are available, it was estimated that there were 500,000 people north of the Arctic Circle in the Soviet Union, compared to some 20,000 on the American side in Greenland, Canada, and Alaska combined. While it is reasonable to assume that these figures have been altered on both sides since that time, the great difference in favor of the Soviet Union, even then, is sufficient indication of that country's great advantage in this area.

By this brief, though highly significant, outline, we have seen the geographic imbalance which exists between our enemy and ourselves. We should further understand, in this connection, that the very oceans which once afforded us protection now offer a means of transportation for long-range atomic submarines, which can deny us the access to important strategic materals and the normal lanes of intercourse over the seas. So, in a world that is smaller than were the vast continents of past wars, in a world where, geographically speaking, our enemy is better situated than we are, we must, if for no other reason, look to airpower as our first line of defense and our immediate capacity for offense.

In passing to the new phase of this New Look, we should pause briefly to consider the other sources of our military strength. To pass completely over them would be an error and an injustice, and even though this thesis is devoted to an argument for our Air Force as constituted, I cannot refrain from stating my position regarding our great companions in strength—the Navy and its components, and the Army.

The objective and strategy of seapower is to control the sealanes or, in other words, to control the seas. This concept, applied with full vigor, enabled us to defeat another great sea power in the Second World War, Japan. This strategy, applied to Germany, contributed to her defeat in the First World War, although Germany, had she understood this power, could well have defeated the Allies in both wars. These two wars, and other wars in which seapower was a decisive weapon, had as their participants countries whose geographical locations best suited them for dependence upon the seas. Russia, however, does not have to rely on the ocean for her lines of communication and supply. Russia is essentially self-sufficient, and even the

satellites that now come under her vicious wings are approached by land or, more important, they are now easily approachable by air. Hence the real power of ocean offensive—blockade and strangulation—will not affect Russia's ability to exist during war, or even to wage war to a successful conclusion. On the other hand, her submarines can roam the seas, where we used to feel safe, and apply the same strategy against us which we would apply against her were seapower a factor in our retaliation potential.

Since the beginning of conflict between men, it has been necessary for the armies of one nation to plant their feet and their flag on the soil of the enemy nation before any real decision could be concluded. How, then, can any war, without full emphasis on infantry, be justified? Let us go back for a moment to the fact that we know our enemy—his strength and his intentions. Should we plan, then, to wage a war matching him man for man? Will that type of battle be successful on such a vast land mass, against numerically superior armies, or should we, instead, exploit our own greatest strength, which is our technological superiority? We used this approach in bringing about the victory in the Pacific, and we saved the lives of thousands of our men.

America's manpower is limited, as is its ability to maintain a vast army thrown halfway around the world. So the strategy of airpower appears to be the only logical and genuinely acceptable avenue of approach to the problem of creating and maintaining peace in the world. By an emphasis on airpower, we utilize our technological advantages, we lean upon our great productive ability, we exploit the basic weakness of the enemy, which is now interior communication, and we do so with a minimum of manpower and a considerably reduced burden upon the economy of our country. This latter consideration is of especial importance, for the proponents of Bolshevik communism have often stated that they will destroy the Western Powers from within by destroying their economic systems; and, if we continue the policy based on the illusion that the unlimited use of money will strengthen us, then we give concrete impetus to their mode of destruction. No economy, including that of the United States, can stand forever the pressures of maintaining full war production and full war manpower in periods of peace. We can, however, look carefully at our hole card, and then proceed in an intelligent and forceful manner to strengthen it.

The New Look about which I have been speaking is a misleading term, to some extent, because it suggests that all the factors now contributing to our air strength are newly devised. The truth is that the New Look in the Air Force has been in the process of formulation since World War II. From the experiences of that conflict, together with those of the Korean action, and the intervening military lessons provided by our country's technological advances, we have gradually reached a point in our thinking where we have accepted the inevitable; that is to say, we have been made, through necessity, to understand some of the older concepts in terms of the exigencies of these explosive times. To a great extent, then, the New Look is merely an acceptance of the Old Look, but it comes at a time and in a manner when the people of this country can best appreciate the results of such a reassessment of our military potential.

Therein lies the key to the New Look in the Air Force. The time has come when the careful planning of General Vandenberg and his staff is bearing fruit in an Air Force consisting of a carefully planned, closely integrated unit, an Air Force whose present leaders fully understand the dependence of our country upon it, and who are developing with amazing strides a power for peace, created by peace, with constant attention given to building the best and the strongest force. These leaders realize that strength in the air is not measured entirely in terms of planes or men, but rather, somewhat, by teamwork, by training, and by the most astute utilization of our new equipment.

I might say at this point that Winston Churchill recognized in one of his great writings that the assessment of airpower is very difficult; in fact, it is more difficult to assess the true power of air forces than it is to assess the true power of land or sea forces.

Indeed, if numbers alone could make the ideal air force, then we had no right to defeat the German Air Force. When we entered the war in Africa, and then in Italy, and eventually on the mainland of Europe, the German fighter force was larger than ours. We can look at Goering's ghost, wherever it may be hiding in abjection, and thank it for the misuse of this airpower, which led to our early and telling successes. To a lesser degree, the same was true of the Japanese Air Force, but quality ran out in that area at a faster rate than in the German area. On the other hand, we remember the Royal Air Force and its heroic defense of little England, which prompted Churchill to say, "Never have so many owed so much to so few." There we saw the ultimate in the employment of limited airpower, successful to the end that the numerically stronger German Air Force was pushed back across the channel.

All these facts must be understood, and I feel that, generally, they are; but remarks have been made on the floor of the Senate and in the press of the country which have led me to this long and rather detailed explanation of our background and our present situation.

It is necessary, furthermore, that we point up the real achievements of the New Look in the Air Force by making some comparisons with the recent past, both with respect to the quantity and quality of our air arm.

Let us look, first of all, at the economies which have been effected by this New Look. In the original program for the Air Force it was felt that a strength of 1,031,000 officers and airmen was needed to man 115 wings. Last year this authorization was reduced to 960,000 as the Air Force's manpower ceiling for June 30, 1954. The Air Force has now committed itself to man 115 wings with 955,000 officers and men by that date. This reduction of 5,000 persons is a voluntary Air Force action.

Pilot training rates have also been reduced. This has been made possible because the floating D-day concept has given the Air Force 2 more years in which to increase the pilot inventory necessary to the manning of its goals. Thus, instead of a fast buildup to a 12,000 pilot training, followed by a sharp cut in this rate, we are building to a training rate of 7,800 pilots a year. This reduced program also permits personnel reductions among the activities supporting the training program. At the same time, it will give us a sufficient number of pilots to man the 137 wings proposed for the middle of 1957.

Mr. President, it might be interesting to note at this point, from information received rather late, that 17,000 juniors and seniors in the ROTC air program in the colleges of the United States have agreed to take pilot training. This backlog of pilot material in itself will greatly enhance the future of the air arm of our defense.

Overseas, the Air Force has benefited from its Project Native Son. Under this project, the Air Force expects to replace some 43,000 service personnel with local civilians by July of 1954. Already, more than two-thirds of this saving has been realized.

The appreciable modernization of the 13 reserve troop carriers has made possible a reduction of 6 troop carrier wings from the original Air Force goal.

I might interject the statement that one of the criticisms leveled at the new look in the Air Force has been that the Defense Establishment has reduced the group carrier wings in the Air Force, whereas in truth this country has more today, if we combine those of the Regular Air Force and the Reserve, than we have had at any time.

(At this point Mr. GOLDWATER yielded to Mr. DANIEL to insert in the RECORD and to comment on the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the so-called Submerged Lands Oil case. Mr. DANIEL's remarks and the decision appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. GOLDWATER's address.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the continuing program for the improvement of maintenance paid off substantially last year, when the Air Force was able to effect a cutback on the planned production of jet engines intended as replacement engines.

In wing strength, the new look has resulted in an increase from 48 on July 1, 1950, to 106 on July 1, 1953, and an estimated 115 for July 1, of this year. Present plans call for this figure to be increased to 137 wings by July 1, 1957.

The Air Force's potential wing power relates to a function of the number of aircraft and the explosive power which each aircraft can carry. The new look has not involved any change in the various types of wings; hence, any increase in a wing's potential power is the result of increased explosive power. For instance, the H-bomb has been described as having a 4-megaton yield, or the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT. By comparison, the World War II atomic

bomb has been described as having a 20-kiloton yield, the equivalent of 1,000 tons of TNT.

General Twining has stated:

> The growth of our tactical atomic capacity is one of the most significant recent developments in modern warfare. * * * It is an Air Force objective that every offensive fighter and bomber aircraft of our tactical Air Force be capable of carrying atomic weapons.

In World War II, the B–17 or B–24 carried an average bomb load of 4 tons for a combat radius of approximately 1,300 miles. The B–36 is described as capable of carrying 10,000 pounds of bombs, or 5 tons, for 10,000 miles. Thus, modern aircraft carrying 20 KT has from 4,000 to 5,000 times the explosive power of the same aircraft carrying more conventional bombs.

Actual wing power is a function of potential power for efficiency of delivery. Delivery capability depends upon our capacities, those of the enemy, and certain external influences, such as weather and the location of the target. While the proficiency of air crews is continually improving, it is difficult to measure in simple terms, since it includes such factors as increased bombing proficiency, better maintenance, fewer gross errors, improved countermeasures, better intelligence materials, and increased flying proficiency.

An air wing, therefore, now as always, is a unit of striking power, equipped and manned to enable it to operate independently in sustained action until such time as normal resupply and replacement can take effect.

On July 1, 1953, our active aircraft numbered 17,100. It is estimated that the figure will have increased to 21,000 by July 1 of this year, and to 22,900 by July 1, 1955.

What, then, of the use of our aircraft and other Air Force equipment? The answer, of course, depends upon the nature of the tasks which the Air Force must be prepared to perform. Under the New Look program, the aircraft themselves are designed to perform as efficiently and economically as possible whatever task is assigned to them. This, naturally, is a fundamental consideration.

The primary operational tasks of the Air Force are threefold: First, strategic offensive; second, theater operations; and third, continental air defense. In support of these tasks, a fourth is generated, that of air transport.

In turn, to sustain these four purposes, the Air Force is engaged in a variety of supporting activities, which also involve aircraft, such as, first, procurement, maintenance, storage, and distribution of material; second, recruitment, training, feeding, clothing, and the medical care of personnel; third, administration of Air Reserve and National Guard programs; fourth, research, development, and testing of new weapons and equipment; and fifth, the construction of airbases and supporting installations.

Turning specifically to the Air Force's task of strategic offenses, it should be stated, at the outset, that, in order to accomplish this function, the Air Force must be able to attack at any point on the globe in a short period of time, with overwhelming destructive power, and despite any measure of enemy opposition. The hard core of this offensive force is the 10-engine intercontinental B–36, whose capacity has been the primary deterrent force of the free world. Soviet defensive capacity, of course, has not stood still; and there are plans now to replace the B–36 with the jet B–52, in order to keep ahead of the Soviet air-defense buildup.

Supplementing the offensive powers of the B–36 is the piston-engined B–50, which is an improvement of the World War II B–29. These units are now already being replaced—in fact, they are practically replaced in their entirety—by the faster jet B–47.

By extending the range and flexibility of the B–47, the Strategic Air Command has made large-scale aerial refueling from tanker aircraft a routine procedure. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that by adopting this refueling procedure, aircraft which, when using their own fuel containment, can sustain themselves in the air, for no longer than 4½ hours, now fly regularly 15-hour training missions across the length and breadth of the United States.

Although the Strategic Air Command is able to operate from the United States in the event of war requiring the use of refueling techniques, the existence of Strategic Air Command bases overseas greatly increase its flexibility and the economy of its operation, and, hence, its effectiveness. These bases, of course, must be defended. The Strategic Air Command, therefore, has fighter aircraft, such as the F–84, capable of both a defensive and offensive role.

The effectiveness of any attack can be no better than the knowledge of enemy targets, hence, the need for the reconnaissance versions of aircraft, such as the B–47 and the B–36. I may say here that although we might consider these aircraft as of the reconnaissance type, nevertheless, they can deliver bombs against an enemy.

Under the Air Force's task of theater operations, we find its vital contribution in the protection of strategic overseas areas, especially NATO and far eastern regions. The task of theater operations involves air defense, close air-support of ground troops, interdiction, support of the strategic offensive, and theater airlift. For these purposes, a number of types of aircraft are needed: Fighter interceptors, such as the F–86 and the all-weather F–94; fighter bombers, such as the F–84; reconnaisance versions of both fighters and bombers—but still capable of performing their primary task of delivering destruction to an enemy; and troop transports, such as the C–119 and the C–124.

The Air Force air-defense role is to prevent an enemy from successfully delivering an air strike which would result in catastrophic losses to the United States. The most effective defense, of course, is a good offense.

Mr. President, that conception of warfare has never changed, from the days when man first threw a rock at his enemy, until today, when we utilize the most effective technological advances in the air. We must never forget that the best defense is a good offense. Consequently, our strategic air forces have an important part to play in destroying the enemy's offensive power at his home bases, even before he gets his aircraft off the ground. This is the most effective and economical military method of protecting the United States from attack.

Nevertheless, the Air Force must also be prepared to conduct a successful air offense by meeting an enemy air strike after it is airborne. This would be especially necessary in the earlier days or hours of a war, in which it is to be anticipated that the enemy would have the initiative.

Successful interception depends upon three things: First, adequate early warning and radar interception; second, the kind of interceptor aircraft to meet the enemy aircraft; and, third, destruction of the aircraft before reaching the bomb-release line. It involves the present location of bases to protect vital areas, well-trained flying and support personnel, and quality performing all-weather aircraft. The types of aircraft involved here are the all-weather jet F–89 and the F–94. As a "last ditch" defense, these aircraft are backed up by the highly publicized rockets for ground-to-air interception of enemy aircraft.

The latest addition to the Air Force's interceptor program is the new RC–121C radar airplane. This giant Super-Constellation-type plane is adapted for special defense missions, and is capable of carrying this country's most powerful search radar to high altitudes, for line-of-sight surveillance, thus overcoming the normal limitation of radar's inability to bend over the horizon or, as we may say, "to look around the corner."

These flying radar stations can locate sneak raiders, and can stay airborne for extended periods of time because of high fuel capacity and large fuel economy.

Mr. President, this is a decidedly important step in the continental air defense of the United States, because of the rather limited value of ground-based radar, particularly in the mountainous regions of Alaska and in the Arctic, where, at its best, ground-based radar would be too late in many cases. However, with the radar these planes carry, it is possible to detect at very great distances an enemy approach.

It is generally recognized that our need for effective defense against air attack is greater now than ever before, since, under present conditions, one large-scale offensive by the Soviets could be decisive, if allowed to be carried out without interference. The Air Force's new program, which provides for 34 air defense wings, reflects our awareness of the greater need for air defense forces, but does not attempt to attain a "perfect" air defense. A more perfect air defense awaits improvements in our air-defense weapons systems.

Mr. President, in all candor and truthfulness, let me say we must look back to the time when England was being attacked by Germany, which was attempting to wipe out that tiny island. There, with a small target, the Royal Air Force was able to stop only from

20 to 30 percent of the invading bombers. Consequently, at best we can expect to stop perhaps 50 percent of bombers which might at some time fly over our soil. But with the proper kind of warning system and, particularly, by means of the maintenance of a great retaliatory air force, I doubt that the Soviets would begin a program of annihilation against us, knowing that the best defense is a strong offense, and that we would strike back at them in the next breath.

The Air Force's transport mission involves air lift support of the Strategic and Tactical Air Command's mobility plans. It also involves providing, through MATS, the necessary air lift to support the theater commitments of all three services. Within the theater, the Air Force must provide the theater air lift, through troop-carrier units. Increased use of air lift to transport personnel and high-cost material will continue to result in greater economy.

The World War II twin-engined C–47 and four-engined C–54 are still performing valuable airlift missions. As a matter of fact, these aircraft are worth more now than they originally cost. The great use of airlift by all services, however, has brought about a need for faster and larger transports, such as the C–119 and the C–124.

In accomplishing its three primary, or combat, tasks, the Air Force is not neglecting the development of guided missiles. Recent announcements of the assignments of Matador Squadrons to Europe is an indication of the progress being made in missiles for theater tactical use. Meanwhile, longer range ground-to-ground missiles and shorter range ground-to-air missiles are being developed to increase the effectiveness of our interceptor aircraft.

We have considered at some length the new look in the Air Force as it has evolved from both distant and recent history and the lessons of these changing times. In every way, the efforts which are being made to meet the threat to our country's military security are gaining momentum and achieving their desired ends. They can never be wholly successful, however, if there is a lack of understanding on the part of either the personnel involved in the military programs or the citizens of our country, who must, in order to reap the benefits of such efforts, realize their total implications and adjust their own thinking to meet the requirements of the resultant policies.

There are certain problems remaining to be solved if we are to achieve and sustain an effective Air Force of 137 wings. Many of these are essentially technical and operational, and can be solved only by the Air Force itself. Airpower supporters out of the ranks of this service can aid in the solution of such problems, however, by providing the Air Force with the proper atmosphere in which to work and the proper men and tools.

Of all the major unresolved problems, probably the most urgent is that concerning the morale of Air Force personnel. I digress from my announced intention of discussing only the Air Force to say that it is the remaining unsolved problem in all our forces, with the possible exception of the Marine Corps. For example, the 4-year terms of some 200,000 airmen expire during this next fiscal year. Most of these individuals have been trained in our technical schools and have, by this time, acquired a high degree of skill and experience, which has been and could be of inestimable value to the Air Force. These men have now reached the point where they can really "pay off," and quickly and rapidly advance to higher skill levels. Yet, the latest survey indicates that nearly 75 percent of them do not intend to reenlist. There is no purpose to be served by attempting to put a price tag on the "know how" we will lose as a result of this occurrence, but the education and training of these persons represents a figure considerably in excess of $344 million.

Two of the primary factors critically affecting reenlistment rates are the availability of community facilities in the vicinity of our bases and the adequacy of personal facilities on those bases. Surely, something can be done about personal facilities such as suitable barracks, adequate messes, chapels, post exchanges, theaters, airmen's service clubs, officers' open messes, libraries, attractive recreational rooms, and hobby shops.

In this connection, I may say that in my own State of Arizona there are several fine Air Force installations. We train jet pilots for the Air Force. At Luke Field, located near Phoenix, Ariz., the Air Force is asking for $78,000 to install coolers, so that the men can live comfortably in the heat which prevails there in the summer, which on many days approaches 110 or 115 degrees. Yet there is argument about that small item. We think nothing of sending $78 million abroad—to accomplish what?

That is typical of the things which the Air Force asks for the men at its bases around the country, to allow them, as dedicated Air Force members to live as their neighbors in the cities and towns live. The Air Force is asking nothing else. The Air Force has developed sound criteria for these facilities—criteria which meet the basic needs of our people in accordance with American standards of living, and which are not in any sense of the word luxurious or extravagant. It is estimated that the cost necessary to bring our bases up to the required standard would be roughly 63 percent of the training cost loss which is anticipated for the next fiscal year. That is 63 percent of $344 million. The relation between the adequacy of base facilities and such things as reenlistment rates and AWOL rates shows that this money would be well spent. I shall insert at the end of my remarks a study made by the Air Force on that one point.

Another problem confronting the Air Force in the pursuit of its new look is the strengthening of the Air Force's Reserve and Air National Guard's programs. These are being carefully reviewed and restudied in the light of the new look, and specific recommendations should be forthcoming within the next few months.

Furthermore, the Air Force faces considerable difficulty from the present 100-hour limitation on so-called proficiency flying. One of the adverse effects of this, for example, is the increased difficulty experienced by the Strategic Air Command in getting the necessary pilots for the building up of its strength and the providing of replacements.

Every year the question of flying comes up, when the Air Force budgets are considered. The question is asked, Should a man, when he reaches the age of 40, 45, or 50, be no longer allowed to fly? That contributes to the low morale among these officers. As I stated on the floor last year, telling a man who has been a pilot all his life that because he is 40, 45, or 50, although he is in perfect health, he can no longer fly is like telling a lawyer that he can no longer talk, or telling a dentist that he can no longer pull teeth.

In this age of nuclear weapons and long-range, high-speed aircraft, a strategic air force is of little value unless it is "combat ready" 24 hours a day 365 days a year. At the same time the professional requirements for piloting modern aircraft are greater than ever. Thus, if the Strategic Air Command is to maintain a constant condition of combat readiness, it must receive an influx of pilots each year who have already achieved a high degree of flying proficiency. It cannot afford to rely on pilots just out of flying school, who require several years of additional flying experience before they are qualified to take our expensive, complicated, long-range bombers into combat. Hence the Strategic Air Command insists that pilots receive a certain number of hours flying experience from other sources before they can be taken into its functions.

As time goes on, however, the restriction on flying will make it increasingly difficult for pilots to obtain these necessary minima. In fact, many younger pilots, with no experience in either World War II or Korea, will find it impossible to do so. The Strategic Air Command, for example, has established 900 hours of flying time as the minimum requirement for a copilot of a B–47. For a pilot not assigned to an operational unit, this represents 9 years of service under the 100-hour restriction. The first pilot of a B–47 must have between 1,500 and 2,500 hours, depending upon the type of aircraft he has previously flown. Under the 100-hour restriction, this represents 15 to 25 years.

A B–36 aircraft commander must have 2,000 to 3,000 hours flying time, or 20 to 30 years service, under present requirements. Consequently a pilot graduating at the age of 23 would be anywhere from 43 to 50 years old before being qualified to command a B–36 aircraft. He would reach retirement age before ever becoming qualified to command a B–36 squadron, much less a wing or a higher echelon or command. Is there any wonder then that morale is one of the great problems standing in the way of the full attainment of the New Look in our Air Force?

Mr. President, when the appropriation bill for the Air Force comes before the Senate this year I urge that consideration be given to the debate of last year.

I urge that we consider the record of the Air Force this year in holding its flying to a minimum, and not attack the flying personnel and the flying proficiency of members of our Air Force who fly.

Finally, there is the question of reestablishing in the Air Force the older traditions of military authority and leadership. The present deficiencies in this area were pointed up by the Womble Committee under the six points.

Mr. President, I made reference earlier to the fact that all our services, with the exception of the Marine Corps, have the problem of low morale. A study of the findings of the Womble Committee and a comparison of them with the situation in the Marine Corps will reveal why the Marine Corps has always maintained a high esprit and high morale. The committee listed the following six points:

First, a dilution of military authority and leadership; second, a consequent reduction of distinction between the ranks; third, emphasis on discipline if military authority is to be reestablished; fourth, effective leadership deterred by inhibition of esprit; fifth, command ability deterred by emphasis on technocracy; and sixth, a reduction of professional standards has made the military service less attractive.

Mr. President, we must have a restoration of the old feeling that existed between the enlisted man and his sergeant, between the sergeant and his officer, and between the officer and his men. We cannot follow one of the recommendations of the Doolittle report, to reduce the military to one basis. There is a difference in the military, and we must go back to the old system as one of the first steps toward regaining and retaining the high morale which has always characterized our successful military forces.

Air power, then, has become our chief military arm, not because of its innate novelty as a weapon, but through geographical necessity. In this age of air transportation, we in the United States, for the first time in our history, find ourselves at a geographical disadvantage in relation to our enemy. Even so, we are in such a position of superiority technologically that we can overcome this factor by the aggressive development of our air power.

How, then, are we prepared for this new and challenging era as far as our own leadership is concerned? From many years of contact and experience with the Air Force, I can assure you that its leadership capacity today, at all levels, is more than equal to its assigned task.

The Air Force is now a close, well-knit, keenly coordinated fighting force, whose leaders know their job and are well-prepared to cope with the problems involved in its pursuit.

Yet there is more at issue here in the creation and maintenance of a successful military machine than the development of the actual military leadership. We must, as a people, learn to respect and to rely upon these defense establishments. We must understand their problems and their requirements, and stand ready to lend our assistance to them.

Mr. President, because the issue is of such importance at the moment, I suggest that Members of Congress refrain from asking personal favors of any branch of the armed services. Service in our Armed Forces is an obligation and a duty, and every American boy should look forward to it with keen anticipation. It is wrong for any Senator or any Member of the House to ask any favors of the military service in behalf of any friend or member of his family or acquaintance. I suggest that we refuse to act on such requests when we receive them from our constituents.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the investigation which is being made now will show that the average Senator and the average Representative do not ask any favors of the armed services. On this subject all of us, I think, hold exactly the view the Senator from Arizona has expressed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. I make the suggestion because it is a point in issue now, and a warning should be served that we should not do anything that will affect the morale of our troops.

Mr. President, what I have been saying applies as much to the Congress as it does to citizens throughout the country, and it has been in the spirit of hope for such help that this rather long discussion has been developed today. It has been offered with a view to shedding some much-needed light on the background, as well as on the present and proposed status, of that arm of our Nation's defense potential which has become a major source of our military defense and offense—the United States Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a chart entitled "Recreational Facilities Compared to Reenlistments and Violations at 12 AF Bases 1-Year Period (October 1, 1952 to October 1, 1953)," together with an explanation.

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

Recreational facilities compared to reenlistments and violations at 12 Zone of the Interior bases, 1-year period (Oct. 1, 1952, to Oct. 1, 1953)

[Bases are arranged numerically—most suitable to the least suitable]

	Hamilton	Keesler	Carswell	Barksdale	Westover	Ellsworth	Mountain Home	McGhee Tyson	Lake Charles	Laughlin	Great Falls	Limestone	Grand total
1. Average base population	6,452	21,342	10,796	9,613	6,642	6,280	3,317	783	5,915	1,805	3,183	2,509	78,637
2. Number of reenlistments	512	1,793	583	297	404	154	22	11	67	20	145	13	4,021
3. Number eligible who did not reenlist	245	1,157	1,014	930	664	521	159	63	556	45	614	89	6,057
4. Percent reenlistments [1]	67.6	60.7	36.5	24.2	37.8	22.8	12.2	14.9	10.8	30.8	19.1	12.7	39.9
5. Percent recreational facilities existing	80.8	65.9	58.8	59.8	62.2	47.2	75.8	15.7	28.8	35.1	41.9	6.9	52.2
6. Percent personnel a. w. o. l. [2]	2.8	4.6	2.0	6.2	13.2	6.8	9.5	11.4	5.0	9.3	12.0	13.4	6.2
7. Percent personnel drunk and disorderly [2]	.2	1.5	4.5	2.8	4.3	2.5	2.6	.6	3.1	9.8	5.8	5.6	2.9
8. Number of a. w. o. l.'s	182	982	221	599	876	425	316	89	293	168	381	335	4,867
9. Number drunk and disorderly	11	326	474	270	283	160	86	5	186	177	184	140	2,307
10. Total cost to construct lacking facilities	$339,000	$1,403,000	$721,700	$973,330	$1,056,100	$1,175,100	$420,000	$268,348	$1,255,400	$422,600	$834,000	$1,036,500	$9,915,648
11. Total loss from nonreinlistments (based on AF average, 60 percent less line 4) [3]	0	0	$850,625	$1,007,505	$643,915	$576,045	$199,665	$76,653	$704,106	$43,705	$721,450	$110,160	$4,923,829
12. Numerical standing on each base for: [4]													
(a) Reenlistments	1	2	4	6	3	7	11	9	12	5	8	10	
(b) Personnel facilities existing	1	3	6	5	4	7	2	11	10	9	8	12	
(c) A. w. o. l.'s	2	3	1	5	11	6	8	9	4	7	10	12	
(d) Drunk and disorderly	1	3	9	6	8	4	5	2	7	12	11	10	
(e) Community facilities [5]	2	7	1	4	3	8	9	5	6	12	10	11	
13. Total points for numerical standing	7	18	21	26	29	32	35	36	39	45	47	55	
14. Final numerical standing of each base	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

[1] Percent reenlistments out of total eligible.
[2] Percent of average base population for the 1-year period.
[3] Loss to Government based on $2,295 for each nonreenlistment.
[4] Standing of the base compared to other 11 bases.
[5] Includes consideration of climate, geographical location, community attitude, community services programs, size of community, civilian housing, commercial services, and segregation problems.

Line 1 contains the average base population for each base during the 1-year period.

Line 2 shows the total number of reenlistments, including personnel who reenlisted from other bases. The figures in this line also include Reserve and Air National Guard personnel as well as Regular.

Line 3 shows the number eligible at each base during the year who did not reenlist.

Percent reenlistments as shown in line 4 is the percent who reenlisted out of the total who became eligible for reenlistment.

Line 5 shows the percent of personnel facilities existing on each base figured on the total facilities each base should have depending on size and mission. Only airmen facilities were considered.

Percent AWOL as indicated in line 6 is the percent personnel AWOL out of the average base population for the 1-year period.

The same applies to line 7 which shows percent drunk and disorderly.

Lines 8 and 9 indicate the total number of AWOLs, drunk and disorderly, respectively, for the 1-year period.

Line 10 indicates the total cost to construct the lacking facilities at each base. Area cost factors were used in arriving at these figures.

Line 11 indicates the total loss to the Government from nonreenlistments at each base when compared to the Air Force average of 60 percent. Air National Guard and Reserve airmen on active duty are not included in computing Air Force reenlistment rates. The number who did reenlist as shown in line 2 was subtracted from the number who would have reenlisted if the 60-percent Air Force rate had been achieved. A cost factor of $2,295 was then applied to this difference in nonreenlistment.

Line 12 shows the numerical standing of each base for reenlistments, personnel facilities existing, AWOLs, drunk and disorderly, and community facilities.

Since it was apparent during the preparation of this study that reenlistments and violations were also influenced by differences in surrounding communities, the Community Services Branch of my directorate established the community facilities rating in paragraph 12 (e). Climatic conditions, geographical locations, community-services programs, size of community, housing, commercial services, community, attitude, and segregation problems were considered in establishing this numerical standing.

Line 13 shows the total points for the numerical standing of each base and line 14 shows the final numerical standing of each base when compared to the other 11 bases.

The chart generally indicates that reenlistments and violations are influenced by existing personnel facilities as is pointed out by the closeness of the figures in line 12a, b, and c. The exceptions are due to differences in community facilities as indicated in line 12e. This serves as further support of Secretary Talbott's belief that geographical location should be seriously considered in choosing sites for new Air Force bases.

The right-hand column indicates the grand total and averages of columns 1 through 11. The average facilities existing at these 12 bases is a little over one-half of what is needed.

The total cost required for all lacking facilities at these 12 bases is $9,915,648, and the total loss from nonreenlistments at the 12 bases was $4,923,829.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled, "USAF's New Look," published in a recent issue of the Reservist.

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

USAF's NEW LOOK

Ike's military budget for fiscal year 1955 as submitted to Congress resolves beyond a shadow of a doubt that dollarwise Air Force is the most prominent military service. In addition to the $11.2 billion asked in new money, funds in past years approved for the USAF will be available, making a grand total of $16.2 billion. According to the President, it provides greater expenditures for airpower than in any year since the close of World War II.

In the buildup to 137 wings, scheduled for attainment by fiscal year 1957, it is evident that 141,600 officers will be on active duty by the close of fiscal year 1955 or June 30, 1955. Approximately 123,000 are now on duty and this figure will rise to 134,600 by June 1954.

Provisions of the new budget call for a pilot production rate of 7,800 to be attained by late this year. Also, the Air Force plans to produce more of its rated officers from ROTC.

The new budget will permit an expansion of personnel from the present 925,000 to 955,000 by June 30 of this year. By June 1955 there will be a new total of 970,000 officers and men which will prevail throughout the buildup to 137 wings. Meanwhile, the other services are expected to take reduced personnel rations.

For USAF's Reserve Forces $28 million is requested. This is approximately $13 million over last year's appropriation. With this money at hand, the Air Force plans to conclude fiscal year 1955 with 14,500 Reserve officers (4,346 in rated categories) and 21,000 airmen, all in pay status. While this is an increase of more than 13,000 personnel over the originally planned June 30, 1954, strength, it is but a small percentage of the USAF's proposed long-ranged strength in pay and nonpay desires.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Arizona for the speech he has made. It is a very real contribution to the subject matter. He brings to it the freshness of one who is not yet a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and one who has a very fine knowledge of the problem with which he deals. It is very timely that the Senate should have the benefit of the thought of someone who is not speaking as a member of the Armed Services Committee, because it has been our experience in the committee, as I am sure it has been the experience elsewhere, that very frequently we who constantly deal with a subject are so close to the trees that we cannot see the forest.

I am particularly impressed by what he said about the question of morale and the need for recreational and other facilities. I agree with him in that regard. However, I can assure him and the American people that, according to my observation, we have the best armed services of any in the world from the standpoint of being the best paid, the best clothed, and the best medically cared for. Furthermore, in our armed services in nearly every case, if not in every case, the American standard of living conditions follows the personnel of our armed services wherever they may go in the world.

So I commend the Senator for his statement with respect to morale and with respect to what needs to be done to save America. It is important that we restore the feeling in our youth that it is a privilege as well as a duty to serve the Nation in its military services, and that such service is not to be looked upon as a chore or as something to be evaded. If we can rebuild that spirit in America a fine contribution will be made to our security. I believe the Senator has rendered a valuable service by the remarks he has made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his very kind remarks and to comment briefly on what he said. I agree that our Armed Forces are the best paid, the best clothed, the best fed, and the best equipped. We provide everything for them. But there is an intangible something which we do not give our Armed Forces in time of peace. We do not, as citizens, give them the respect to which they are entitled. I can remember that before the Second World War there was almost contempt for the wearer of the uniform. We now begin to see, since peace has come to us to some extent, the outlook of the uniformed man. It is not a matter of pay, clothing, housing, or equipment; there is an intangible something which starts in the home, the school, the church, with an all-consuming love of country. But, more than that, it is nurtured and carried into full flower by an understanding citizenry and an understanding legislative body in Washington. The source of our difficulty is not in the men themselves; it is not in the service they get or the attention they receive. It is a matter of doing unto the other fellow as we would have him do unto us. We need to get back to the established discipline in the Armed Forces in line with the suggestions which have been made by the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with what the Senator has said with reference to the intangible which he mentioned. I think we must adjust ourselves to building a large peacetime military force, and to treat the men and women of the services as technicians. In peacetime we do not exhibit the ardor, enthusiasm, and patriotism which is in evidence during a war. They are entitled to our support so that their esprit de corps may be promoted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With reference to the retaliatory force and the maintenance of a peacetime reserve, including the National Guard, and so forth, does the Senator from Mississippi recall that when he was a boy at school he perhaps picked a fight with a boy he could not whip? That has a bearing on the retaliatory force about which we are speaking.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his fine contribution with reference to the

great issue which confronts the Senate and the entire Congress and which will continue to confront it for some years to come. It was inspiring to hear the Senator's message, and I join with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi in the tribute which he has paid to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I also should like to express to the Senator from Arizona my word of appreciation and commendation for his study and for the contribution which he has made. I think we are all indebted to him for the fine work and leadership he has given to this very important problem and the so-called new military look.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SUBMERGED LAND CASE

During the delivery of Mr. GOLDWATER's address,

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Texas, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. And with the understanding also that my remarks will appear at the end of the address of the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I have just come from the Supreme Court, and am happy to say to the Senate that the Court has handed down an opinion in the cases of Alabama and Rhode Island against the States of Texas, Louisiana, California, and Florida, upholding the constitutionality of the so-called Tidelands Act which was passed by the Congress last year. The Court has passed upon the merits of the controversy in dealing with the question of whether motions would be granted for the filing of suits against the coastal States.

The Court has decided that the Congress was acting within its power and that it constitutionally enacted the submerged lands legislation. This marks the end of a long fight waged by most of the States of the Union, to protect the ownership of lands which the States had held in good faith for more than 100 years.

I am quite pleased that the Supreme Court has passed upon the merits of the cases by upholding the law passed by Congress restoring this property to the States.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the opinion of the Supreme Court, the concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Reed, as well as the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Douglas.

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

STATE OF ALABAMA, COMPLAINANT, *v.* STATE OF TEXAS; STATE OF LOUISIANA; STATE OF FLORIDA; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; GEORGE M. HUMPHREY; DOUGLAS MCKAY; ROBERT B. ANDERSON; IVY BAKER PRIEST, DEFANDANTS—STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, COMPLAINANT, *v.* STATE OF LOUISIANA; STATE OF FLORIDA; STATE OF TEXAS; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; GEORGE M. HUMPHREY; DOUGLAS MCKAY; ROBERT B. ANDERSON; IVY BAKER PRIEST, DEFENDANTS—MARCH 15, 1954

Per curiam:

"The motions for leave to file these complaints are denied. Article IV, section 3, clause 2, United States Constitution. *United States* v. *Gratiot* (14 Pet. 526, 537): The power of Congress to dispose of any kind of property belonging to the United States 'is vested in Congress without limitation.' *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Company* (236 U. S. 459, 474): 'For it must be borne in mind that Congress not only has a legislative power over the public domain, but it also exercises the powers of the proprietor therein. Congress "may deal with such lands precisely as a private individual may deal with his farming property. It may sell or withhold them from sale." (*Camfield* v. *United States* (167 U. S. 524); *Light* v. *United States* (220 U. S. 536).' *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30): 'Article 4, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory and other property belonging to the United States." The power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations. "And it is not for the courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for Congress to determine."' *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 27): 'We have said that the constitutional power of Congress [under article IV, section 3, clause 2] is without limitation. *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30.'

"The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases."

Mr. Justice Reed, concurring:

"The per curiam opinion in these cases based its conclusion that the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 29), is constitutional on the language in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution: 'The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States; * * *' I agree with that result. Neither Alabama nor Rhode Island has or would question that power, if the applicability of that clause was accepted.

"Those States, however, do not accept the applicability of the quoted clause. It is their position that the resources under the marginal sea do not, under *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707), *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19) constitute property either of the United States or any State. The complainant States assert those cases held that the 'paramount rights' in the United States decreed by this Court arose from the sovereignty of the United States and the duty to provide for the common defense. Further, they urge that the rights are held in trust for all the States as a Federal responsibility and to cede them to individual States would take away the 'equal footing' among States by extending State power into the domain of national responsibility. See *United States* v. *Texas, supra,* at 719, and *Coyle* v. *Oklahoma* (221 U. S. 559).

"This Court is the only court for the trial and discussion of the points upon which Alabama and Rhode Island rely. We have heard complainants on all these points and I desire to state why I think the arguments extracted by the States from this Court's ruling authorities on these same rights do not justify a hearing.

"The fact that Alabama and the defendant States were admitted into the Union 'upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever,' (2 Stat. 701, 3 Stat. 489, 5 Stat. 742, 797, 9 Stat. 452), does not affect Congress' power to dispose of Federal property. The requirement of equal footing does not demand that courts wipe out diversities 'in the economic aspects of the several States,' but calls for 'parity as respects political standing and sovereignty.' *United States* v. *Texas, supra,* at 716. The power of Congress to cede property to 1 State without corresponding cession to all States has been consistently recognized. See, e. g., *United States* v. *Wyoming* (335 U. S. 895), and cases cited by the Court.

"While this Court did not hold in express terms in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases that the area in question belonged to the United States as proprietor, it did hold that 'the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil' (332 U. S. at 38–39). This incident is a property right and Congress had unlimited power to dispose of it.

"If the marginal lands were thus declared by the California and following cases to belong to the United States, they were ceded to the States through the subsequent Submerged Lands Act of 1953 by the clause: 'Title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters * * * are hereby * * * recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States * * *' (sec. 3 (a)). If, on the other hand, the marginal lands were not declared by those cases to belong to the United States, title to them remained in the respective States. Either by original ownership or by the cession of the act, the lands are now the property of the respective States. The use or control of the undersea area and its resources by the respective States cannot, therefore, now be challenged by any other State on the ground of lack of sovereignty in the challenged State.

"The cession challenged here does not affect the power and responsibility of the United States as sovereign to foster and protect against foreign and domestic enemies that area or resources ceded to the proprietorship of the respective States. The Federal Government, of course, owes the same duty to the undersea area that it does to the uplands, the tidelands or the beds of the inland waters. Moreover, the Submerged Lands Act purports to convey to the States only 'the lands beneath the navigable waters' and 'the natural resources within such lands and waters' and expressly provides that 'the United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to

the respective States and others by section 3 of this act' (sec. 6 (a)). Surely this provision negatives any contention that the act empowers individual States to alter the historic relationship of the States respecting navigation of the ocean. See *Kelly* v. *Washington* (302 U. S. 1); cf. *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385).

"The United States holds resources and territory in trust for its citizens in one sense, but not in the sense that a private trustee holds for a cestui que trust. The responsibility of Congress is to utilize the assets that come into its hands as sovereign in the way that it decides is best for the future of the Nation. That is what it has done here. Such congressional determination as the legislation here in question is not subject to judicial review."

Mr. Justice Black, dissenting:

"Alabama and Rhode Island asked leave to file complaints to challenge an act of Congress which purports to convey to some of the States an indefeasible title to and ownership of soil under the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The act includes a similar gift of all the 'natural resources within such lands and waters.' Some States are given a 3-mile strip of ocean; some States are given about 10 miles; most States are given no ocean at all. Some States that are thus receiving gifts claim even more. Louisiana by law makes claims extending 30 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. Texas law asserts that at some points its State borders project as far as 150 miles into the Gulf. If Congress can cede 3 miles of ocean I see no reason why it could not later cede 150 miles or more.

"Alabama and Rhode Island deny that Congress has any power to dispose of the national interest in the ocean or its uncaptured resources. These States assert that whatever power the United States has over the ocean is an inseparable part of national sovereignty which cannot be irrevocably parceled out or delegated to States, individuals or private business groups. Admitting the power of Congress to control and regulate the use of the ocean and the capturing of its assets, Alabama and Rhode Island deny that any part of this sovereign national control can be vested in any State. Such an unauthorized abdication of essential national sovereignty, so the two States urge, is precisely the effect of the challenged act. If true, this subjection of Alabama and Rhode Island to regulation by other States deprives them of that 'equal footing' as States which is theirs by right. *United States* v. *Texas*, 339 U. S. 707, 719. The Court, however, summarily denies Alabama and Rhode Island a right even to file their complaint. This I assume must be done on the ground that the claims they present are so clearly without merit as to be frivolous. I am unable to agree to this and would grant leave to file in order that the case might be considered in the usual manner. My reasons can be briefly stated.

"Ocean waters are the highways of the world. They are no less such because they happen to lap the shores of different nations that border them. Freedom of the seas everywhere is essential to trade, commerce, travel, and communication among the nations. These far-flung international activities have frequently led to conflict and war. The War of 1812 bears witness to this. In ocean waters bordering our country, if nowhere else, day-to-day national power—complete, undivided, flexible, and immediately available—is an essential attribute of Federal sovereignty. The present act might be construed in such way that this power would not be substantially impaired, weakened or made less easily available at all times. But the Court is not construing it that way.

"The act's language purports to convey 'all right, title, and interest of the United States' to immense ocean areas as though the ocean could be divided up and sold like town lots. If valid, the act grants to States all 'proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources' of the ocean. The result is that some favored States can say how, when, for what purposes, and to what extent other States and their citizens can use the ocean or its resources. This raises serious and difficult questions with respect to the authority of Congress to relinquish elements of national sovereignty over the oceans.

"Once private property rights in ocean waters are recognized, I am uncertain where lines can be drawn. The Court's decision today in *Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.* v. *Federal Power Commission, ante,* goes a long way toward partitioning up the running rivers of America into conceptualistic segments.[1] Under that case the Government is likely to have to pay large sums if it wishes to use its rivers. Mr. Justice Douglas' dissent in the *Niagara Mohawk* case should warn us to beware of extending the concept of State ownership of land under inland streams to the vast ocean areas of the world.[2] The results in that case are in my view bad enough. But it could be far worse to permit agencies other than the United States to clutter up the ocean with multitudinous wells and derricks and deeds and leases and time-consuming lawsuits. All of these things suggest some of the dangers of depriving the United States of complete, unhampered control of the ocean bordering our Nation. We should not forget that the ocean 'belongs to no one nation, but is the common property of all.' (*Lord* v. *Steamship Co.* (102 U. S. 541, 544).)[3]

"The Constitution does give Congress power to dispose of and regulate 'Territory or other property belonging to the United States.' This power, where it applies, has been declared to be unlimited. Congress, the Court has said, 'may deal with such lands precisely as a private individual may deal with his farming property.' (*Camfield* v. *United States* (167 U. S. 518, 524).) Of course, this authorizes Congress at will to sell or dispose of property it owns as property. It could produce oil from the ocean and sell that property. It could have that oil produced by its agents. But I have difficulty in believing that any State can be granted power under our Constitution to exact tribute from any other State that wants to take oil or fish from the ocean which is the common property of all. And I have trouble also in thinking Congress could sell or give away the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans. If it can treat those oceans as 'territory' within the Constitution's meaning, why could it not deed away thousands of miles of the Atlantic or Pacific at will? I suppose no one would say that the Constitution permits Congress to create new States, at least in part out of submerged lands with State power to govern and rule over the Territory so disposed of. Would this Court sustain the power of Congress to sell the Mississippi or any of the other great navigable rivers of this country? The Court's decision here and in the Niagara Mohawk case leave me in doubt.

"The issues presented are too grave and too doubtful for me to assent to closing the doors of this Court to these States without a more careful consideration of the question than the Court has afforded. For there is a great deal more involved than who gets what oil. Congress has here transferred to the States substantial power over the ocean. This necessarily makes less readily available the Nation's power to protect the freedom of the seas—a power essential to keep peace and friendship among the nations of the world. I cannot agree to deny these States a full opportunity to challenge the act."

Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting:

"California lost her claim to the sea beyond the low watermark by a 6 to 2 decision. (*United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19).) Then came a change in the Court's membership; and Texas lost her claim to the marginal sea by a 4 to 3 decision. (*United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707).) Only three of the majority that decided those cases survive. It would therefore be quite understandable if a majority of the present Court were to take the position of the earlier minority and overrule those decisions. But if those decisions are to stand, it is inconceivable to me that we can deny leave to file the complaints in the present cases. To deny these motions we must hold that the issues tendered are frivolous and insubstantial. But if the earlier decisions are to stand, certainly that cannot be said.

"If the issue before us were only the power of Congress to dispose of public lands, the claims of Alabama and Rhode Island would be foreclosed by article IV, section 3 of the Constitution. But the entire point of the earlier litigation in the California and Texas cases was that more than property rights was involved. As we said in *United States* v. *Texas, supra,* page 719, 'once low watermark is passed the international domain is reached. Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign.' Any 'property interests' which the States may earlier have held in the bed of the marginal sea were 'so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty.' (Id.)

"Thus we are dealing here with incidents of national sovereignty. The marginal sea is not an oil well; it is more than a mass of water; it is a protective belt for the entire Nation over which the United States must exercise exclusive and paramount authority. The authority over it can no more be abdicated than any of the other great powers of the Federal Government. It is to be exercised for the benefit of the whole. As Mr. Justice Black aptly states in his dissent in these cases, 'In ocean waters bordering our country, if nowhere else, day-to-day national power—complete, undivided, flexible, and immediately available—is an essential attribute of Federal sovereignty.'

"Could Congress cede the great Columbia River or the mighty Mississippi to a State

---

[1] This Court has referred to ownership of submerged lands under navigable streams as "theoretical ownership and dominion," "a qualified title," and "a bare technical title." (*Scranton* v. *Wheeler* (179 U. S. 141, 160, 163).) See also *United States* v. *Commodore Park* (324 U. S. 386, 390).

[2] See *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 36).

[3] It is true that the act does purport to reserve for the United States "all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control * * * for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs. * * *" But surely this reserves nothing that Congress could give away. Any attempt to relinquish the National Government's power over the oceans to that extent would ignore the fact that "navigation on the high seas is necessarily national in its character. Such navigation is clearly a matter of 'external concern,' affecting the Nation as a nation in its external affairs. It must, therefore, be subject to the National Government." (*Lord* v. *Steamship Co.* (102 U. S. 541, 544).)

or a power company? I should think not. For they are arteries of commerce that attach to the national sovereignty and remain there until and unless the Constitution is changed. What is true of a great river would seem to be even more obviously true of the marginal sea. For it is not only an artery of commerce among the States but the vast buffer standing between us and the world. It therefore would seem that unless we are to change our form of government, that domain must by its very nature attach to the National Government and the authority over it remain nondelegable.

"It is said, however, that the interests in the marginal sea may be chopped up, the States being granted the economic ones and the Federal Government keeping the political ones. We rejected, however, that precise claim in the earlier cases. We said, for example, that the 'equal footing' clause in the joint resolution admitting Texas to the Union precluded the argument that Texas surrendered only political rights over the marginal sea and retained all property rights in it (339 U. S., pp. 716–720).

"If it were necessary for Texas to surrender all her property and political rights in the marginal sea in order to enter the Union on an 'equal footing' with the other States, pray how can she get back some of those rights and still remain on an 'equal footing' with the other States? That is the unresolved question in these cases. That is the question which points up the grievances of Alabama and Rhode Island. For what Texas (and a few other States) obtain by the present act of Congress what we held the 'equal footing' clause forbade them to retain. The 'equal footing' clause, in other words, prevents one State from laying claim to a part of the national domain from which the other States are excluded (339 U. S., pp. 719–720). Today we permit that precise 'inequality among the States' which we earlier said was precluded by the 'equal footing' clause.

"Alabama and Rhode Island can justly complain. So can the other States. Our Union is one of equal sovereigns, none entitled to preferment denied the others. That is what the 'equal footing' standard means or it means nothing. Today powerful political forces are marshalled to wipe out our prior decisions for the benefit of a favored few. But those decisions were sound in constitutional theory and they should stand. If they presented a question suitable for judicial review, so does the present controversy."

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Senator from Texas for bringing such encouraging news to the Senate. I join in the jubilation expressed by the Senator that the Supreme Court now recognizes the basic concept of our Constitution that the powers of the Federal Government flow from the States.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona, and I apologize for interrupting the most important address which he is making to the Senate. However, because duties call me elsewhere, it is not possible for me to stay throughout his entire address. That is why I asked for permission to interrupt.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a short statement on the decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very much pleased, of course, with the substance of the news which has been brought to us by the Senator from Texas. I think it particularly appropriate that the news be announced to the Senate by the junior Senator from Texas, who played such a very able and constructive part in this long legal battle, in which he rendered such very fine service in behalf of his native State of Texas. On the floor of the Senate the Senator from Texas joined in a most effective way in the effort, extending over months and months, to bring about sound legislation on the subject of the submerged lands. I wish to commend him especially for contributing in a large way to the soundness of the position finally taken by the Court, as well as contributing to the sound nature of the legislation which was passed by the Congress.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, before I make a motion with respect to the pending legislation before the Senate I wish to make a very brief observation on the decision of the Supreme Court announced today in the submerged land case.

I have been very much amused, in reading the ticker reports, by the comments of some of the proponents in the Senate of the submerged lands bill.

Of course I shall reserve final judgment on the decision until I have read it in its entirety, because all that I have before me at the present time is the benefit of quotations contained in the news-ticker report.

However, if the quotations properly present the Court's theory of the case, they are very interesting indeed, and the proponents of the submerged lands bill will have a difficult time in reconciling their speeches on the floor of the Senate as to the basic theory of their speeches with the decision of the Court.

One of the ticker quotations reads:

Today's majority opinion cited previous decisions in which it pointed out that the Constitution provides that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States."

The opinion then asserted:

"The power over the public land and thus entrusted to Congress is without limitation."

The opinion then again referred to another earlier decision in which it was stated: "And it is not for the Courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for Congress to determine."

Another quotation from the ticker reads:

But the Court said: "It must be borne in mind that Congress not only has a legislative power over the public domain, but it also exercises the powers of the proprietor therein." "Congress may deal with such laws precisely as a private individual may deal with his farming property. It may sell or withhold them from sale," the opinion said, still quoting from past decisions.

Mr. President, my comment is that a great many of us on the floor of the Senate during the historic debate on the oil land bill argued that the submerged lands property belongs to the United States Government. Apparently, judging by the excerpts from the decision which are carried on the ticker report—and, as I said, I shall reserve my final decision until I have read the decision in its entirety—that is one of the findings on the basis of which the Supreme Court rendered its decision. Therefore, it follows, as some of us argued during the debate, that the responsibility for the giveaway of Federal property rests squarely upon the Members of Congress who voted for the giveaway.

Apparently the Supreme Court itself has concluded that the property belongs to the United States, not to Texas, Louisiana, California, or the other States, which now obtain the benefit of this giveaway on the part of Congress.

I have not read the decision to determine what the Court did with a question which some of us felt was inherent in the situation, namely, the question of sovereignty and the relationship of constitutional provisions to the doctrine of sovereignty.

I merely make these comments now because, on the basis of what the ticker report shows, the Supreme Court has verified the position taken by those of us who opposed the giveaway legislation. We argued that if we voted for it we would give away property which belongs to all the taxpayers of the United States.

I am perfectly willing to take the Supreme Court decision to the voters of the country in the 1954 election, because if it is what I think it is, that is, if it is based on the proposition that the property belonged to the Federal Government and, therefore, Congress, having jurisdiction over it, had the right to dispose of it in accordance with its wisdom, then we were right during the course of the debate when we said it raised a vital political issue as to public policy in respect to public property. It is a political issue which will have to be fought out in the political forums of 1954 and 1956, because, in my judgment, it was not a giveaway which was in the best interests of the people of the country as a whole. The proponents of the submerged land giveaway have not heard the last of this fight. I venture the suggestion that a few Members of Congress will be retired to private life as the result of their supporting the giving away of billions of dollars of the wealth of all of the people of the United States to a few of the States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 489. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut;

S. 1827. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington;

S. 2111. An act to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.; and

S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of red-cedar shingles."

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to

cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 752. An act for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan; and

H. R. 2214. An act for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAXES AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the White House has announced that President Eisenhower will make a 15-minute address on the administration's tax policy at 9 p. m. today, over ABC, Dumont, and NBC television networks, and the ABC radio network. Rebroadcasts will be carried by CBS television, and by Mutual, NBC, and CBS radio networks.

The text of the President's statement is, of course, not yet available. I hope he will recognize the significant changes in the economic situation, and will give the support of his administration to the national tax policy which has been presented recently and so effectively by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

If there continue to be fundamental differences between Republican and Democratic policies in the field of taxation, I suggest that it would be entirely appropriate for the Democrats to have equal radio and television time in which to answer the administration. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia would be an excellent spokesman for the minority.

Mr. President, before undertaking a discussion of taxes and our national economy, I should like to call attention to the following excerpt from pages 5 and 6 of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a committee of which I am a member.

ECONOMY CAPACITY FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE PROGRAM

The [President's] Economic Report states that "Our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes its possible to turn the productive potentialities of the economy increasingly to peaceful purposes."

We welcome this opportunity to reduce military expenditures and do not view with pessimism the adjustments involved in making this transition.

It is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee to pass judgment upon the adequacy of our military preparedness. It is not our function to determine how many air wings, ships, or divisions are necessary.

However, we do feel it is within our jurisdiction to state that, in our opinion, the economy is capable of meeting safely additional military expenditures if such expenditures are necessary for our military security.

This is not a recommendation for more spending for national-security purposes. It is rather an assertion that reductions in these programs, which have been made and which are projected for the future, should be justified upon their merits, and not upon the premise that they are made necessary for economic reasons.

To my mind, this section calls for a new look at the New Look, a reexamination of our national-defense program.

We have heard a great deal about the New Look. Much of this discussion has been in terms of assurances from the administration that we are getting, in the words of a prominent Republican, "more bang for a buck."

Only the most naive could believe that the reductions in military expenditures, made and to be made, have strengthened our defense. I do not believe anyone seriously questions the fact that substantial reductions were made out of a belief that the economy could not stand greater expenditures.

I agree that our national security requires that economic as well as military considerations must be taken into account.

What I quarrel with is the administration's estimate of the strength of our economy.

I believe the administration has seriously underestimated the capabilities of our economy, and its fundamental strength. They believed it had to be shaken down, that it was operating at a pace which could not be maintained. They did not appreciate that during the 2 years immediately preceding January 1953 the economy of the United States was—

First. Conducting a great military operation in Korea, half way around the world;

Second. Accumulating a great store of military equipment against the possibility of world war III;

Third. Building a broad industrial base for fighting such a war and maintaining the lead in scientific and engineering developments; and

Fourth. Doing all that, we still were maintaining a standard of living for the masses of our people higher than that of any previous time or any other country.

This was the situation as accurately described to the Joint Economic Committee by a sound and conservative economist.

Failing to appreciate the strength of our economy, the administration has proceeded to reduce its preparedness goals to fit its own image of the country's capabilities. This image was too small.

So I suggest that our military planners, and the Appropriations Committees and Armed Services Committees of the Congress should reappraise our preparedness programs in the light of this admonition of the Joint Economic Committee's report:

Reductions in these programs, which have been made and which are projected for the future, should be justified upon their own merits, and not upon the premise that they are made necessary for economic reasons.

Mr. President, I have made these few remarks upon our military program as a prelude to a discussion of taxes and our national economy. I have done so from the belief that our first duty—before considering tax reduction—is to reappraise our military posture. Only as we can satisfy ourselves that our military program is adequate, can we afford to consider significant tax reduction.

However, on the assumption that this will be done—that we shall determine this question, one way or the other—I wish to address myself to the state of our economy.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, I have recently participated in a series of hearings on our economic situation.

I do not pose as an economist, but by reason of this recent experience and what I have seen and heard from over the country, I have formed a number of general impressions about the state of our national economy:

First. The Nation's economy has suffered a recession in overall economic activity.

There are many indications of this. In the case of manufacturing, for example, it amounts to about 10 percent, since the middle of 1953.

The farmers' per capita income is now lower compared to per capita income of the rest of the population than at any time since the beginning of World War II.

Between October 1953 and February 1954, unemployment rose by 1.5 million, an increase of 125 percent in 4 months. Unemployment under the new census amounted to 3.7 million—and it is still rising. Business failures increased almost 50 percent during the past 12 months.

Virtually every index of our economy declined—industrial production, by 10 percent between July 1953 and January 1954. Incidentally, I understand that the February figures, which will be released today, will show a further decline. There were also declines in personal incomes, retail sales, heavy construction, autos, farm equipment, textiles, mail order sales, steel production, freight-car loadings and inventories.

Second. I am impressed by the unanimous judgment of private and public experts alike that, for the long run, there are sustaining economic forces that can provide a basis for later long-term economic growth.

Third. In the present situation the key issue—the outcome of which may well determine whether we face a real depression, or revival to prosperity—is the kind of tax bill this Congress shall pass.

It is altogether too often overlooked that what might be sound long-range tax policy may be altogether unsound short-range tax policy.

Most of the current debate over tax policy has centered upon the question of the relative merits of tax relief for consumers versus tax relief for business as a means of stimulating the economy. In part, the debaters have been at cross purposes. On the one hand the administration has been stressing long-term objectives of tax reform. In this connection it has, of course, advocated changes in such tax provisions as those governing business depreciation.

I hardly think anyone will quarrel with the long-term desirability of whatever changes may be necessary to insure that depreciation provisions of the tax law correctly reflect the true economic life of the capital plant and equipment which the businessman uses in his enterprise.

It seems to me the debate should center not on whether such provisions are sound per se, but whether the particular revisions proposed are timely.

Now the basic question is whether the current recession in employment and production is the result of inadequate consumer demand or whether it is the result of inadequate investment activity.

Some evidence bearing on this question is significant: Investment activity has been exceedingly high for 8 years under precisely the kind of handicaps which are now stated to be a serious detriment to investment.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that the present state of inventory, which is not low, indicates that a part of the economic problem is lack of either purchasing power or purchasing desire on the part of the potential consumers of the country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator's thought. That is the thesis of my proposal. As I have said, the crucial factor always is the timeliness of the particular suggestion. As of now, what the Senator has referred to as the inventory situation indicates the absence of adequate purchasing capacity, willingness, or power. All three of those factors must combine in order to bring about effective purchasing.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, I suppose the Senator argues—and it seems to me to be an inescapable conclusion—that when tax reduction is limited to the so-called upper brackets, and seeks to benefit the so-called investors or manufacturers, such a policy will result in their freezing their savings by putting them away rather than investing them in further productive machinery. Am I correct in my conclusion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The first step, therefore, ought to be the showing of some concern for the people in the consumer or purchasing class, who apparently do not have the wherewithal at the present time to do the buying.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is correct. The concern is not only for those who need tax relief the most, which is certainly a proper concern, but the primary concern is to bring about the result which is best designed to keep our economy on a reasonable level and to prevent an abrupt and more serious recession. If we can accomplish such an objective, we will create conditions which are beneficial to all classes in our economy.

If the handicaps to which I have referred are now a serious detriment, why were they not so for 8 years? Gross private domestic investment, according to the Department of Commerce, has averaged 15.5 percent of the total gross national product since 1946; and in 1953, under these same handicap taxes—and I quote the word "handicap," which has been referred to so often by the administration—the percentage was 15.2. It may be noted that the same percentage was about 15.2 percent in 1929, and averaged about 15.1 percent for the decade of the twenties. In other words, in recent years under so-called tax handicaps, investment has been larger in proportion to total economic activity than during the period before 1930, when so-called tax handicaps were not in the law.

Furthermore, according to the evidence presented at the Joint Economic Committee hearings by Mr. Dexter Keezer, of the McGraw Hill Publishing Co., private investment in the last few years has been sufficient not only to meet the demands for replacement of wornout equipment and plant, but also to expand industrial capacity between 1946 and 1953 by about two-thirds, which is an average of almost 9.5 percent per year for 7 years. This increase in our manufacturing capacity has been sufficient not merely to take care of the normal growth of the economy of about 3 percent a year, but also to make up for the great deficiencies which resulted from the depression of the 1930's, and for those shortages of capital goods which resulted from military demands during the war. According to the best estimates and the best judgments that I know of, and according to the President's Economic Report, our capacity to produce is now about in line with private and public demands at full employment. If this is indeed the case, and we have been expanding capacity in recent years and modernizing our plant and equipment at a rate much larger than the normal long-term-growth trend of the economy would call for, then it seems to me highly doubtful that the tax provisions under discussion have been any really serious detriment to investment in recent years. It appears that in the next few years the normal growth of the economy might well require a demand for investment somewhat lower than recent rates, even with the most favorable stimulus from the side of tax policy.

In this respect, let us face the record squarely. The one previous time when this kind of tax policy was tried was in the 1920's. There seems to be general agreement from research economists that the net effect of the Mellon tax program was to stimulate a growth of investment and of savings at the expense of market demand, so that by 1929 the economy found itself with between 15 and 20 percent of its capacity not utilized at the peak of business activity in that year. In fact, the economy became so unbalanced under this program, and investments were indulged in on such an unsound speculative basis, that for a decade the American people paid for this folly with unemployment and investment-depressing excess capacity. Another result was a period of headline scandals in high business places, which was caused by excessive speculation at the expense of sound market development and expansion.

I have so far concentrated on the relation of tax policy to the need for stimulation of investment. There is a further aspect in the present circumstances: Will investment actually be stimulated in any healthy, sustainable fashion by the administration's tax policies? Essentially these proposals attempt to stimulate investment by giving tax relief to corporations, to dividend recipients (mainly in the upper brackets), and to upper-bracket incomes generally. The philosophy of this approach has been made perfectly clear in recent weeks, both by Mr. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, and by Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The gist of their proposition is that these measures will encourage upper-bracket income recipients to save and businessmen to invest, thus creating jobs, incomes, and consumer purchasing to provide prosperity to the Nation. In effect, that is an assertion that (a) savings have been too little, since we must encourage them; (b) investment has been too small, since we must encourage it; and (c) tax benefits to investors themselves, directly, will provide stimulus.

As to these propositions, the facts are that in recent years our savings have averaged about 7.5 percent of disposable personal income, as compared to 5 or 5.5 percent in previous years of high employment. The further fact is that business has been saving $10 billion or more in retained earnings, plus, according to the Department of Commerce, between $20 and $30 billion in funds from depreciation and depletion allowances.

This does not suggest to me that there has been a lack of funds for investment because savings were too low. Quite the contrary is the case. Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee was that at this time the funds are certainly adequate—as they have been in the past few years. There was an exception to this when untimely monetary and debt management policies artificially restricted credit and raised interest rates. A glaring example, of course, was Mr. Humphrey's debt management program during the first half of 1953.

Has investment been inadequate? I have already remarked on the vast increase in manufacturing capacity of recent years, and of the general judgment that our capacity is now adequate for the immediate future. If this is the case, it hardly seems reasonable in the short run of the next year or two to indulge in a program aimed at providing tax incentives to expand a level of investment which, far from inadequate, seems to have been adequate for the something-more-than-normal requirements of growth in the economy.

The only issue which remains is whether tax benefits directly to large savers and investors are going to do the

job of stimulating investment at all. It seems to me to be a very dubious proposition to maintain that businessmen are going to indulge in investment to take advantage of these tax benefits, even if markets do not expand enough to absorb the output of existing capacity, much less the additions. This overlooks the plain canons of business prudence. Prudent judgment in business, as I understand it, has always been that one expands capacity to take advantage of market opportunities, not to speculate on the possibility that if one could only get some income out of his investment, one could take advantage of some new tax provision. Elimination of double taxation of dividends, various other revisions in business-tax revisions, and the changes in depreciation allowances are useful to the businessman only if he has a business income, after expenses, against which to charge these benefits or allowances. If he has an inadequate market for his existing capacity, it hardly seems likely that his income before these deductions is going to be sufficient to make it worthwhile for him to indulge in additional investment to take advantage of the mirage of tax benefits.

Businessmen are stimulated to make sound investments when they see a chance of an expanding market for their goods, a market arising from immediate and foreseeable consumer demand. If this is, indeed, the most important motivation to investment in real terms—not speculative gambling in financial equities—then it appears that the administration's tax policy is the exact opposite of the policy which would stimulate investment—even if that were what we need.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not probable that the error into which the administration has fallen arises from the fact that Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, and others regard savings and investments as identical terms? It might well be that in so-called normal periods, everything that is saved is invested, and anything which is not saved is not invested, but in a period of recession, with idle equipment and idle plants, as the Senator from Arkansas has been suggesting, is it not true that even if savings on the part of individuals were to increase and were to flow into banks, it would not follow that the banks and other financial institutions would then invest those savings in industry? Might not industry be afraid to borrow, and might not banks be afraid to lend, with the result that the savings would be impounded in the financial institutions and would effectively be sterilized from entering the economic blood stream?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in my opinion, what the Senator from Illinois—who really knows more about economics than does any other member of our committee, I believe—has said is entirely correct. If I correctly recall the figures, the banks already have an excess lending capacity for which there is no real and effective demand. The mere fact that the financial institutions become overflowing with savings, by no means shows that they will be invested. There again, I think the demand for industrial products should be stimulated instead of providing for tax benefits.

Again I wish to emphasize the point that, in my opinion, the administration has forgotten the element of time. As I said before, the policy of stimulating investment, under proper conditions might well be a sound one, but this is not the correct time for it. What the Senator from Illinois has said is entirely appropriate to the existing situation.

Even if business again might take advantage of tax stimuli such as those proposed, and go on a "binge"—if we may use that term—of investment such as was done in the 1920's, would this be desirable? The verdict of Dr. H. G. Moulton, former president of Brookings Institution, and considered a very conservative economist, would seem pertinent:

> The rapid growth of money savings as compared with consumer expenditures in the twenties retarded rather than accelerated the growth of productive capital. The excess savings which entered the investment market served to inflate prices of existing capital goods and to produce financial instability. A larger relative flow of funds through consumptive channels would have led to a larger utilization of existing productive capacity and also to a more rapid growth of plant and equipment.

Mr. President, I may say that the recent rather strange action on the part of the security markets, which reached a new high for 24 years, has puzzled many persons; but it may be explained by what Dr. Moulton said took place in the 1920's, namely, competition and the bidding up of the price of existing securities, in an attempt by the owners of securities to take advantage of anticipated tax benefits. This has run up the stock market in the face of such indices as 68½ percent of full production of steel and large increases of unemployment, which I mentioned earlier in the course of my remarks. Many persons have been puzzled as to why there has been such an increase in the average prices in the stock market, and I think this might be one of the explanations.

All of my observations, therefore, and considerations of the evidence presented before the Joint Economic Committee seem pointed in a direction for need for immediate expansion of consumption of the products of our capacity. However, we shall certainly need later every possible stimulus to invest to enable us to keep up with the then much larger demands of our economy.

In the short run, then, we need, in a word, an expansion of consumer markets. What does the administration propose in the way of a tax program to do this immediate job? In the first place, it points, of course, to provisions which I have already discussed for relieving impediments directly on savers, investors, and business. This includes the double taxation of dividends provisions, the depreciation allowances provisions, and so forth. The other part of the program is concerned, to the tune of perhaps $250 to $300 million, with a considerable number of minor revisions, such as the so-called working mothers provision. These are laudable, so far as they go.

In addition, about $3 billion in individual tax reductions became effective on January 1, 1954, at the same time the excess profits tax was allowed to lapse. This sounds as though the consumer is getting a break. But it is well to point out that simultaneously on January 1 the social security tax went from 1½ percent to 2 percent on employer and employee, with the result that any worker with a wife and 2 children with less than about $70 a week actually had a decrease, rather than an increase, in his take-home pay after January 1. This group, therefore, has less income available for current spending than they had before January 1.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the figures showing how much the lower income groups have been able to save. The Federal Reserve Board has reported that in 1952 approximately half of the population earned less than $3,440. Yet at the end of that year this one-half of the population held only about 28 percent of the liquid assets.

To put it in a nutshell, the administration's entire tax efforts seem to be concentrated on repeating past mistakes which contributed to, or, at least, failed to forestall, the great depression. This is precisely because the tax policy so far aims at giving almost all of the next tax relief to those with incomes above $5,000 a year and, in particular, above $10,000 a year, or else to business enterprises.

I would not object to some benefits to these groups; but the fact is that the major error is a lack of balance in the existing proposals, which lean too much toward relief for those business concerns which have adequate capacity, those in the upper income brackets who have adequate if not saturated inventories of consumer goods of recent purchase, to those income groups and organizations who always have a ratio of savings to income after taxes which is above the national average.

Let me here say a word about the agricultural situation. I have no panacea for the problem of agricultural surpluses. However, the administration seems to rely upon price reductions, "flexibility," and "modernized parity," as its answer.

It seems to me the answer, if there is one, is increased consumption. While lower prices to the consumer could increase consumption, unfortunately, lower prices to the farmer do not mean significant decreases in consumer prices.

This fact was illustrated by a witness before our committee in this way:

A 20-cent loaf of bread contains about 3 cents worth of wheat. If the price of the farmer's wheat is reduced by 15 percent, the value of the wheat in the loaf is decreased by four-tenths of a cent. The baker cannot reduce the price of bread to 19.6 cents. But the wheat farmers, on a 1-billion bushel crop, would lose $350 million.

Or, take cotton. A $3 shirt contains about 45 cents worth of raw cotton. If raw-cotton prices drop 5 cents a pound, or 15 percent, this decline will be reflected in a 7-cent drop in the price of

the shirt. So the shirt could be sold at $2.93. But the cotton farmers would lose $350 million.

Perhaps a partial answer to the farm problem lies in greater opportunities for the farmers who are operating uneconomical units, who merely subsist, and yet contribute to the surpluses with which we have to deal. These poor farmers cannot and should not be forced out of farming, but many of them can be attracted out by better opportunities in industry. This has already occurred to some extent in the past. Now, however, the reverse is taking place. As unemployment increases, these are often the first people to be laid off. Many of them are returning to the farms, where they will begin to add to the problem of surplus commodities, and, at the same time, decrease the demand.

I am not under any illusion that tax policies are going to directly relieve the problem of agricultural surpluses. I suggest, however, that the tax policy of the administration is much less likely to help than a tax policy directed toward increased consumption and maximum employment.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the tax policy of the present administration is in line with the historic policy of the Republican Party; namely, to pour prosperity in at the top and hold out the hope that it will seep down to the bottom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. That historic policy was the policy during the 1920's.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It goes back, really, to Alexander Hamilton; does it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. I think that is the traditional and historic difference between the approaches of the two parties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Democratic Party, our party, with all its faults, nevertheless has sought to provide a higher standard of living for the great groups of people and to build up their real purchasing power, in the faith that if we do so, we not only improve their condition, but provide a sound market for industry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has put his finger on what I believe to be the primary consideration in this whole subject. It is the maintenance of opportunities in business which will benefit the rich just as much as the poor, relatively, within their various phases of activity.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a moment.

I do not know, but perhaps the Democrats by reason of their concern for the welfare of the individual, have unwittingly been led into benefiting rich Republicans by producing a stable economy. In any event, they have not only served the individual, but have also created a very prosperous economy under which, in my opinion, the rich Republicans have benefited more than they did under their own system of taxation.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is not the present Republican tax proposal somewhat in line with the historic Republican approach, in that they are trying to fatten the herd by feeding the bull?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. He has put the point a little differently from the approach of the Senator from Illinois.

I think the traditional Republican policy is futile. If I thought it would be really effective I would have no objection to pouring prosperity in at the top; but the real objection is that such a policy does not work. I predict that the Republicans will maintain that we are misled by our humanitarianism into doing something unsound. That was more or less the approach of the Secretary of the Treasury. He misses the point. Our approach actually would stabilize the economy and offer greater opportunity for industry. One may argue that it is incidental that it would help the poor people more than the rich. It would, of course, relatively; but the main thing it would do would be to bring about a prosperous economy under which everyone could operate profitably.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that if a tax refund or tax remission of 5 percent, or $160, should be given to the man having an income of $3,200, a much larger proportion of such 5 percent tax remission would be spent for consumer goods than would be the case if those with incomes of more than $10,000 were to receive the same percentage of tax remission?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Illinois is right. Not only would it be spent for consumer goods, but would be spent immediately, and would not be deferred through savings to some future time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, there would be no such sterilization of purchasing power as would occur at times such as these, when a tax favor to the well-to-do would result in some savings and to the impounding of those savings and the consequent failure of the savings to flow out in the form of investments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One further point. One need not embrace completely the doctrines of John Maynard Keynes as a permanent credo to believe that in the present situation there may be a gap between savings and investments?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. I appreciate his contribution.

Basically, the administration's tax program is wrong because it sacrifices expansion of the consumer market to achieve the objective of reducing tax burdens on those groups and individuals who have had it best in the recent years. Worst of all, it could quite possibly induce such a period of unsound speculative activity leading to an unbalance between expanding investment and restricted consumption, as to run the hazard of creating a depression within a few years which might closely resemble those terrible years following 1929, which still leave their scars on many an American family.

On the basis of our present economic situation, I feel that what we need is a tax program which will expand the market for the products of our vast industrial and agricultural capacity by putting more money at once into the hands of those families who constitute our great untapped market for further expansion of demand. To this end, tax action now ought to be directed toward the maximum increase in purchasing power in the lower-income brackets with a minimum of change or disturbance to the basic tax structure. This could be achieved, first, by a drastic reduction of all excise taxes on necessities and semi-luxuries to increase the purchasing power of the consumer dollar; second, a change in the personal-income tax to increase the number of consumer dollars available to buy goods. This might take the form of an increase in the personal exemption, or investigation might show that the desired objective could better be achieved by changing the first or second bracket tax rate. This latter method might prove to be the best way of concentrating as much as possible of the tax relief in those lower-income brackets most likely to spend the increase in their after-tax incomes.

It would have the virtue of reducing taxes and not taking so many people altogether off the tax rolls, an objection which has been raised, and an objection which I believe has some merit. At least I am recommending that this method be investigated as to its effect upon the lower-income group.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Taxes and the Recession," written by Walter Lippmann and published in this morning's Washington Post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whatever the exact prescription, the tax adjustment should be such as to encourage consumers to spend by making tax relief available to those families most in need of it, and who, therefore, could be expected to channel it into the market.

Mr. President, before concluding, let me pay tribute to the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the ranking Democratic Member of the Senate Finance Committee, and for many years its chairman. He has had the vision and the foresight to realize that our tax policies must be adapted to and, in fact, controlled by the economic condition of the country. Because of his long experience in tax matters, he realizes, perhaps better than any of us, the dangers of approaching this question from a rigid, doctrinaire viewpoint, without regard to the times in which we live. I commend his leadership.

EXHIBIT 1

TAXES AND THE RECESSION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The crucial question, it seems to me, about the President's tax program—on which Congress will begin to act this week—is whether it still reflects the best judgment of his advisers on the economic situation. Perhaps the President's broadcast will remove the doubts which inspire this question. But at the moment, and unless he takes a different line, it does look very much as if he were still accepting the views of those who put the balancing of the budget ahead of the balancing of the economy.

If the President does that it is a safe prediction that he will lose the argument in Congress. For the recession is quite severe enough to make the economic consequences of the tax legislation rather than the budgetary consequences, the main criterion of policy.

In Senator GEORGE's motion to raise the exemption in the income tax to $800, the Democrats have a proposal which would be hard to beat at any time, and is very hard indeed to beat in an election year when there is a recession. Yet the Democratic proposal is—so at least it seems to me—an unsound proposal which ought not to be adopted.

Why is it unsound? Not because it would give big tax relief to the great masses of the people. Far from it. That is its virtue, particularly in this phase of deflation. Nor is the Democratic proposal unsound because it may increase budgetary deficit. That is desirable and good policy during the recession.

The unsoundness of the Democratic tax plan is that in the process of reducing taxes, it reduces by more than 4 million the number of taxpayers. It is bad public policy to narrow the base of the visible tax system. Counting all the voters in the families who would be put outside the income-tax system, there would be a very large mass of people who would not have the direct personal experience of having to pay for the costs of the Government.

It would be a great pity to create so large a number of voters who do not share the tax experience of the rest of the country. Nor is it necessary to do this. Large and widely distributed tax relief can be given by reducing the rate of income tax and by reducing excise taxes.

The President will have little hope of defeating the George proposal if he has to argue that the country cannot afford tax relief, or more tax relief than he is proposing, for the masses of the people. If he has to take that position, the President will be a man inhibited by an economic theory that, it is fair to say, is quite obsolete. It is held by no modern economists, including his own official advisers, and by fewer and fewer of the financial leaders of the capitalist world. He must not let his affectionate respect for the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, which are so amply justified on every other ground, lead him in this critical time up the blind alley of fiscal dogmatism.

In a recession, and preferably at the first clear signs of it, there should be tax reduction to replenish the purchasing power of the mass of the consumers and also additional incentives to the investors. Experience shows, I believe, that in a recession a reduction of the rate of taxes is likely in the end to produce larger Government revenues than the maintenance of the higher rate fixed during the boom. And the reverse we know from the hard experience after 1929—that the effort of trying to balance the budget when production is falling is almost certain to make production fall still more, and so to diminish the yield of taxes, and thus to fail to balance the budget.

The way to a balanced budget under present conditions is by restoring the balance of the economy and bringing the recession to an end.

It is clearly the time for the administration to pass from the attitude of wait and see into firm and positive measures. That is not because the economic situation is now ominous, or that it has suddenly taken a turn for the worse, or that a depression is now unavoidable or even probable. It is because the time to take preventive measures is when the symptoms, though plain and not imaginary, are not severe and critical.

Whereas now, a little may be quite enough, the administration—if it waits too long for more obvious symptoms—is running the risk of being too late with too little. No serious harm can be done by taking precautions before one is absolutely certain that they are absolutely necessary. But to have failed to take them if they are necessary, could do much harm.

We know clearly enough what are the first things that a situation like this one calls for. As a matter of fact, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have already taken the fundamental preliminary step. They have reversed the hard and tight money policy with which the administration began a year ago, on the assumption that it was faced with the danger of an inflationary boom rather than with the beginnings of postwar recession.

The second step is the one now before us, to give tax relief which will promote consumption and stimulate investment. It is not at all certain, however, that easy money and tax relief will be enough. For we know from experience that while monetary and fiscal measures can stop a boom, we cannot be sure that they are enough to reverse a recession.

They are, as an economist said to me the other day, like a rope tied to a mule. You can use the rope to keep the mule from running away. But if you want the mule to go ahead, you will not persuade him to do so my pushing the rope.

We must, therefore, keep our minds open and alert, and what is more, receptive to ideas of how to stimulate the investment of capital. It may well be that the administration's tax measures dealing with depreciation allowances, while right in principle, is too cautious.

We should also ask ourselves whether this may not be the time when the rate and the amount of public spending for defense, for highways, for public health, and for public education, can be increased profitably.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking to the pending bill, the so-called natural gas bill, at the close of my remarks I shall ask for action on the following motion, which I send to the desk:

Mr. President, I move to recommit to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce H. R. 5976, with instructions that hearings be held on the same.

I shall ask for action on the motion at the close of the debate. In the debate on Friday, Mr. President, I laid the foundation for my motion, and I wish to invite attention to the following passages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday:

On page 3171 there is a statement which I wish to quote, but before doing so I desire to point out that the two Senators from Ohio, for both of whom I have the highest respect, are in dispute over the bill. This bill will have a very direct effect on economic interests in Ohio, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that when two distinguished Senators from the same State find themselves in such diametrically opposed positions as those which the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Ohio expressed in the debate on last Friday, all the rest of us should take a long look at the issues before a final vote is taken.

Because of the difference of opinion, joined in by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who pointed out that hearings were not held on the bill in the Senate, I think the only fair thing to do is to recommit the bill back to the committee for hearings.

On page 3173 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is the following comment by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE]:

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in discussing H. R. 5976, which is generally known as the Hinshaw bill, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], is correct when he states that the bill seeks to override or supersede, so to speak, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down in 1950, in the case of East Ohio Gas Co. against the city of Cleveland, which held that distributing companies, such as the East Ohio Gas Co., are subject to the regulation of the Federal Power Commission.

It is my belief that the enactment of the pending bill would ultimately cost the gas consumers of the United States millions of dollars. I am confident that it would be very costly to the people of my home State.

On that allegation the two Senators from Ohio disagreed, as the debate will show. We should have all the facts and should be certain of them, and we are, therefore, entitled to hearings by the committee so that there can be submitted to the Senate a committtee report bearing specifically upon the allegations and counterallegations of the two Senators from Ohio in regard to the financial effect of the bill upon the consumers of gas.

Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of Senators to page 3178 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Friday on which I sought to lay the foundation for the motion to recommit. After listening to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I learned for the first time that hearings on this bill had not been held by the Senate committee, and I asked permission to ask the following questions last Friday:

No. 1. On the bill now pending before the Senate, there have not been any hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foregin Commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. No. 2. The only hearings which were held in the House apparently were very short hearings, of a day or two in duration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One day in duration.

Mr. MORSE. No. 3. The Senate committee knew before it reported the bill to the Senate that one of the members of the Federal Power Commission did not find himself in favor of the bill, but, nevertheless, he was not called by the committee to testify.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. The Commission's report stated that one member dissented; and that report is included in the committee report on this bill.

Mr. MORSE. But the committee did not seek his testimony before it reported the bill to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No hearings were held, and no statement was then submitted by him. I should like to point out that the bill passed the House on July 30, was referred to the Senate committee on the same day, and was reported by the Senate committee on the same day.

Mr. MORSE. If I understand correctly, the fourth point the Senator from Illinois makes is that, apparently, there was belief on the part of members of the committee that the bill pending before the Senate was so similar to the previous bill, known as the O'Conor bill, in the preceding Congress, that they thought, in principle, they were voting on an identical bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may have been possible. The testimony before the House seems to indicate that some of the witnesses thought they were discussing what was substantially the same as S. 1084. In fact, if I may say so, in Senate Report No. 817 of the 83d Congress, which is on the desks of Senators, a statement appears on page 3, as follows:

"This bill is substantially the same as the O'Conor-Bricker bill, S. 1084, which was reported favorably by your committee by unanimous vote late in the 82d Congress and which passed the Senate but was received in the House too late for action."

As I shall show, it is a very different bill from S. 1084, and grants much wider exemption than did S. 1084.

Mr. President, a reading of the remainder of the debate on Friday will disclose that the Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Ohio found the pending bill to be substantially different from Senate bill 1084. I think they proved their case as they presented their analyses of the pending bill in comparison with the previous bill.

There are other excerpts from the RECORD of last Friday, Mr. President, which I might very well read in support of my motion to recommit, but I believe I can summarize the debate in a sentence or two.

We have here, Mr. President, a bill which, in my judgment, not only is of great importance because of its immediate application to the operative companies which it is to affect, but it is likewise of great importance from the standpoint of establishing a precedent which can be applied to other situations similarly related to it as they may arise.

When we have views and thoughts concerning such precedential value, we should take a long look at the situation. Therefore, most respectfully, and without casting any reflection upon the good intentions and the sincerity of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I wish to say that I do not think this bill should have come to the floor of the Senate without hearings.

Mr. President, the member of the Federal Power Commission who does not agree with this bill and who has filed with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] individual views as to the effect of the bill, which were placed in the RECORD last Friday, should be brought before the committee for questioning, because, if he can sustain the views set forth in the memorandum which he filed with the Senator from Illinois, I believe many Senators will agree with me that the bill should not pass. The Senate should have the benefit of a committee hearing and a committee examination of the views of the junior Senator from Ohio before it takes action on the bill. I know of no way of getting the kind of a record on which to predicate action other than by hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the motion I have filed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon has moved to recommit the bill?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Martin
Anderson	Gillette	Maybank
Barrett	Goldwater	McCarthy
Beall	Gore	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Case	Jackson	Purtell
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Symington
Duff	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	Kuchel	Upton
Eastland	Langer	Watkins
Ellender	Lennon	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wiley
Flanders	Magnuson	Young
Frear	Malone	
Fulbright	Mansfield	

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The clerk will state the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is moved that H. R. 5976, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with instructions that hearings be held.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion to recommit, for the reasons, first, that the pending bill, like the preceding bill on the same subject, has been inadequately considered by the committee; and secondly, that it is a further annihilation of the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

As the RECORD shows, the bill was reported by the committee with speed greater than that of lightning. It passed the House on July 30 of last year. On the same day it was messaged over to the Senate. On that very day it was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without a hearing. So, it was reported almost simultaneously with the passage of the bill by the House, and without consideration by the Senate committee.

Incidentally, on the question of hearings, the same course had been followed with the preceding bill on the same subject, S. 1084, in the 82d Congress, which measure was reported without a hearing.

I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Oregon that in the case of so important a measure as this it is desirable to have the committee hold hearings to ascertain what is covered by the bill, and to afford opportunity for dissenting opinions to be expressed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota has not had too much of an opportunity to study the bill. He has been told that it contains one feature with respect to which he would like to have the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, namely, if the bill should be enacted, would there result a revaluation of gas properties within State lines, and would that mean, in effect, that the revaluation would be on a replacement basis, less depreciation, rather than on the basis of original cost?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there would be that tendency. The Federal Power Commission, as the Senator from South Dakota well knows, generally follows the prudent investment theory of valuation. In the specific case of Ohio, the State Public Utilities Commission is bound to follow the reproduction cost theory. In certain other States the State commissions follow the so-called going valuation, or fair value theory, which tends to be a sort of hodgepodge of various bases. These other valuation theories, of course, generally result in much higher rate bases.

In my opinion, there is no doubt that the transfer of jurisdiction will result in the lateral pipelines and also the terminal pipelines being put under State regulation. Because of the different valuation theories in some States and the practice of others not to account so strictly in measuring costs, the tendency will be to value the properties at a

higher figure than would otherwise be the case, and there will also be a tendency for the rates to increase.

Mr. CASE. The aspect of the bill which disturbs me is the prospect that there will be a revaluation when the administration of such activities is taken over by State utility commissions, and the consequent prospect that such revaluation on a replacement basis will result in an increase in rates. That would be wholly unjustified from an historic standpoint.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from South Dakota is completely right in his suspicions. That is one of the major reasons why the Senator from Illinois is opposing the bill. The bill not only contains the exemption provided by Senate bill 1084, which exempted pipelines which sold directly to consumers, but it adds the exemption of lateral pipelines coming from the main stem which are owned by other companies and which sell gas for resale. The bill not only allows a greater immediate exemption, but opens the way for main pipeline companies which now own lateral pipelines to divest themselves of the ownership of the lateral pipelines to dummies, and in that way to remove them from the authority of Federal regulation and place them under State regulation, where, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, regulations are softer and easier.

These are two reasons why I believe the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, let me say just a word in urging support of the motion to recommit the bill.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said, no hearings whatever were held on the bill in the Senate committee. The brief record in the House of Representatives committee demonstrates that most of the witnesses who testified there in favor of the bill thought they were supporting Senate bill 1084, which is very different from the pending Hinshaw bill. Many of the mayors and city attorneys of the Nation would like to be heard by the committee in opposition to this bill.

So, Mr. President, I urge support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I cannot let pass the opportunity to correct any impression the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may have to the effect that as a result of the enactment of the pending bill there would be an evasion of regulation or any change in the valuation or in the rate base. This bill will not remove any public utility company from regulation. It merely will do what Congress thought it was doing in passing the Natural Gas Act, which states that it shall not apply to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution.

Congress believed then, as I am sure it still does, that the purchase, transmission, and sale of natural gas for ultimate use within a State are local matters. Congress believed that all aspects of such transactions should be regulated locally by State regulatory bodies, which are better acquainted than a Federal Government agency in Washington can be with local needs and with the activities of local companies.

This bill is opposed by the Federal Power Commission, which wishes to extend its bureaucratic jurisdiction. On the other hand, the State regulatory commissions are unanimous in supporting the bill.

As I have said before, enactment of House bill 5976 is necessary because of the decision of the Supreme Court, in the case of Federal Power Commission against East Ohio Gas Co., in which the majority of the Court gave a very strained construction to the provision of the Natural Gas Act to which I have adverted, and said that the local-distribution proviso in the act is surplusage and is not actually necessary.

On the other hand, Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Frankfurter pointed out very clearly, in their dissenting opinion, the erroneous position on the part of the majority of the Court in not giving to the language of the act the meaning Congress intended it to have.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. President, the enactment of the pending bill will not mean an increase in the rates. The respective State commissions have adequate power to arrive at the valuation of the property of any utility which is serving the people of their States No one can say with correctness that the State commissions would be less zealous than the Federal Power Commission in taking action to protect the rights of the people of the States. As a matter of fact, I am confident that the State commissions are far more competent than is the Federal Power Commission to pass upon the valuation of such properties in their States and to protect the people of their States. The State commissions, which are thoroughly familiar with the situation in their respective States, are far more competent to pass upon such matters than is a bureaucratic agency in Washington, which is attempting to handle these matters in a very different way from that intended by Congress.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether turning over this matter to the State commissions would require new valuations.

Mr. BRICKER. No, it would not require new valuations. The States always have had jurisdiction over matters within their borders.

Even if the enactment of the pending bill should require new valuations—although it will not—such valuations are made only when the question arises before the State commission in a rate case. It cannot properly be assumed that the State commissions would arrive at a higher rate base than would the Federal Power Commission.

The only question here is whether we shall trust the Federal Power Commission to proceed fairly to all concerned in its grab for power, or whether we are to continue to have confidence in the ability of the State commissions to continue to perform properly the duties imposed upon them by Congress when it passed the Natural Gas Act.

As I have said, the necessity for the enactment of this bill has arisen only because of the assumption of power on the part of the Federal Power Commission, whose action was sustained by the Supreme Court, in a very divided opinion, with dissenting opinions filed by Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Frankfurter. However, the enactment of this bill will not involve in any way the rates or the valuation. This bill applies only to a delineation of power. Certainly the proper place to repose jurisdiction is along State lines.

As I have said before, this measure does not involve in any way, shape, or form, rates or valuation.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Ohio referred to a grab for power, but he also stated that the Federal Power Commission is supporting this bill.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from South Dakota must have misunderstood me; I did not say the Federal Power Commission is supporting the bill.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Ohio mean that a change in the complexion of the Federal Power Commission has caused a change in its position?

Mr. BRICKER. That might be; but there is in the record a letter from Chairman Kuykendall, asking for support of certain amendments, which the committee voted to incorporate in the bill.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a telegram from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, unanimously supporting the bill.

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

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *February 5, 1954.*

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio unanimously in favor of the Hinshaw bill and urges its passage without further amendments. Our resignation from the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners was over a matter of principle involving internal matters and in no way indicates any change of feeling as far as the Hinshaw bill is concerned. We unreservedly endorse the actions of the association as far as the Hinshaw bill is concerned.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO,
ROBERT L. MOULTON, *Chairman.*
RAY MARTIN, *Commissioner.*
RALPH A. WINTER, *Commissioner.*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me at this time?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The eminent Senator from Ohio quoted from the opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson and the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Will he inform the Senate whether that was a majority opinion or a dissenting opinion?

Mr. BRICKER. I was very careful to say it was a minority opinion, a dissenting opinion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that six Justices of the Supreme Court, or a clear majority, held to the contrary?

Mr. BRICKER. Five Justices held to the contrary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Five?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that one Justice who did not participate in the opinion was Associate Justice Burton, who disqualified himself in the case, on the ground that he had been Mayor of Cleveland and, while serving in that position, had initiated the action asking the Federal Power Commission to make a valuation finding in the case of the East Ohio Gas Co.?

Mr. BRICKER. That may be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not so?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Illinois referred to it last week, but I do not know anything about it.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate to understand that the question of the rate base and the question of valuation of the property do not govern, when it comes to determining the charge to the consumers. In my State, the predominating factor in connection with the determination of rates by the Ohio Public Utilities Commission is the reproduction cost, less depreciation. Yet the Federal Power Commission, in its activities in attempting to reach across the State border to fix rates, has caused the Ohio rate to rise, until now it is the fourth highest among the rates for all the States of the Union, insofar as charges for natural gas are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The minority opinion in the East Ohio Gas Co. case, as quoted by the Senator from Ohio, was an opinion which might be used to justify Senate bill 1084 of the 82d Congress, but the provisions of the pending bill go far beyond the provisions of Senate bill 1084, in exempting from Federal rate regulation lateral gas trunklines, which are differentiated in ownership from the main trunklines, which sell for resale to other utilities. Will the Senator from Ohio be willing to substitute the provisions of Senate bill 1084, which embody the principles of judicial opinion he has cited, for the provisions of the bill which is now before the Senate?

Mr. BRICKER. I would not be willing to do that. This matter was thoroughly studied by the Senate committee at the time when the report was made, and the bill was also thoroughly studied by the House of Representatives committee. The provisions of this bill are much clearer than those of the original bill. The pending bill is much more restrictive, because it requires a certificate from the State regulatory commission, or whatever the State authority may be, to the extent that it has jurisdiction over the determination of value and the fixing of rates; the State commission must so certify to the Federal Power Commission. In that way, the pending bill is more restrictive and is better safeguarded than was the original bill.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will my colleague concede that the Federal Power Commission uses different accounting methods than those used by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio?

Mr. BRICKER. In Ohio, a uniform system of accounting is required of all public utilities, and that system is not so extensive or so costly as is the system required by the Federal Power Commission. I may also say it is not needed for the purpose of fixing rates.

The system required by the Federal Power Commission amounts to a duplication of reporting on the part of the utilities operating within a State. Therefore, it means considerable additional cost to the operating utilities; and the additional cost enters, as a matter of expense, into the determination of the rate base, and the additional expense must be allowed for or taken out before the return to the company is fixed. Therefore, the consumer pays every cent of the duplicate cost.

The junior Senator from Ohio well knows that in the accounting of a utility company expense items are considered before any rate of return is determined. It is much more important to reduce the expenses of a utility company than it is to change the valuation or the rate base. If the return is based upon 5 percent, it is 20 times as important to determine the expense as it is the rate base.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator not concede that the accounting methods are different?

Mr. BRICKER. The uniform system of accounting in Ohio is different from the system of accounting required by the Federal Power Commission. That is true.

Mr. BURKE. I wished to bring out that point in answer to the question which has been raised.

Mr. BRICKER. The uniform system of accounting in Ohio is much simpler, which is to the benefit of the rate payer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish very quickly to summarize the reasons why I think my motion should be agreed to.

First, let me say, in fairness to the senior Senator from Ohio, that he was not chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the bill was reported.

The reasons for my motion are these:

First. We are confronted with a bill which has its immediate effect upon a State, although, as I said earlier this afternoon, it will have great precedential value, affecting similar cases, if we establish the precedent this afternoon.

Second. We are dealing with a case in respect to which the two Senators from the State directly concerned take diametrically opposite positions. I believe that when such a situation exists we owe it to both Senators to take a long look at the issue which is raised, particularly in this instance, in view of the fact that there have been no hearings on the bill before the Senate committee, and apparently a hearing lasting only part of 1 day on the House side.

Third. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] pointed out in the RECORD last Friday that a great many municipal officials are opposed to the bill and wish to be heard.

Lastly, the record is perfectly clear that one member of the Federal Power Commission is opposed to the bill and has raised some serious objections to it. He has not been called to testify before the committee. Therefore, I think he ought to have an opportunity to be heard on the subject.

The bill can be recommitted to the committee and be back before the Senate within a space of 3 or 4 weeks. From the standpoint of orderly procedure in the Senate, I believe that when a bill is so pregnant with controversy as this one is, we ought to have on our desks the benefit of a committee hearing on the bill before we are called upon to vote.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, let me advise the Senate that there was no request from any city official, aside from those who appeared before the House committee, for an opportunity to adduce testimony before the Senate committee. No such request was received before the bill was reported, and none has been received since that time. Commissioner Doty did not give us any memorandum in committee. One has been submitted on the floor of the Senate.

The bill has been pending for many months on the calendar. Anyone could have submitted a request to be heard at any time he desired. It was known that the bill had the unanimous support of public-utility commissions in every State of the Union. Anyone who desired to be heard could have submitted a request.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am persuaded that the Senator is right as to the merits of the bill. However, I wish to be sure that we are not doing violence to the traditions of the Senate with regard to hearings.

Do I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio to say that no requests were received by the committee from persons who desired to be heard?

Mr. BRICKER. There have been no requests of any kind at any time, either this year or last.

Mr. LONG. Do I further correctly understand that both during this year and last the Senator received no requests for witnesses to be heard, and, secondly, that he has received notice that this measure has the unanimous support of all the State regulatory commissions, and also the support of the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to that observation, let me say that I think the bill came to the floor of the Senate so fast that persons who might otherwise wish to testify on the bill did not have an opportunity to do so. Once a bill is on the calendar, the statement which is usually made, and the point of view which is usually accepted is, It is too late now. The bill is on the calendar, and there will be no committee hearings on it.

We have the statement of the junior Senator from Ohio in the RECORD last Friday, pointing out that a great many municipal officials are opposed to the bill and would like to testify with regard

to it. I think the answer to the argument made by the senior Senator from Ohio is to give those witnesses an opportunity to testify, and to protect what I think is the orderly procedure of the Senate, namely, hearings on each bill, so that we may have the benefit of the hearings when we come to vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Oregon will not prevail. It would require the bill to be recommitted to the committee, and then, presumably, it would be back on the floor of the Senate, as the Senator from Oregon puts it, in perhaps 3 or 4 weeks.

We have a very heavy legislative program ahead of us, as I am sure every Senator thoroughly understands. Not long ago I discussed the program with the minority leader, and stated to him that it was the judgment of the majority leader that we would not be able to take a recess during Easter week, as I understand the House intends to do. We plan to take a recess from Thursday evening before Good Friday until the following Monday. However, we shall not be able to take a recess during Easter week.

Even though we work in active daily sessions from now until the 31st of July, we shall find our hands full if we are to complete the legislative program which is before us.

Regardless of the final action of the Senate on the bill, I hope it will not be recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit House bill 5976 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with instructions. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—25

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Burke	Hayden	Morse
Case	Hennings	Mundt
Clements	Jackson	Murray
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Flanders	Kennedy	Symington
Frear	Langer	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	
Gillette	Mansfield	

NAYS—52

Anderson	Goldwater	McCarthy
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bennett	Holland	Potter
Bricker	Hunt	Purtell
Bridges	Ives	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Schoeppel
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Daniel	Knowland	Thye
Dirksen	Kuchel	Upton
Duff	Lennon	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Welker
Eastland	Malone	Young
Ellender	Martin	
Ferguson	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—19

Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Russell
Carlson	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Williams
Green	McCarran	
Griswold	McClellan	

So Mr. MORSE's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3-11-54-A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Commission upon its own motion may, or upon application shall, exempt from the provisions of this act a person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural gas and who owns or operates facilities used or to be used for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or for the sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce, or for or in connection with the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire, provided, (1) such facilities do not extend beyond a community or metropolitan area, and (2) all gas delivered or transported through such facilities is ultimately consumed within such community or metropolitan area. To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is granted pursuant to this subsection the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to follow paragraph (9), to be numbered paragraph (10), to read as follows:

"(10) 'Community or metropolitan area' means the area of a community or city, and a zone adjacent thereto, which the Commission upon the basis of commercial, economic, social, or other relevant factors, or upon the basis of facilities, organization, and arrangements for the distribution of natural gas, finds to constitute a community or an area properly integrated for the local distribution of natural gas, and within which the Commission finds that the transportation or sale of gas does not require regulation by the Commission in order to protect the public interest."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute would exempt from Federal regulation stub lines to local distributors selling gas directly to consumers, and it exempts from Federal regulation the metropolitan area facilities of New York.

It does retain, however, the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to determine valuation and to rule on service applications on extensive trunk pipeline selling within a State for domestic consumption. It also retains the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to regulate rates charged by lateral pipelines selling to other utilities for resale.

In short, it seems to me it makes certain adjustments in the Natural Gas Act permitting local action on all regulatory matters on the tips of the system and inside the metropolitan area of New York, but it retains the ability of the Federal Power Commission to find value in the case of one group of extensive trunk pipelines which sell directly to consumers, and to continue to regulate rates of lateral pipelines which do not sell directly to consumers, but which sell to other utilities. It seems to me it is a thoroughly practical method, of leaving matters that are truly local to the State commissions, but retaining for Federal regulation those parts of the natural gas distribution system that require some uniformity of treatment if consumers are to be protected. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5976) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 461, making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the joint resolution which is before the Senate makes an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, in connection with the Mexican farm-labor problem. It is one of those matters which come to us on short notice. That is the reason for the quick hearing and the report. We were informed that the money was exhausted on March 12, which was only 2 or 3 days ago. However, as a result of a new agreement which has been reached with Mexico, the previous agreement having expired on December 31, 1953, and having been extended to January 15, 1954, there are new conditions.

Mr. President, at the time when action on the joint resolution was taken by the House committee and, I think, by the House itself, an agreement with Mexico had not been executed. Subsequent to action by the House committee and the House, a new agreement was negotiated.

The House approved an appropriation of $478,000. The Senate committee was asked to recommend an appropriation of $550,000. The additional money is to provide facilities for a station in the southwestern section of the country for the purpose of making physical and medical tests in the United States. Without the additional money asked for by the Department itself, it was decided that the facilities required in the United States could not be provided.

When the program was inaugurated, a very interesting provision was made in the law to the effect that the user or the employer of this type of Mexican labor should pay certain costs in connection with the recruitment of the labor, which amounted to not more than $15 in an individual case. As a result, a surplus was piled up, which was unusual for a Government department. Recently, however, the amount charged for the service was reduced until it was brought down to $6 and $2. Since that time the costs have been maintained on the basis of $6 and $2.

As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I desire to save the Federal Government and the American taxpayers all the money possible. It is very obvious to me that this year it will become increasingly difficult to reduce appropriations. As the present occupant of the chair knows, and as other Members of the Senate know, Congress is faced with a challenge.

Therefore, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I proposed to the committee that I be allowed to offer, on the floor of the Senate, an amendment on page 1, line 11, after "$478,000" and before the period, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That employers shall reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred by it for the physical or medical examination of workers.

In other words, the Government would provide for the employer the medical and physical examinations of the worker, which still would bring the cost to the employer to a figure much lower than he had previously paid. In that case, there will be sufficient funds left from the $478,000 to enable facilities in the southwestern section of United States to be built under the current appropriation, which is the same figure as provided by the House, and to place the physical and medical examination costs on the employer.

This is a very simple procedure, as Senators can understand. It required a little Yankee figuring to determine how the money could be saved. The amount involved is very small, but there is an old saying that it takes little stones to make a wall.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after "$478,000" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided,* That employers shall reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred by it for the physical or medical examination of workers."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not know that I object to the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. If any hearings had been held on the proposal, or if any testimony had been received as to the effect which the amendment would have, I am inclined to believe that I would at least favor the purpose of the Senator's amendment. But I do not think the proper way to legislate is to have a member of the Committee on Appropriations come before the Senate with a legislative proposal and to ask that it be tied to an appropriation.

I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. All over the United States public employment offices are now registering persons, and in greater numbers today than for some time in the past. The Federal Government is providing the employment offices. It may be that in this particular line of employment, the employers, who are the recipients of the type of labor involved, should pay all the expense. But before the Government embarks on a new kind of proposal, I should like to have the appropriate committee of the Senate consider the matter and hear testimony. If it should be the conclusion of the committee that there should be an arrangement such as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire suggests, I should be glad to go along with the proposal.

I am somewhat reluctant to raise the point of order, because my experience with the senior Senator from New Hampshire has been very pleasant and productive. I think his ideas usually are very good, and this one has some appeal to me. However, there has been a little difficulty in working out an arrangement so far as this type of labor is concerned, particularly in the Southwest.

Since the passage of the so-called wetback bill a few days ago, a new agreement with Mexico has been concluded. Our neighbor to the south will provide stations on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, so it will be incumbent upon the United States Government to provide similar receiving stations on our side of the border.

It will be my purpose, as soon as the Chair shall have ruled, on behalf of my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and myself, to offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution to raise the figure from $478,000 to $542,000, in order to provide a station in Texas to receive these persons, to give them examinations, and to carry out the United States part of the agreement.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not insist upon action on his amendment today, without holding hearings on the subject.

I observe on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. AIKEN]. I know he has given a great deal of thought and study to the whole general subject, but I doubt that he is prepared today to state positively that the type of arrangement proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire should be included in the law of the land.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. To the best of my recollection, the matter was not considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when the committee previously considered the legislation which authorizes the making of a contract between the United States Government and the Mexican Government. I do not desire to say whether the proposed amendment would or would not be legislation on an appropriation bill. It has the earmarks of being legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not think there can be any doubt that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. If not, I will say it would be pretty close to it. As probably everyone knows, the basic legislation, authorizing the making of a contract between the United States Government and the Government of Mexico, expires on December 31 of this year. Thus far, no bill has been offered which would renew the authority. I presume such a bill will be offered. I suppose there will be Sen-

ators who will desire to have the legislation continued. I am satisfied there may be a few who will want to discontinue it. If so, I may say that, so far as I can promise, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give the matter a very thorough hearing and also will be very glad to consider the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. It seems to me that his amendment has some merit in these days, when Congress is trying to effect economy in Government. As I have said, the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty will give the amendment thorough consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the light of what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said, I hope the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not insist upon his amendment; or, in the event it is held out of order, that he will not insist on a motion to suspend the rule in order to seek to have it acted upon and agreed to.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I should say that probably the point of order is a valid one, but I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire has raised the question, because I believe it to be very important. I think action on the proposal can be taken before very long, because hearings on the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor have been in progress for some time, and an extended discussion of the whole matter was held one day last week. It is entirely possible, therefore, since it will be only a little more than 90 days before the beginning of the new fiscal year, that the question can be discussed further, and perhaps a legislative proviso can be prepared which will be agreeable to all concerned. Nevertheless, there will be testimony to support such a proviso, including what the Department of Labor may do by way of regulation to provide whatever authority may be needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Texas is sustained.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President I should like to speak to the question before action is taken. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made reference to the fact that the committee which is dealing with the appropriations for the Department of Labor has had discussions on the question, and will continue the discussions in the very near future. It is very true that the amount which has been proposed to be charged in this particular administrative year was reduced below the actual cost, and that we will be drawing on the unused reserve which had been accumulated in the years when the charge had been $15 on the original contract and $7.50 on the second contract. At a later time, $11 was the reduced figure on the original contract. Now the figure has come down to $6 and $2, which figures are below the actual cost.

Therefore, I think the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, is entirely justified in asking that the cost of the physical and medical checkup be borne by the contractor or the user, because the user has the service at a reduced rate this year compared with the rates of last year, and compared with an earlier rate of $15.

With reference to the point of order, while there is a legislative question which might well be considered, yet I think the principle invoked by the chairman of the committee is in general entirely right, and I think he should be upheld in this instance rather than have a point of order raised against his motion.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President the point of order having been raised, I realize that the chance of getting a two-thirds vote on the amendment is probably slim. As the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Illinois have stated, I think the amendment is right in principle. I see no reason on God's green earth why the employer should not assume a small part of the cost of the proper medical service. It has not been a hard burden on anyone.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] did not commit himself. He was very careful, in his very precise way, to leave a little crack in the door open; but he put himself on record in a general sort of way.

With assurances from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Chairman of the Agricultural Committee, that the bill to which he referred, and the amendment will receive consideration, I am willing to withdraw the amendment, in order not to have the question raised on a point of order, though I think I am right, and I hope if the legislation is extended it will include such an amendment as I have proposed. It is one way to save about $300,000 a year; and we have got to save.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$478,000" and to insert "$542,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, was the figure $475,000 or $474,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It was $478,000, and we propose to raise it to $542,000. The original figure would have applied if the station had been at Harlingen. That was prior to the time when the agreement with Mexico was reached. The Department is now proposing to put the station at Hidalgo, and we ask for $542,000 instead of the original sum.

Mr. BRIDGES. If my amendment is to be defeated, when almost everyone has agreed to it in principle, we hope it will be embodied in the next bill on the subject which comes before the Senate for consideration, but in that event it will not be in effect until the next fiscal year. Facilities must be provided which are called for in the agreement with Mexico; and we are practically bound to appropriate the amount suggested by the Senator from Texas. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for himself and his colleague [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT—TELEGRAM FROM THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed Senate bill 2548, relating to management of national forests. Since that time there have been some rumors that the National Wildlife Federation was opposed to the bill, or to some provisions of it.

This morning I received a telegram from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in convention at Chicago, Ill., stating that the policy committee of the federation had approved, without a dissenting vote, the bill passed by the Senate last week.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram which I received be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 13, 1954.*

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
Senate Office Building:

National Wildlife Federation convention today adopted following report of conservation policy committee without dissenting vote:

1. We approve the final draft of Senate bill 2548 as passed by the United States Senate on March 8, 1954, as fair legislation recognizing the broad public interest in our national forests.

2. We express to Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, chairman, and the committee our appreciation for their careful and intensive study of all the problems involved and their considerate fairness in hearing the various spokesmen representing conservation and public interests.

3. We strongly recommend to the House Committee on Agriculture that such committee in consideration of H. R. 6787 adopt the same amendments approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry applicable to Senate bill 2548, in order to conform H. R. 6787 to the Senate bill as passed on March 8, 1954.

4. Our approval of Senate bill 2548, as passed by the Senate, is without prejudice. We will vigorously oppose any amendment which would change such bill to favor any private interest use, to the detriment of any other recognized use or to the detriment of the public welfare.

CHAS. H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the business pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is Senate bill 49, the unfinished business, which the Chair lays before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to make a brief statement concerning the pending bill granting statehood to Hawaii which has been amended by the amendment which was adopted last week, providing statehood for Alaska. I hope that the Senators who are either favorably disposed or in opposition to the statehood bill as it is now before the Senate will be prepared to carry on the debate, starting from this time forward, or certainly from tomorrow, when the Senate reconvenes again after its recess. If there are any other amendments to be submitted, I hope they may be presented and adequately debated, in order to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the amendments, and then finally to vote the bill up or down.

Personally, I hope the bill as now before the Senate may finally be passed and sent to the House. At any rate, it is an issue on which both of the great political parties have expressed themselves in their national platforms. Both this administration and the prior administration have spoken from time to time, through responsible Cabinet officers and others, as being in favor of statehood for either Hawaii or Alaska, or both. The only way statehood is going to be achieved by either, it seems to me now, is by passing the bill which is now pending before the Senate.

I certainly would not suggest that adequate discussion be foreclosed. Of course in this body I do not need to remind my colleagues that adequate discussion could not be foreclosed. Be that as it may, it seems to me that on an issue of so much importance as this, the country is at least entitled to know how all Senators feel, and is entitled to have a yea-and-nay vote on the question of statehood. I earnestly ask the cooperation of the Members on both sides of the aisle, whether they be in favor or opposed to statehood for these Territories, in working with the majority leader to bring the question to a head, so that we can determine the statehood issue, and then can take up the other business which the Senate has in its heavy schedule.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the majority leader in the views he has just expressed with regard to the statehood bill. I am satisfied that it is clearly the duty of the Senate to proceed now, without interruption, to take final action on that bill, to which the Anderson amendment has been attached. I am satisfied that in the Senate there will be sufficient favorable votes to make it possible for the bill to be passed.

I am also inclined to believe that sufficient favorable votes will be cast in the House of Representatives, in regard to both statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii, if it is possible for the measure to reach a vote in the House.

I wish to say that subject, of course, to priority of consideration for privileged matters, and also subject to being outvoted in the case of a motion to displace, henceforth I shall object to any proposal in the Senate to obtain unanimous consent to have the statehood bill displaced by any other measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will be willing to maintain a somewhat flexible attitude on the subject, because there may be a question of temporarily displacing consideration of the statehood bill for the consideration of an appropriation bill; and, of course, of necessity and by custom, appropriation bills have been taken up when ready.

Furthermore, I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that at the request of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, who sought assurances from the majority leader that there would not be any unnecessary delay in taking up the New Mexico senatorial election contest, I gave assurances that I would cooperate with them in having that question come before the Senate at an early time. As a result of my consultations with Members on the other side of the aisle, I believe we shall be able to reach an agreement as to a division of the time available for debating that question. I understand that it has been suggested that there be 12 hours of debate, with the time to be divided equally. Such an arrangement probably would take us through two whole days. At this time we are trying to see whether a general understanding can be reached in regard to a formula which will be agreeable—although of course such a matter would have to be submitted to the Senate itself—in regard to reaching a vote on the New Mexico senatorial election contest not later than next Tuesday.

So I merely ask the Senator from Oregon—without seeking to obtain a commitment from him—to maintain a somewhat flexible attitude, at least regarding the New Mexico senatorial election contest and any appropriation bills which may be ready for consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, most good naturedly, that methinks entwined in the statement of the Senator from California is a suggestion that I am lacking in flexibility. Certainly that is not what my critics say of me. They protest that I display too much flexibility. [Laughter.]

However, let me say to the Senator from California that I understand his point of view. On the other hand, in connection with the Alaska-Hawaii statehood proposal, we are faced with such a parliamentary situation, that the longer we delay final action on the statehood bill, the greater the chance that final action on that measure will be postponed and dragged out until the dying days of the session, at which time we may be confronted with a conference report on the bill; and then we may hear the old, bewhiskered argument, which so often is made on the floor of the Senate, "Oh, there is nothing we can do about it; we must take the conference report as it is."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I can give the Senator from Oregon assurances, without any mental reservation whatsoever so far as I am concerned, that, as majority leader, I wish to bring the statehood bill to a head as soon as possible; and I have no disposition to let it drag along all session, to be killed in the closing hours of the session, with numerous other legislative proposals.

So the Senator from Oregon will have my full cooperation in the effort to secure a vote on the bill in the Senate as rapidly as possible, and I shall be glad to have the Senate vote at any time from tonight on. However, obviously, there must be some debate; and I understand that several additional amendments will be submitted—one by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] proposing a commonwealth status. That amendment probably will be in the nature of a substitute; and there may be other amendments which will have to be considered in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield further, I wish to say that I am convinced he has stated his point of view, and that he wishes to speed up action on the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill. Let me say that I shall do everything I can to help him. I believe the greatest service I can perform in aid of the majority leader is to be a little obstinate about the matter.

So, with the right to reserve judgment—which I now reserve—let me say that, as of now, I will not agree to a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate consider the New Mexico senatorial election contest ahead of the taking of the final vote on the Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill. I see no reason to make such a change in the order of consideration, and I believe this is the time to find out whether the Senate will proceed to reach a final determination on the statehood bill—unless a real emergency justifies temporarily lay-

ing aside the further consideration of that bill.

Of course, I can always be overruled by motion, as the Senate has demonstrated many times in the past. But what I have just outlined is the procedure which will have to be followed unless I am to be overruled, although of course I shall always be willing to change my mind if a worthy case is presented. But first I must see the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must say I find myself in a rather difficult position, for some of the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, as the British say, "take a dim view" of evening sessions, and in trying to work out a rather heavy program I am caught between the upper millstone of objection to evening sessions and the nether stone of insistence upon prompt consideration of a particular bill. I also have the responsibility of trying to have the Senate complete its business in time to adjourn by July 31.

I shall try to maintain a sense of honor in endeavoring to meet the desires of various groups of the Senate membership. But, as President Cleveland once said, "We have a condition, not a theory, confronting us." Either I must have some leeway in regard to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business, or we must be able to hold evening sessions, if we are to transact the business of the Senate.

I think it only fair to say to the Senator from Oregon—because I learned long ago that once a commitment is made, one must live up to it, regardless of how difficult that may be—that I feel I have a commitment to Senators on the other side of the aisle to have the Senate take up at an early date, whenever it is agreeable to do so—and I think that certainly means within a week's time—the New Mexico senatorial election contest.

So, Mr. President, in living up to the commitments I have made, I feel that it will be necessary for me to move that the further consideration of the statehood bill be temporarily displaced—much as I should dislike to do so—by, at least, the New Mexico senatorial election contest; and, thereafter, I shall move that the Senate resume consideration of the statehood bill.

I hope we shall not have to take that course, but I believe I must do so because of the commitment I have made. Obviously Senators must be able to rely upon the word of the majority leader.

COOPERATION WITH STATE OF KENTUCKY IN ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL CAVE PROPERTIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 4, after "the" insert "purchase of."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the House amendment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the amendment consists of the addition of two words "purchase of." The amendment does not change in any way the meaning of the original bill. It involves the use of some language which a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs thought was necessary. At least, he was interested in his own verbiage. It does not change the bill one iota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the House amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, unless there are further routine matters, such as requests for insertions in the RECORD, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1956. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Roszel C. Thomsen, of Maryland, to be United States district judge for the district of Maryland, vice W. Calvin Chestnut, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edwin M. Stanley, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina, vice Bryce R. Holt, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

B. Ray Cohoon, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina; vice Fred S. Worthy, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Philip A. Hoghaug, of North Dakota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to the prescribed qualifications:

LINE

John J. Bergen
Leon J. Jacobi
George M. Wauchope

DENTAL CORPS

Charles R. Wells

SUPPLY CORPS

William L. Nelson

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Maurice S. Sheehy

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virgil B. Huff, Brundidge, Ala., in place of J. D. McEachern, deceased.

Claud Russel Robison, Odenville, Ala., in place of J. E. Channell, resigned.

Louie F. Butts, Salem, Ala., in place of M. W. McLain, retired.

ARKANSAS

Jessie C. Brewer, Higginson, Ark., in place of L. L. Walker, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Joseph A. Grabill, Boulder Creek, Calif., in place of H. L. Hartman, deceased.

Harding T. Crandell, Lafayette, Calif., in place of E. S. Schutt, transferred.

Ernest L. Layton, Lower Lake, Calif., in place of W. E. Weiper, deceased.

Albert E. Lacy, Mount Hermon, Calif., in place of D. F. Halls, resigned.

Ernest L. Kincaid, Napa, Calif., in place of G. T. Provine, resigned.

Edward C. Wright, National City, Calif., in place of T. H. Cosby, retired.

Willis R. Jones, Olivehurst, Calif., in place of J. T. Ward, deceased.

Boyce T. True, Pauma Valley, Calif. Office established August 31, 1951.

Lucile A. Ingraham, Rio Dell, Calif., in place of L. A. Parker, deceased.

Marion R. Bessac, Riverbank, Calif., in place of C. D. Golvin, resigned.

Elmer H. Dean, Santa Monica, Calif., in place of P. T. Hill, deceased.

John J. Vizzolini, Westley, Calif., in place of J. A. McConnell, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Ruth L. Lewis, Eastford, Conn., in place of F. W. Latham, deceased.

Louis E. Molinaro, North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., in place of L. P. Despelteau, retired.

FLORIDA

Frederick L. Swain, Anthony, Fla., in place of R. A. Swain, deceased.

Louis Raymond Adair, Davenport, Fla., in place of W. L. Hoag, retired.

Adwell D. Gobler, DeLeon Springs, Fla., in place of J. F. Ritch, removed.

Leland H. Goddard, Key West, Fla., in place of H. R. Bervaldi, retired.

Lenora H. Brown, Mayport, Fla., in place of H. F. Anderson, removed.

Ralph G. Simpson, Nokomis, Fla., in place of E. J. Courtoy, deceased.

Milton E. Knellinger, Palm Harbor, Fla., in place of R. S. Troutman, retired.

GEORGIA

Robert L. Anthony, Shellman, Ga., in place of S. W. Sutton, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Robert A. Hummert, Breese, Ill., in place of E. J. Mahlandt, resigned.

Albert L. Immel, Carthage, Ill., in place of R. A. Brooks, transferred.

John R. Depper, Caseyville, Ill., in place of H. M. Schanuel, resigned.

Edward J. Kleen, Elmwood, Ill., in place of, C. R. Bowers, retired.

Harry A. Lange, Mattoon, Ill., in place of P. W. Poorman, retired.

Alfred G. Waffle, Moline, Ill., in place of C. R. Hesler, deceased.

Kate Wilson, New Haven, Ill., in place of J. W. Bosaw, removed.

Charles R. Callaby, Saunemin, Ill., in place of J. D. Lannon, retired.

Eva V. Freund, Spring Grove, Ill., in place of B. M. Esh, retired.

INDIANA

Lyle J. Fowler, Bloomington, Ind., in place of G. W. Purcell, deceased.

James K. Stanforth, Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of H. T. Ferguson, retired.

Dewayne Hamilton, Morgantown, Ind., in place of O. R. Wells, retired.

Clyde M. Matthews, North Vernon, Ind., in place of J. W. Clerkin, resigned.

IOWA

James M. Pomeroy, Dedham, Iowa, in place of W. H. Meshek, transferred.

Orie L. Jones, Earlham, Iowa, in place of O. J. DeVault, retired.

Clair L. Bowers, Runnells, Iowa, in place of William Bowers, transferred.

Burtis M. Bush, Stacyville, Iowa, in place of J. C. Kinney, retired.

KANSAS

James S. McCormick, Burr Oak, Kans., in place of R. W. Smullins, transferred.

Frederick H. Boyd, Fowler, Kans., in place of M. V. Bohling, transferred.

Wesley V. Joy, Narka, Kans., in place of R. L. Bever, deceased.

Ivan D. Holland, Olathe, Kans., in place of E. R. Marshall, resigned.

Edward J. Spineto, Pittsburg, Kans., in place of R. E. Mangrum, retired.

KENTUCKY

William W. Peavyhouse, Mount Sterling, Ky., in place of G. B. Senff, retired.

MARYLAND

Elwood M. Walls, East New Market, Md., in place of E. R. Twilley, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Everett G. Reed, Bryantville, Mass., in place of H. A. Grant, retired.

Donald M. Stacey, Marblehead, Mass., in place of T. D. Cudihy, retired.

Joseph E. Yelle, Norton, Mass., in place of T. W. Curran, deceased.

Robert H. Hughes, Oak Bluffs, Mass., in place of A. E. Holmes, removed.

Edgard A. Whitcomb II, West Boylston, Mass., in place of R. L. Soule, retired.

MICHIGAN

William A. Munroe, Saginaw, Mich., in place of L. S. Jennings, deceased.

Gerald Howard, Stevensville, Mich., in place of F. C. Miller, retired.

MINNESOTA

Arlie R. Wilder, Amboy, Minn., in place of H. E. Otterstein, removed.

Raymond J. Michelau, Dundee, Minn., in place of G. E. Arens, resigned.

MISSOURI

Roy E. Gregg, Creighton, Mo., in place of R. L. O'Neal, deceased.

Marion L. McBride, Eureka, Mo., in place of L. G. Kidd, transferred.

John W. Jones, Lebanon, Mo., in place of J. H. Easley, retired.

Wilber M. Williams, Lucerne, Mo., in place of O. T. Hughs, transferred.

MONTANA

Willard J. Adams, Bridger, Mont., in place of H. H. Harrison, retired.

Gordon G. Garrick, Outlook, Mont., in place of L. K. C. Roderick, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James Martin Fortier, Center Conway, N. H., in place of L. T. Garland, removed.

NEW JERSEY

John R. Dougherty, Bordentown, N. J., in place of M. L. Dunn, resigned.

Irving Krieger, East Orange, N. J., in place of P. L. Fellinger, retired.

Margaret G. Spencer, Lake Hopatcong, N. J., in place of E. M. Crater, retired.

Allan B. Nixon, Moorestown, N. J., in place of G. M. Gibson, deceased.

Clifford C. Cooper, Navesink, N. J., in place of W. T. Keeshan, deceased.

Frank Elia, Union City, N. J., in place of Arthur Necker, resigned.

George Ekholm, Whitehouse, N. J., in place of G. B. Seals, removed.

NEW YORK

Henry S. Salfi, Accord, N. Y., in place of G. L. Miller, deceased.

James R. Walker, Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of W. H. O'Brien, Jr., removed.

Donald L. Phelps, Burdett, N. Y., in place of C. T. Burnett, transferred.

Paul E. Lunt, Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of A. L. Lyon, retired.

Walter M. Lowerre, Haines Falls, N. Y., in place of H. J. Myer, retired.

Donald R. Harvison, Olean, N. Y., in place of J. J. Shortell, deceased.

Francis X. Hannigan, Ossining, N. Y., in place of T. A. Kenney, deceased.

Henry E. Holley, Otisville, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Zimmerman, deceased.

Alvin R. Bunce, Pavilion, N. Y., in place of T. Q. Quinlan, retired.

Henry A. Glasstetter, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in place of C. I. Lavery, retired.

Jack L. Edleson, Tarrytown, N. Y., in place of J. M. Kelly, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Daniel F. Sawyer, Jr., Blounts Creek, N. C., in place of B. L. Adams, resigned.

Robert Duke Tutterow, Mocksville, N. C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.

William B. Johnson, Salemburg, N. C., in place of L. L. White, retired.

OHIO

Percy H. Friend, Baltic, Ohio, in place of A. P. Hahn, retired.

Gaylord W. Shutt, Convoy, Ohio, in place of O. W. Gray, retired.

Ernest Falb, Copley, Ohio, in place of Ivah Averhill, retired.

Talmage O. Nelson, Crestline, Ohio, in place of F. P. Hayes, retired.

Walter E. Sindel, Delta, Ohio, in place of W. F. White, transferred.

Paul H. Marshall, Marshallville, Ohio, in place of H. D. Zeigler, transferred.

Girden B. Harrington, Peninsula, Ohio, in place of W. P. Bean, removed.

Clair E. Olson, Stow, Ohio., in place of F. G. Wetmore, retired.

OREGON

Conrad Burbank, North Portland, Oreg., in place of H. C. Knapp, retired.

Richard V. Carleson, Rickreall, Oreg., in place of E. B. Rowell, resigned.

John R. Metsger, Sandy, Oreg., in place of R. I. Loundree, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gerald E. Rishel, Boalsburg, Pa., in place of E. A. Murray, retired.

Bernard J. Arnold, Brockport, Pa., in place of Agatha Mullany, retired.

Charles M. Brubaker, Dornsife, Pa., in place of L. E. Latshaw, retired.

Anna E. Lefever, Holtwood, Pa., in place of B. D. Kilburn, retired.

Fred J. Mills, Houtzdale, Pa., in place of J. J. McGrath, resigned.

Dallas L. Darr, Jacobus, Pa., in place of G. I. Zartman, resigned.

George A. McDowell, Jamestown, Pa., in place of B. W. Webb, retired.

Michael B. Krell, Lansford, Pa., in place of W. J. Cannon, deceased.

Marianna W. McClelland, Masontown, Pa., in place of H. G. Provins, retired.

Godfrey G. Drake, Milford, Pa., in place of A. E. Hinkel, transferred.

Russell S. Weiss, Milford Square, Pa., in place of R. C. Weikert, removed.

Doyle H. Brewer, Orangeville, Pa., in place of O. V. Deterick, deceased.

Allen W. Reep, Petrolia, Pa., in place of J. R. Roach, retired.

Lillian M. Mengle, Port Clinton, Pa., in place of N. H. Hafer, resigned.

Harold D. Schildt, Reading, Pa., in place of W. A. Ringler, deceased.

Twila K. Scott, Seneca, Pa., in place of Z. L. Smith, resigned.

Jacob F. Lefever, Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. V. Kingree, Jr., resigned.

Frederick E. Zimmerman, Southampton, Pa., in place of F. M. Severns, retired.

Walter C. Snyder, Swarthmore, Pa., in place of A. P. Smalley, retired.

Charles W. Snyder, Three Springs, Pa., in place of J. C. Hess, resigned.

Charlotte M. Chase, West Springfield, Pa., in place of M. R. Fowler, resigned.

Keith G. Baird, Youngwood, Pa., in place of L. H. Zeilinger, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold O. Ewing, Jr., Turton, S. Dak., in place of V. O. Klapperich, declined.

Marvin W. Wilcox, Volin, S. Dak., in place of B. M. Christenson, transferred.

Clair E. Woodard, White, S. Dak., in place of R. R. Davis, removed.

TENNESSEE

Samuel Shelton Crass, Jr., Oliver Springs, Tenn., in place of J. McD. Ernest, deceased.

TEXAS

Elmer C. Boatler, Big Spring, Tex., in place of Nat Shick, retired.

D. W. Springer, Blooming Grove, Tex., in place of J. R. Griffin, deceased.

Allen A. Keese, Medina, Tex., in place of E. J. Banta, retired.

Joe P. Spalding, Sadler, Tex., in place of E. G. Perry, deceased.

Harry Reast, Whitesboro, Tex., in place of G. W. Hodges, transferred.

UTAH

James Austin Cope, Jr., Spanish Fork, Utah, in place of H. M. Creer, transferred.

VERMONT

William P. Cook, Underhill, Vt., in place of L. F. Lamphere, transferred.

Charles A. O'Brien, White River Junction, Vt., in place of D. P. Healy, retired.

Leon E. Andrus, Wolcott, Vt., in place of O. B. Lafont, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Carroll E. Conner, Elkhorn, Wis., in place of T. B. Morrissy, retired.

Benjamin C. Hoffman, Helenville, Wis., in place of G. W. Rickeman, deceased.

Archie L. Kirby, Humbird, Wis., in place of John Michael, retired.

Mac Marshall, Jr., La Farge, Wis., in place of H. M. Norris, deceased.

Frank W. Ocain, Redgranite, Wis., in place of W. W. Lawrie, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Clyde V. Hickerson, minister, Barton Heights Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee that Thou art the light that never fails, the love that never forgets, and the life that never ends.

We praise Thee for the many manifestations of Thy concern for us as individuals and as a nation. We would be very grateful to Thee for the privilege of being citizens of this land and for the heritage of so many and so great benefits bought at so dear a price by others. May our gratitude be so deep and so sincere that we shall always seek our country's highest welfare above our own personal advancement and partisan interests.

Grant, we beseech Thee, wisdom and guidance to these men and women who stand today in places of high responsibility and public trust—that they have understanding of our deepest needs and to know what we as a nation ought to do. Help us, we pray, to believe that righteousness exalteth a nation and that our true wealth and security rest ultimately not upon the material but upon the moral strength and the spiritual vision of all our people.

Help us this day to do justly, to love kindness and to walk humbly with our God.

In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; and

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5337) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Caroline members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54-9.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

AMENDMENT OF KOREAN GI BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Korean GI bill, Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which would permit an eligible veteran to initiate his course of training by October 15, 1954, or 2 years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the later.

Under the law at the present time the last day on which an eligible veteran can initiate his course is August 20, 1954. This means that veterans who have not yet initiated their course of training and who were discharged on or before August 20, 1952, would not be able to enroll in any school or institution of higher learning because most schools would not be open in August.

My bill simply seeks to correct this situation by permitting the veteran to have until October 15, this year, to begin his training, since by that time all of the schools will have opened their doors for the fall semester.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Training and Education of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am hoping the full committee will report this bill out as soon as possible. I believe that all will agree it is a meritorious measure and should be enacted at the earliest moment.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, before making any remarks, I would like to say that I know my close friend, our stricken colleague, ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan, had planned to speak on this subject today. Having worked in Hungary, he had firsthand experience with its people, and knew well its desire for independence. As many of us here today know, the 15th of March marks a traditional day of celebration for all Hungarians, wherever they may be. On that date in 1848 Hungarian patriots first expressed publicly their determination to win independence. Since that time March 15 has become for Hungarians what the Fourth of July is for us—Independence Day.

Since 1848 the American people have followed with sympathy the Hungarians' fight for independence. They watched with sorrow the subjection of Hungary to foreign tyranny. Today they share the aspirations of all Hungarians for eventual liberation. It is fitting that we should use this occasion as an opportunity to send a message of hope to those now suffering under Soviet tyranny. We admire the bravery and courage of those who are keeping alive their faith in freedom and democracy. We wish these people to know that America will never cease her efforts to win freedom and independence for all peoples.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

FINGERPRINTING BRITONS

A great deal of ire was expressed in Parliament the other day over a requirement of the McCarran-Walter Act that British applicants for visas to the United States be fingerprinted. There were indignant demands for retaliation in kind—opposed by the Foreign Undersecretary on the ground that two wrongs would not make a right. The furor, lacking as it may be in logic, is by no means difficult to understand psychologically.

There is nothing degrading about being fingerprinted. Of itself, it seems no worse than being photographed—a normal form of identification required of Britons, no doubt, as well as of Americans, in numerous situations. Fingerprints are the surest way yet devised of identifying an individual; they are an effective precaution against imposture and as such a protection for honest men.

What irks Englishmen, we suspect, is not fingerprinting of itself but fingerprinting as a symbol of the ugly excesses of the McCarran-Walter Act and of the American preoccupation with internal security. The resentment over this triviality reflects, doubtless, the culmination of a long concern over practices which make this country seem sometimes a mirror image of the totalitarianism against which it is defending itself. We cannot help wondering if the McCarran-Walter Act gives the United States anything like as much in terms of security as it cost the country in terms of foreign respect and regard.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday there appeared the above editorial in the Washington Post—an editorial which was critical of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to fingerprinting. The editorial expresses the indignation of Members of the British Parliament over a provision of the law which, incidentally, has been the law since 1940.

I am not greatly concerned about the feelings of Members of the British Parliament toward steps that we take in protecting ourselves, but I am disturbed because of the number of American newspapers which are now engaged in a deliberate attempt to mislead the American people with respect to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] may be granted official leave of absence for 2 days on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT PRICE ON COTTONSEED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture was before the House Committee on Agriculture last week. He made several rather amazing statements. One in reply to an inquiry of mine about the amount of damage that had been done to farmers because of his action in reducing the support price on cottonseed from 90 percent to 75 percent last year when the price paid to farmers went to the lower level. He disclaimed any knowledge that there had been any protests filed. It seems that either someone is keeping the facts from Mr. Benson or that he is unfamiliar with what is going on in the Department of Agriculture. I know there were numerous protests filed, both before this action was taken and after it was taken.

I was further amazed to find that instead of acknowledging this protest he said he had received commendation from certain industries. It may be that he had received commendation from some manufacturers who took advantage of this great loss to the farmers, because while the support price was reduced causing the price received by the farmer to fall, the price of shortening and the price of salad oils and other manufactured products actually went up.

Now Mr. Speaker, just to refresh our memories, including that of the Secretary, as to what happened last year let us review the record.

First of all, Secretary Benson junked the package plan which worked so well from 1950 through 1952. Now the program is set up to make direct loans to farmers themselves, which, of course, is not practical anywhere in the Cotton Belt except in the arid regions of the Far West. In other words, it is downright ridiculous to even suggest that a farmer store cottonseed on the farm—it just cannot be done.

I have copies of letters in my files addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, carbon copies of which are mailed to Howard Gordon, at that time Administrator of the PMA, who, incidentally, acknowledged the letters of protest relative to both the junking of the package support program and the proposed reduction in support price.

In addition to copies of protests filed by Missouri producers I also have a copy of a telegram from the Agricultural Council of Arkansas to Secretary Benson wherein they expressed their protest in these words:

> This farmer organization, many of whose members are ginners and have interest in cooperative oil mills, urge you support cottonseed at 90 percent of parity and continue the present program of purchasing cottonseed products in one package. Past experience has proven on-the-farm storage impractical and unworkable in this area.

I also feel that someone of Secretary Benson's staff should call his attention to a telegram under date of June 15, 1953, which reads as follows:

> Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
> *Secretary of Agriculture,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Your announced intention to reduce cottonseed price support breaks faith with cotton producer and repudiates President Eisenhower's campaign pledge. Also inconsistent with butter program. Fear trade organizations have undermined farmers' interest.
>
> W. P. HUNTER,
> *President, Missouri Cotton Producers Association, Portageville, Mo.*

During the month of July 1953 there was an interchange of correspondence between Mr. Hilton L. Bracey, executive vice president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, and Mr. M. B. Braswell, Acting Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, which further substantiates the basis of my inquiry to the Secretary last week. Furthermore, I feel certain that Missouri and Arkansas cotton producers were not the only ones who were protesting this unfair discriminatory action of the Secretary of Agriculture, and while, of course, the Secretary should not be held responsible for everything that occurs in the Department of Agriculture, it would seem that one of the several members of his staff by whom he was surrounded during the time that he was testifying before our committee would have reminded the Secretary that numerous protests had been filed and that the Department had every opportunity to know of the great injury which was being inflicted upon the cotton producers of the Nation, causing them losses of many millions of dollars but with no benefit to the consuming public.

ESTABLISH GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY ON LIQUOR IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there is great need in the District of Columbia for additional revenue. I am today introducing a bill to create a whisky monopoly in the District of Columbia and give to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board the exclusive right to operate retail liquor stores.

Last year there were 16 monopoly States in America. In 1952 the profit in those 16 States from the sale of liquor was over $200,000. It is estimated by the Library of Congress that last year the sale of liquor in the District amounted to $75 million. If that be true, a conservative estimate of the profit to be derived from operating retail liquor stores is between $15 and $20 million. In my humble opinion, it is far better to raise money this way rather than by putting a tax on groceries.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and on Wednesday next after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes each on the double taxation theory of the tax bill.

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

There was no objection.

CHANGE NAME OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress today is quite concerned about procedures in Government. I offer as a suggestion for possible adoption by the House a change in the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Activities Against the United States.

We are a legal body. The word "American" is a cultural, geographic, continental concept. We get it from Amerigo Vespucci — 1452–1512 — an expert in calculations on latitude and longitude, a skilled map draftsman.

Many things make up the word "American," but there is one concept, a legal concept, that makes up the United States, and that is "Equal Justice Under Law."

I respectfully suggest to the Congress that it consider seriously using the title "Activities against the United States," instead of "Un-American Activities."

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we were assured by the administration that come this March prosperity would be on its way back. We have been

patient as we were once before when we were told prosperity was just around the corner. But now, Mr. Speaker, the Ides of March have come. It is time to look around that we may know how fares it with our beloved country. In Chicago, Alvin E. Rose, the city's welfare commissioner, has just told an unemployment conference that he will be compelled to call upon the Governor of Illinois to summon the State legislature into emergency session if the relief load continues to grow. Representatives of 250,000 Chicago workers passed resolutions urging a moratorium on installment payments and other debts for persons unemployed through no fault of their own.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

AMERICA FIRSTERS, OR THE ISOLATIONISTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the friends of the U. N. and the one-world government advocates will take notice of what the Vice President told us Saturday night.

Time was, not so long ago, when Gen. Robert E. Wood, head of that organization of patriotic Americans who were then insisting that a President and the Congress were in duty bound, in considering not only a domestic but a foreign policy, to give first consideration to the welfare of our people and the security of our Republic.

The officers of that organization, its members, and all who agreed with them were abused and vilified by certain internationalists and advocates of a one-world organization.

Not only were those who then thought, and who then were insisting, that the duty of a citizen and of a legislator was to first serve the interest of his country, charged with lacking in charity, in kindliness, in consideration for other people, and other nations, but it seemed impossible for the one-worlders to find language abusive enough to, in their opinion, properly describe those who advocated a free and independent Republic.

Benjamin Franklin once said that experience was a dear school, but that fools would learn at no other. Certainly those who opposed the America Firsters were not fools. Assuredly they were not dumb. In the main, they were exceptionally well educated, at least in the higher branches of learning.

Some were extremely wealthy, many possessed exceptionally great political power, and some held high positions in the Government. They assumed to speak for all, and questioning their judgment, the conclusions which they appeared to entertain, in the opinion of at least many editors and columnists, was heresy.

But from bitter experience a lesson has apparently been learned.

Billions of dollars have been spent, hundreds of thousands—yes; a million or more men have been wounded or killed in the well-concealed effort to force us into some form of a world organization where our independence would be lost, the welfare and freedom of our people destroyed.

It has been said, "All things come round to him who will but wait."

To some of us, the Saturday night talk of our Vice President was an assertion of the unsoundness of not only the domestic but of the foreign policy of the last two administrations.

After consultation with the President, and evidently with his approval, the Vice President, among other things, told us that our previous foreign policy of falling into the trap of becoming involved in every dispute anywhere in the world a dispute might arise, even to the extent of sending our men to fight thousands of miles from home, was not only unsound but inevitably would, if continued, ruin us.

That is no more, that is no less, than the doctrine for which the America Firsters contended, for which they were misused and abused, yes; and some of them hauled into court by persecuting officials of a previous administration.

But listen again to the words of our Vice President, as he gave us the President's and his own outline of our future foreign policy:

> And in determining what that policy should be we decided to find what the men in the Kremlin were up to. We found that militarily their plan apparently was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites, however, where they themselves were not involved, and where due to our inability to bring to bear our great superiority on the sea, in the air, that we were unable to win those wars.
>
> We found that economically, their plan apparently was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth to be prepared to fight anywhere, anywhere in the world that they, the men in the Kremlin, chose.
>
> Why, because they knew that this would force us into bankruptcy, that we would destroy our freedom in an attempt to defend it.
>
> REFUSE TO BE TRAPPED
>
> Well, we decided that we would not fall into these traps, and so we adopted a new principle, and that new principle summed up is this:
>
> Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely in the future primarily on our massive mobile retaliatory power which we could use in our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose.
>
> We adjusted our armed strength to meet the requirements of this new concept, and what was just as important, we let the world and we let the Communists know what we intended to do.

If that statement means anything at all, boiled down to one sentence, it means this: That we will not be trapped into disputes or wars wherever over the world they may occur, unless we are ourselves vitally interested; that, if an aggressor attacks us, we will hit him with all our power where it will hurt him the most.

The thought thus expressed is what the America Firsters intended to say, what they said, and it was the course of action they advocated. The policy outlined Saturday night by the Vice President was the policy long ago announced by the America Firsters; it was the policy that was given support by General MacArthur, when he told us in substance that it was useless to engage in war unless the purpose was to win.

It was apparently the thought behind the statement of Herbert Hoover when he advised that we could not with safety fight everywhere in the world that the Kremlin might induce a satellite to aggravate us. That, as everyone knew, we should confine our line of national defense to an area which we could supply and maintain.

So permit me to say to the One Worlders and to the advocates of U. N. that it is time that even they begin to think of the welfare of our people, of the security of our Republic; of a foreign policy which will enable us to care for and protect our own, rather than of a policy impossible of implementation; a policy which if followed will ultimately destroy us.

It is time that this administration, knowing as it does that no other first-class power conscripts its men to fight in foreign lands, quit drafting the youth of America in an effort to settle disputes of other nations.

The warmongers, the profiteers, the seekers after war profits, or "fool's gold," as Franklin Delano Roosevelt called it, should be given notice by the people of our country that no longer will they furnish cannon fodder in an effort to estab- a one-world government.

FRANCOISE BRESNAHAN

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 752) for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Line 7, after "fee.", insert "The Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation and warrant of deportation in the case of said Francoise Bresnahan, and is further directed hereafter not to exclude or deport her from the United States by reason of any of the facts constituting ground for deportation as set forth in such outstanding order or warrant of deportation."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEROSLAV, BOZENA, YVONKA, AND JARKA ONDRICEK

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Jeroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, strike out "four" and insert "the required numbers."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

PAY CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS QUARTERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

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

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

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

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

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

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

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

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMEND ACT OF FEBRUARY 15, 1923

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

There was no objection.

ADVISABILITY OF A NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

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

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

There was no objection.

ACQUIRE PROPERTIES WITHIN MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the State of Kentucky for the purpose of arranging for the eventual acquisition by the United States of the Great Onyx Cave and the Crystal Cave within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park. The Secretary shall deposit to the credit of a special receipt account that portion of the annual admission, guide, and elevator fee receipts from the said park which exceeds the annual amount available to the park for management, guide, and protection purposes, which funds so deposited may be expended thereafter in payment for the said cave properties. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into such contracts and agreements as he may determine to be necessary to effectuate the acquisition of the cave properties as authorized herein.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "the", insert "purchase of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXTEND TIME FOR ENROLLMENT OF INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2974) to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, within 6 months after the approval of this act, is authorized and directed to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California the names of Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), the act approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), or by the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), provided he shall find such persons to be descendants of an enrollee on the revised roll approved November 24, 1951, and that such applicants were living on May 24, 1950.

SEC. 2. The amount due any enrollee living on May 24, 1950, who may have died intestate since that date, shall be paid to the surviving spouse provided such person is a descendant of an enrolled Indian of California. If neither spouse is living, the amount shall be paid to the children of the deceased enrollee. If no children exist, the amount due shall be paid to the father and mother, or the surviving parent. If the parents are deceased the amount shall be divided equally between the brothers and sisters of such deceased enrollee.

SEC. 3. Any amount not claimed by an enrollee or beneficiaries herein named within 2 years after the approval of this act shall revert to and be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, and thereafter be subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of the Indians of California: *Provided*, That any amount due an enrollee who may have left a last will and testament, the amount due such person shall be paid as provided by the will.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress within 60 days after the approval of this act, a full and complete report of funds used and the purposes accomplished to carry out the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), and shall include an alphabetical list of the Indians of California whose names appear on the approved revised rolls, giving the name, address, and date of birth of each such enrollee, together with such other factual information, if any, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem advisable as tending

to identify each enrollee, and 3,000 copies of each report shall be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That section 7 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended by the act of April 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 259), the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), and the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), is hereby further amended by deleting the words 'six months' in the penultimate sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'until June 30, 1955,'.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress on or before August 31, 1955, a full and complete report of funds used and the purposes accomplished to carry out the provisions of this act and the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), and the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time for enrollment of the Indians of California, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTEND EMERGENCY AUTHORITY ON FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6318) to amend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101, 77th Congress, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5183) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMIT FLYING OF UNITED STATES FLAG IN FLAG HOUSE SQUARE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2111) to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any rule or customs pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended, authority is hereby conferred on the appropriate officer of the State of Maryland to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Albemarle and Pratt Streets, Baltimore, Md.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of section 3 of the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, as amended, authority is also conferred on the appropriate officer of the State of Maryland to permit the flying of a replica of the flag of the United States which was in use during the War of 1812 for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Albemarle and Pratt Streets, Baltimore, Md.

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.

EXCESS-LAND PROVISIONS SHALL NOT APPLY TO OWL CREEK UNIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4721) to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project, authorized in section 9 (a) of Public Law 534, 78th Congress, approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

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

SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF OFFICIALS OF THE FORT PECK TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6154) to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribe.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or such official as may be designated by him, is hereby authorized, until otherwise directed by Congress, to advance to the tribe or to pay out of any unobligated tribal funds of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States salaries and expenses of tribal officials or representatives at rates and/or limitations designated in advance by the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the length of stay of representatives serving the tribe at the seat of government shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The act of July 1, 1947, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "tribe" and insert "tribes."

Page 1, line 10, after "Interior", insert "and to advance to the tribes or to expend tribal funds for such other purposes as may be designated by the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "tribe" and insert "tribes."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "July 1, 1947" and insert "April 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 203)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBES OF FORT BELKNAP TO ACQUIRE INTERESTS IN TRIBAL LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4481) to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assinniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Fort Belknap Community Council of the Gros Ventre and Assinniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., is hereby authorized to dispose of tribal lands within the boundaries of such reservation to any enrolled member of the Gros Ventre or Assinniboine Tribes upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Title to any land conveyed under this act may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian owner.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the period, strike out "Title to any land conveyed under this act may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian owner." and insert "A fee patent to land conveyed under this act shall be issued to the individual Indian owner, except where the Secretary finds such owner is incompetent. In the case of any such exception, title to any land conveyed under this act to an incompetent individual Indian owner may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for such owner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RULES FOR PRACTICE IN COURTS OF APPEALS FOR REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF TAX COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1067) to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code be amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, as follows:

"§ 2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

"The Supreme Court may prescribe, and from time to time amend, uniform rules for filing petitions, preparation of records, and

the practice, forms, and procedure, in the United States Court of Appeals in proceedings for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

"Such rules shall neither abridge nor enlarge the substantive rights of any litigant.

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the 1st day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

SEC. 2. The chapter analysis of chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code immediately preceding section 2071 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "procedure", insert "except as to qualification for admission to practice."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8045) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 489) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Connecticut all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Windsor Locks, Conn., together with all buildings, improvements therein, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately fifty-eight and six hundred eighty-five one-thousandths acres and fomerly designated as the Post Engineer Area of Bradley Field, as shown on maps on file with the Office of the Chief of Engineers:

PARCEL ONE

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route No. 75 and the northern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence north along the east line of Connecticut Route No. 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of sixty feet more or less; thence north fifty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of five hundred and eighty-eight feet more or less; thence north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of four hundred seventy-three feet more or less; thence north seventy-eight degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of three hundred and forty feet more or less; thence south sixty-six degrees twenty-five minutes east, a distance of two hundred and sixty-two feet more or less; thence south seventeen degrees forty-five minutes east, a distance of seventy-seven feet more or less to the northerly boundary of the fifty-foot right-of-way of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence along the northern boundary of such railroad spur, south seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes west, a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-five feet more or less, to the point of beginning.

PARCEL TWO

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route No. 75 and the southern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence easterly along the southerly right-of-way line of such spur track, north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of two thousand six hundred and thirty-five feet more or less; thence south seventy-one degrees thirteen minutes east, a distance of one hundred eighty-three and five-tenths feet more or less; thence south eighteen degrees nine minutes west, a distance of one thousand three hundred and ninety-five one-hundredths feet more or less; thence north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and seventy-nine feet more or less; thence south twenty degrees ten minutes west, a distance of five hundred seventy-six and twenty-four one-hundredths feet more or less, to the northerly line of highway Connecticut Route No. 76; thence westerly, along the northerly line of Connecticut Route No. 76, north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and thirty-six feet more or less; thence north twelve degrees no minutes east; a distance of seven hundred and fifteen feet more or less; thence north eighty-five degrees no minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and five feet more or less to the easterly line of highway Connecticut Route No. 75, thence north along the easterly line of Connecticut Route No. 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of thirty feet more or less to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Connecticut shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Connecticut during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Connecticut, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus six months such property shall revert to the State of Connecticut.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 8045) was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT UNION NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1005) to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to preserve and protect, in the public interest, the historic Old Fort Union, situated in the county of Mora, State of New Mexico, and to provide adequate public access thereto, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by donation, or he may procure with donated funds, the site and remaining structures of Old Fort Union, together with such additional land, interests in land, and improvements thereon as the Secretary in his discretion may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. Upon a determination of the Secretary of the Interior that sufficient land and other property have been acquired by the United States for national-monument purposes, as provided in section 1 of this act, such property shall be established as the "Fort Union National Monument" and thereafter shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to national monuments. An order to the Secretary, constituting notice of such establishment, shall be published in the Federal Register.

Following establishment of the national monument, additional properties may be acquired as provided in section 1 hereof, which properties, upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States, shall become a part of the national monument: *Provided*, That the total area of the national monument established pursuant to this act shall not exceed 1,000 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "act.", insert "Donated lands may be accepted subject to such reservations, terms, and conditions as may be satisfactory to the Secretary, including right of reversion to donor, or its successors and assigns, upon abandonment as a national monument, and reservation of mineral rights subject to condition that surface of donated lands may not be used or disturbed in connection therewith, without the consent of the Secretary."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "acres", insert "exclusive of such adjoining lands as may be covered by scenic easements."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

LAKE OF THE WOODS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluc-

tuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EDEN PROJECT, WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7057) to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assure the most beneficial application of the available water supply to lands within the Eden project, Wyoming, established pursuant to the provisions of the item entitled "Water Conservation and Utility Projects" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), as amended, including the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277), and to facilitate land settlement and land use:

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and when the public interest will be benefited thereby—

(1) to exchange public lands in the State of Wyoming, within or without the boundaries of the project, for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the exterior boundaries of the project which are adaptable for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities;

(2) upon concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture public lands within the exterior boundaries of the project which are suitable for development and settlement; and

(3) for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of lands in the project, upon concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, to exchange public lands in the State of Wyoming, within or without the boundaries of the project, for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the exterior boundaries of the project which are suitable for development and, upon consummation of such exchange, the lands received in exchange shall thereupon become a part of the project and subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) when in his judgment the public interests will be benefited thereby, to exchange lands under his jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of the project for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the boundaries of the project which he finds are suitable for project development and settlement; and

(2) upon concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior lands or interests in lands which are adaptable for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities, or are unsuited for incorporation into farm units and are surplus to the needs of the project.

(c) (1) The lands transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of section (a) (2) and received in exchange under the provisions of sections (a) (3) and (b) (1) shall be developed, settled, disposed of and otherwise administered in the same manner as acquired project lands; and (2) the lands transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of section (b) (2) shall be administered under the public land laws, excepting lands transferred for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities which, together with the lands received in exchange under the provisions of section (a) (1), shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in all respects the same as other project lands under his jurisdiction.

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

FACILITATING ENTRY OF PHILIPPINE TRADERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8092) to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon a basis of reciprocity secured by agreement entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines, a national of the Philippines, and the spouse and children of any such national if accompanying or following to join him, shall, if otherwise eligible for a visa and if otherwise admissible into the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163), be issued a visa and admitted into the United States under the provisions of section 101 (a) (15) (E) of said act if entering solely for the purposes specified in subsection (i) or (ii) of said section.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill — to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders—introduced at the request of the Secretary of State, places American businessmen in the Philippines and Philippine businessmen in the United States in the status normally enjoyed by so-called treaty traders.

The need for this legislation arose from the fact that in order to confer the status of treaty traders on foreign nationals in the United States, there must be a treaty of commerce and navigation in existence.

Our treaty with the Philippines has expired and a new treaty is being negotiated right now. In the meantime, however, business must go on, and it would be highly undesirable if our businessmen would have to leave the Philippines and the Philippine businessmen would have to go home during these negotiations.

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 3, 1954.

The Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: With reference to bill H. R. 8092, to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders, introduced in the House of Representatives on February 25, 1954, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as being in full accord with the provisions of this bill. We feel its early passage would materially improve United States-Philippines relations. On the other hand, delay in the passage of this bill may result in some eventuality which may impair the friendly relations which have for so long existed between the two countries. We, therefore, urgently recommend that prompt and favorable consideration be given this bill by your committee.

May we inform you that the chamber has had under consideration for many months the views of its members concerning any modification in the present provisions of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 and the agreement on trade and related matters between the United States and the Philippines which was entered into pursuant to that act. Our views were submitted, by letter, on December 29, 1953, to the Chairman of the Interdepartmental Philippine Trade Agreement Committee, Department of State, Washington, D. C., and incorporated in the annual report of our board of directors which was submitted to all members last January. The following is an extract from the aforementioned letter:

"(6) Immigration: Concerning the entry of Americans into the Philippines and Filipinos into the United States, we feel that an arrangement similar to the one contained in the trade agreement should be provided for in a revision of the Trade Act. We strongly support any legislation by our Congress whereby Filipinos will have treaty merchant status; any revision of the Trade Act should be reciprocal for Americans in the Philippines, such provisions to remain in effect for the duration of the Trade Act, as amended."

For your information and guidance, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce was incorporated in the State of New York on March 18, 1920, to foster and promote trade, commerce, mutual welfare, and other business relations between the United States and the Philippines, and their respective peoples, and to serve those persons and organizations havings financial, trade, business, and professional interests in either or both countries.

A list of the officers and directors of the chamber is attached.

Very truly yours,

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
W. E. MURRAY, *President.*

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC., 1954

Officers

W. E. Murray, president; H. A. Magnuson, vice president; George Hampton, vice president; H. H. Herts, vice president; F. M. Satterfield, treasurer; Col. John F. Daye, secretary.

Directors

(Term expires annual meeting January 1955)

A. K. Aurell, vice president, Singer Sewing Machine Co.; Henry P. Byrd, area manager Philippine division, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.; J. H. Foley, executive vice president, Ansor Corp.; H. A. Magnuson, executive vice president, Connell Brothers Co., Ltd.; F. M. Satterfield, assistant vice president, the National City Bank of New York; M. D. Thompson, chairman executive committee, Insular Lumber Co.

(Term expires annual meeting January 1956)

A. A. Alexander, vice president, American President Lines, Ltd.; Wm. Knight, Hanson & Orth; J. J. McCabe, president, Ledward, Bibby & Co., Inc.; T. H. Mitchell, president, RCA Communications, Inc.; W. E. Murray, manager, Central Asiatic area, California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.; H. W. Taylor, vice president, Centennial Flouring Mills Co.

(Term expires annual meeting January 1957)

K. J. Brown, vice president and secretary, American International Underwriters Corp.; Geo. Hampton, vice president, General Foods Corp.; H. H. Herts, president, Dayton, Price & Co., Ltd.; M. J. Ossorio, Victorias Milling Co.,

Inc.; L. D. Seymour, president, L. D. Seymour & Co., Inc.; L. W. Wirth, vice president, Neuss, Hesslein & Co., Inc.

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

SPECIAL PRAYERS ON APRIL 18

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) requesting churches and synagogues to give special prayers on Easter Sunday for those denied freedom to worship behind the Iron Curtain.

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

Whereas our country has, from its beginning, been inspired by God and its citizens throughout its history have sought His divine guidance; and

Whereas the dictatorship of communism is based upon atheism and directed toward the complete destruction of all religious worship; and

Whereas this atheistic dictatorship has subjected religious leaders and their congregations to barbaric persecutions such as the world has not seen for nearly 2,000 years, as exemplified in Hungary by the torture of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass, in Poland by the incarceration of Cardinal Wyszynski, in Yugoslavia by the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, in Bulgaria by the oppression of Protestant ministers, and by the persecution of Jews throughout the area dominated by communism; and

Whereas millions of worshipers behind the Iron Curtain are prevented by force and violence from the free exercise of their religious beliefs and rituals: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress reverently requests the churches and synagogues of America to set aside a portion of their services on Easter Sunday and on the first day of Passover in 1954, both of which fall on April 18, for special prayers for the deliverance of all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom to worship in their own fashion.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Congress", strike out "reverently requests" and insert "respectfully suggests that."

Line 4, strike out the word "to."

Line 8, after the word "own", strike out the word "fashion" and insert the word "way."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution requesting American churches and synagogues to give special prayers on April 18 (Easter and the Passover) for deliverance of those behind the Iron Curtain."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8193) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not the purpose of this bill to reunite the families of people who are living in this country but have relatives abroad? When the Relief Act was passed, there was a certain number designated as refugees. The demand for those to come is much smaller than the numbers needed to reunite families and the 7-month period of operation demonstrates the need for a larger number; is that correct, and is it the intention that all laws and regulations pertaining to immigration are applicable to the Refugee Relief Act and to this amendment?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. It will not increase overall the number of people admitted?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will not.

Mr. WALTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Under the bill it is provided to legalize the entry of those persons brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment. The report seems to limit those to Japanese brought from Peru.

I should like to ask the chairman if it is the intent of the bill to include persons of any origin brought from all American Republics for internment or for the convenience of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in the law which would confine this to Japanese nationals. It applies to anyone brought into the United States for internment from any other country.

Mr. KILDAY. From all the American Republics?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (c) be added to section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 401), to read as follows:

"(c) Any allotments of visas provided in paragraphs (5) and (6), paragraphs (7) and (8), and paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) of this section, shall be available bilaterally within each of the three ethnic groups therein defined."

SEC. 2. Subdivision (c) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 403) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The assurances required in this section shall be in lieu of the assurances required in section 7 of this act, and the provisions of section 7 (d) (2) shall not apply to eligible orphans as defined in this section."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 403) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Any alien who establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and that he is unable to return to the country of his birth, nationality, and last residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or who was brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment, may, not later than June 30, 1955, apply to the Attorney General of the United States for an adjustment of his immigration status."

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

STATISTICS OF REDCEDAR SHINGLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2348) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles."

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles," approved May 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 204, 205) be, and it is hereby, repealed.

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.

RIGHTS OF PRIORITY OF NATIONALS OF JAPAN AND CERTAIN NATIONALS OF GERMANY AS TO APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6280) to extend temporarily the rights of priority of nationals of Japan and certain nationals of Germany with respect to applications for patents.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the rights of priority specified in section 1 of Public Law 690, 79th Congress, approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 940), which arose before April 1, 1950, are hereby extended, with respect to inventions made subsequent to January 1, 1946, in favor of nationals of Japan, and of nationals of Germany, excluding persons residing in or subject to the jurisdiction of the zone of Germany occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Soviet sector of Berlin or other areas of Germany under Soviet or Polish administration, to a date 9 months after the enactment of this act, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 4, 10, 12, and 15 of said Public Law 690.

For the purpose of this act, the phrase "passage of this act" in said Public Law 690 shall be understood to refer to the date of enactment of the present act.

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

BOUNDARY AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALABAMA AND FLORIDA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 347) giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Alabama and the State of Florida establishing a boundary between such States.

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

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Alabama passed an act designated as act No. 440, Senate bill numbered 231, which was approved by the Governor of such State on August 28, 1953; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida passed an act designated as chapter 28141, Senate bill No. 1155, which was approved by the Governor of such State on June 12, 1953; and

Whereas such acts both provided in substance that upon ratification, confirmation, and adoption of such acts by the Congress of the United States, the boundary between

such States at the mouth of the Perdido River, and adjacent thereto, should be as follows:

The middle of the Perdido River at its mouth, as defined by the Constitutions of the States of Alabama and Florida, is at latitude thirty degrees sixteen minutes fifty-three seconds north and longitude eighty-seven degrees thirty-one minutes six seconds west as the control point;

That the boundary line at the mouth of Perdido River is fixed, as nearly as may be, in the axis of the mouth of said river, passing through the control point and running north and south and having as its northern terminus a point of latitude thirty degrees seventeen minutes two seconds north and longitude eighty-seven degrees thirty-one minutes six seconds west, and as its southern terminus a point one thousand feet due south of the control point;

That from the northern terminus of the boundary line at the mouth of the river, the boundary up the lower portion of said river be a straight line to a point of latitude thirty degrees eighteen minutes no seconds north, longitude eighty-seven degrees twenty-seven minutes eight seconds west, thence by a straight line to a point in the center line of the Intracoastal Canal at longitude eighty-seven degrees twenty-seven minutes no seconds west;

That the seaward boundary between Florida and Alabama extends from the south end of the boundary line at the mouth of Perdido River, thence south no degrees one minute no seconds west to the seaward limit of each respective State; and

Whereas such acts of the States of Alabama and Florida constitute an agreement between such States establishing a boundary line between them: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary, and such acts of the States of Alabama and Florida are hereby approved.

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

VETERANS DAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7786) to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making the 11th day of November in each year a legal holiday," approved May 13, 1938 (52 Stat. 351; 5 U. S. C., sec. 87a), is hereby amended by striking out the word "Armistice" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Veterans."

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

Mr. REES of Kansas, 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the action of the House in approving H. R. 7786 because I know that it will meet with universal approval by veterans, veterans organizations, and the public generally. I may say that before I introduced this legislation I consulted with the representatives of veterans organizations. As indicated by the report of our House Committee on the Judiciary, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans all took official action approving this bill and urging its adoption.

I should also like at this time to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, and to the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, before which I appeared and presented the need for passing this legislation.

This legislation will change the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day. I have long felt that the national holiday which we celebrate on November 11 of each year has lost its original significance. It was originally dedicated to the cause of world peace, and was intended to honor the veterans of World War I. The date November 11 was, of course, chosen to commemorate the close of that First World War.

The United States has now been involved in many great military efforts, and each has produced its number of veterans. We all realize that it would not be feasible to establish a national holiday to commemorate the closing of each war. This legislation does not establish a new holiday. Rather, it expands an existing holiday so that we may honor all veterans at the same time.

I sincerely trust that the other body, following the action we have taken here today, will approve this legislation at an early date in order that appropriate plans may be made for the first national celebration of Veterans Day in 1954.

Mr. SADLAK. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7786, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, my friend [Mr. REES], has much appeal to veterans of my district and apparently to veterans everywhere. This expression of opinion of war veterans is exemplified in the newspaper article that appeared in the Evening News, published at Harrisburg, Pa., on November 12, 1953, expressing the views of veterans in that area to setting aside one day to celebrate the ending of all United States wars.

H. R. 7786, and an identical bill introduced by me, H. R. 8299, provides that the 11th day of November of each year, now known as Armistice Day, be dedicated to world peace honoring all veterans. Aside from this one day, sentiment in the above-mentioned article, as well as sentiment among my own comrades in the veteran posts of which I am a member, favors May 30 as a tribute to the hero dead. A constituent of mine, who also is a very good friend and who had served as a paratrooper in World War II, brought the desirability of such an observance to my attention following a small turnout at a recent Armistice Day parade; this convinced him that one day should be designated as a celebration of all of our war endings, including the more recent conclusions known as V-E Day, V-J Day, and V-K Day, meaning of course, victories in Europe, Japan, and Korea. This distinguished soldier to whom I have reference is Lt. Joseph Snecinski, of Hartford, recent zone 1 commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, and like myself is a member of Post No. 51, PLAV. Zone 1 includes the State of New York and the New England States. H. R. 7786 has, I feel, the complete support of the Members of the House of Representatives, and I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and include herein the fine article that was written by C. William Britsch:

SENTIMENT RISES FOR SETTING ONE DAY TO CELEBRATE END OF ALL UNITED STATES WARS

(By C. William Britsch)

Is Armistice Day losing its significance?

Are V-E Day, V-J Day, and other war anniversaries, generally observed on Memorial Day, crowding Armistice Day into oblivion?

World War I and World War II veterans prominent in servicemen's activities disagree whether observance of the anniversary of World War I's end is waning.

MERGED OBSERVANCES FAVORED

But a majority of those interrogated feel that one day should be set aside for celebration of the end of all wars in which the United States has participated.

And a majority felt, further, that the end of all United States wars should be celebrated on Armistice Day by a display of our military might, with Memorial Day retained exclusively for paying tribute to the war dead.

This opinion was shared by Luther G. Smith, State commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and president of the Pennsylvania Joint Veterans' Council.

"November 11—Armistice Day—is an established date and should be designated a national holiday by Congress to celebrate the end of World War II and all United States wars as well as the end of World War I," Smith said.

OPPOSES MIXED OBSERVANCES

"Instead of mixing the observance with memorial services and similar ceremonies, it should be celebrated by a gigantic display of America's armed might. Memorial Day should be retained for the purpose its name signifies—to honor our men and women who lost their lives in the service of our country in all our wars."

The Purple Heart commander added that he favored retaining the little known observance of August 8, anniversary of the founding of the Purple Heart by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., in 1782, to honor those men who were wounded—the living wounded—in all United States wars.

Frank Crispino, commander of Pvt. Earl E. Aurand Post 1086, Veterans of Foreign Wars, likewise favors the Armistice Day date for an armed might celebration of the end of all United States wars and Memorial Day for tribute to the memory of all war dead.

DIMINISHED OBSERVANCE

"Armistice Day has lost is popularity and will continue to diminish in importance unless it is set aside for the one big celebration of the end of all our wars," Crispino said. "Veterans' groups should get behind the idea of a single celebration of the end of all our wars on Armistice Day with emphasis on keeping the Memorial Day observance just that, but for the dead of all wars."

Brig. Gen. A. H. Stackpole, who will become commanding general of the 79th Infantry Division, United States Army Reserve,

January 1, did not agree that Armistice Day is losing its identity.

"Very little, it seems to me, despite the dates of later wars' end," he replied in answer to the question. "Until Congress decides that there shall be one day devoted to observing the end of all wars in which our country fought, November 11 will be observed with pride and proper remembrance."

Lloyd C. Pike, past State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, expressed an opposite view. He said: "Definitely it has lost much of its identity."

"Armistice Day never was celebrated as it should have been; it's not even a business holiday generally," he added. "Fewer persons are participating each year. World War I and all other United States wars' end should certainly be celebrated on one day if justice is to be done to those we desire to honor."

"We should devote as much attention to the Armistice Day of World War II as that of World War I," said Lt. Spero W. Calos, adjutant of Detachment 8, 2021st Army Service Unit, stationed at the local Army and Air Force recruiting station.

"Living in a day of merging and consolidation," he said, "I would favor one day for the celebration of the end of all our wars. I have noticed that the Armistice Day celebration is waning."

"I don't think Armistice Day is losing its identity, because it's being celebrated today as it always has been in the United States and France," Frank Heidel, State adjutant of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, said.

"But I do feel that Armistice Day should be designated officially for celebration of the cessation of hostilities of all our wars with an Armed Forces demonstration. To make it the success it should be we should dispense with other similar celebrations.

"And Memorial Day, which is primarily to honor the dead of the Civil War, should be extended by legislation to include honoring the dead of all our wars."

FAVORS AUGUST 14 PROGRAM

Oscar N. Tingley, immediate past commander of Post 27, American Legion, last August advocated designation of August 14—V–J Day—"as a sort of 'National Preparedness Day' to bring the Armed Forces Day or National Defense Day, and a few others of similar character into one special observance that would show us to the world in bright, mighty light."

"Instead of an outright memorial—a period of regret and remorse, or solemnity and ceremonials—it is highly possible that the thousands of young men who never came back would want something to show the might of their Nation to the rest of the world so that any possible aggressor of the future would think twice before starting something that would take additional lives from our land," he continued.

J. Hugh McNeill, commander of Post 27, American Legion, said he plans to advocate for Harrisburg a 1-day celebration of the end of all United States wars because he believes the popularity of Armistice Day is declining.

"The Armistice Day parade idea is losing its appeal," he said. "People are not turning out to watch the parades as they did prior to World War II. And the older veterans have reached a point where they don't care to march and the younger ones won't march. As a result the Armistice Day parade amounts to nothing much more than a procession of National Guard and Reserve units and paid bands.

"I'd favor elimination of the Armistice Day parade next year because even those men left who still are willing to parade cannot get away from work and cannot afford to take the day off. I favor one day for a celebration of the end of all our wars and this should be a demonstration of our military might."

WANT EQUAL RECOGNITION

In increasing numbers those who fought in World War II are clamoring for equal recognition of V–J Day.

Likewise, some veterans of European fighting in World War II feel that its end—V–E Day—should be observed with a separate and fitting celebration.

Eventually these demands by veterans' organizations, many feel, will lead to separate celebrations with parades and other ceremonies detracting from Armistice Day's importance unless the 1-day celebration is adopted.

Some legal or public holidays, such as Independence Day, Memorial Day, and Armistice Day, are taken for granted by Americans as national holidays.

Actually there are no national holidays in the United States. The President and Congress designate legal or public holidays only for the District of Columbia and Federal employees.

SINGLE INSTANCE NOTED

The only instance of Congress declaring a national holiday throughout the United States appears to be in an act of March 2, 1889, which used the expression with reference to April 30, 1889, the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

Each State sets its own holidays by legislative enactment or executive proclamations. Usually the individual States have followed Federal designation of legal holidays.

An outstanding conflict followed President Franklin D. Roosevelt's designation of a different day from the traditional fourth Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day. He moved it ahead 1 week but many States ignored his proclamation.

Whether Armistice Day is losing, or will lose, its prominence seems to depend upon action of the veterans themselves.

EXCHANGE OF LAND BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1548) to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the land identified in section 2 hereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real estate briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

(a) A strip of land alongside of Munoz Rivera Avenue, San Juan, and east of Army medical building, containing four and eight-tenths acres; the site of the San Sebastian Guardhouse at 205 Sol Street, San Juan, containing five one-hundredths acre; old walls around La Fortaliza containing sixty-six one-hundredths acre; driveway to Insular Department Justice containing eleven one-hundredths acre, and all shown in detail on drawing numbered 15–02–142, dated August 15, 1951, entitled Fort Brooke Military Reservation.

(b) Punta Las Marias Military Reservation, comprising eighty-seven one-hundredths acre, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–150, dated November 24, 1948, entitled Punta Las Marias SL and FC Site.

(c) Punta Cangrejos (Battery Lancaster) Military Reservation, comprising fifteen and eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–114, dated November 10, 1948, entitled Battery Lancaster (No. 264) Military Reservation.

(d) Punta Maldonado Military Reservation, comprising one acre, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–151, entitled Punta Maldonado SL and FC Site.

(e) Mata Redonda Military Reservation, comprising ninety-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and one and eighty-one one-hundredths acres of roadway easements, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–155, dated December 3, 1948, entitled Mata Redonda Gun Emplacement Site.

(f) Point Lima Military Reservation, comprising one-hundred thirty-five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and nine acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–152, dated November 24, 1948, entitled Point Lima Gun Emplacement Site.

(g) Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation, comprising nine hundred six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 48–01–160, entitled Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation.

(h) Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation, comprising seven and five one-hundredths acres and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–160, dated August 17, 1949, entitled Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation.

(i) Tract 16 of Salinas Maneuver Site, comprising three hundred sixty-nine and ninety-eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 18–01–126, dated November 1, 1948, entitled Salinas Maneuver Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accept from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without cost to the United States, a conveyance by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the lands briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

Area numbered 1 comprising about one thousand and four hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the upper one-half of the east boundary of the existing Salinas Maneuver Site and area numbered 2 comprising about five thousand and one hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the west and north boundaries of the reservation. These areas are shown on drawing numbered 15–02–24, dated April 10, 1951, entitled Expansion of Salinas Maneuver Site.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the land identified in title IV hereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real estate identified in titles II and III and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. Those lands acquired by the United States of America, without payment of compensation, under the Treaty of Paris and set aside for military purposes by Executive order, dated June 30, 1903, identified as follows:

"(a) A strip of land alongside of Munoz Rivera Avenue, San Juan, and east of Army medical building, containing four and eight-tenths acres; the site of the San Sebastian Guardhouse at 205 Sol Street, San Juan, containing five one-hundredths acre; old walls around La Fortaleza containing sixty-six one-hundredths acre; driveway to Insular Department Justice containing eleven one-hundredths acre, and all shown in detail on drawing No. 15–02–142, dated August 15, 1951, entitled 'Fort Brooke Military Reservation.'

"(b) Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation, comprising seven and five one-hundredths

acres and shown on drawing No. 18-01-180, dated August 17, 1949, entitled 'Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation'.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. Those lands acquired by the United States of America through condemnation proceedings and payment of just compensation as determined thereby, identified as follows:

"(a) Punta Las Marias Military Reservation, comprising eighty-seven one-hundredths acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-150, dated November 24, 1948, entitled 'Punta Las Marias SL and FC Site'.

"(b) Punta Cangrejos (Battery Lancaster) Military Reservation, comprising fifteen and eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-114, dated November 10, 1948, entitled 'Battery Lancaster (No. 264) Military Reservation'.

"(c) Punta Maldonado Military Reservation, comprising one acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-151, entitled 'Punta Maldonado SL and FC Site'.

"(d) Mata Redonda Military Reservation, comprising ninety-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and one and eighty-one one-hundredths acres of roadway easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-155, dated December 3, 1948, entitled 'Mata Redonda Gun Emplacement Site'.

"(e) Point Lima Military Reservation, comprising one hundred thirty-five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and nine acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-152, dated November 24, 1948, entitled 'Point Lima Gun Emplacement Site'.

"(f) Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation, comprising nine hundred six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-160, entitled 'Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation'.

"(g) Tract 16 of Salinas Maneuver Site, comprising three hundred sixty-nine and ninety-eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-126, dated November 1, 1948, entitled 'Salinas Maneuver Site'.

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accept from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without cost to the United States, a conveyance by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the lands identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

"(a) Area No. 1 comprising about one thousand four hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the upper one-half of the east boundary of the existing Salinas Maneuver Site and area No. 2 comprising about five thousand one hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the west and north boundaries of the reservation. These areas are shown on drawing No. 15-02-24, dated April 10, 1951, entitled 'Expansion of Salinas Maneuver Site'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1827) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

A portion of West Canal Street and Burns Avenue NW., described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 16, block 3, Ross addition; thence on the south line of said lot south eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds west seven and forty one-hundredths feet to the true place of beginning; thence south thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes west ninety feet to a point on the north line of the Lake Washington Canal; thence following the said north line to the most southerly corner of lot 8, block 1, Seattle tide lands; thence along the easterly and northeasterly lines of said lot 8 to an intersection with the southeasterly line of that portion of Burns Avenue Northwest as vacated by ordinance numbered 76354; thence following said southeasterly line northeasterly to an intersection with the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest; thence following the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest and West Canal Street southeasterly to the true place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of West Bowdoin Place, formerly West Fortieth Street: Beginning at the southeast corner of block 6, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence south thirty-nine degrees six minutes no seconds west one hundred thirty and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on the said northerly line, northwesterly four hundred forty-eight and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes east sixty-nine and sixty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of said block 6, Ross addition; thence on said north line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east thirty-one and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred seventy-five and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block; thence on said line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east sixty-three and twelve one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of Sixth Avenue Northwest: Beginning at the northwest corner of block 8, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the west line thereof south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-six and two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred forty and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block 8; thence south thirty-eight degrees sixteen minutes no seconds west ninety feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly three hundred fifty-eight feet, more or less, to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street): Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 4, block 9, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the north line of said block north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east forty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street, as established by ordinance numbered 14267; thence on said line southeasterly two hundred seventy-eight and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of said block 9, which said point is south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-two and sixty-four one-hundredths feet from the northeast corner of lot 11 of said block; thence on the east line of said block and the same extended south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east one hundred and forty-eight feet, more or less, to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning.

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

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. 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	Fine	Metcalf
Addonizio	Fino	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Forrester	Morano
Barrett	Fulton	Morgan
Battle	Gamble	Morrison
Becker	Granahan	Moulder
Bentley	Green	Multer
Bentsen	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boland	Halleck	O'Neill
Bolling	Hardy	Osmers
Bolton, Frances P.	Harrison, Nebr.	Patten
Bosch	Harrison, Va.	Pelly
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bramblett	Heller	Powell
Brownson	Hoeven	Preston
Buckley	Holifield	Radwan
Busbey	Holtzman	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Hosmer	Roberts
Canfield	Hruska	Rodino
Celler	Javits	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Jensen	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Jonas, Ill.	Scherer
Church	Jones, N. C.	Sheehan
Clardy	Kearns	Shelley
Condon	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Corbett	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	King, Calif.	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Nebr.	Klein	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Tuck
Dawson, Ill.	Krueger	Velde
Dingell	Lane	Warburton
Dollinger	Latham	Weichel
Donohue	LeCompte	Wilson, Ind.
Donovan	McConnell	Winstead
Dorn, S. C.	McCormack	Yorty
Evins	Mason	
Feighan	Merrill	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit on the bill H. R. 7839, the housing bill, while the House is engaged in general debate this week.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8367) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue during the remainder of the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, then, that the bill will not be taken up under the 5-minute rule today, but that it will be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Simply the first paragraph of the bill will be read today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8367, with Mr. MCGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is my responsibility to bring before the House for discussion and debate the bill to provide appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1955.

The appropriations recommended by the committee amount to $430,983,700. This is a reduction of slightly over $34 million from the budget estimates submitted to us and $10,609,000 less than the appropriations for these purposes during the current year.

When our subcommittee made its report to the full committee on last Thursday, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, as well as of the full committee, made the remark, and certainly he speaks from very broad experience in the field of appropriations and other legislation, that he considered this to be probably the most difficult bill to handle that fell to the lot of any subcommittee. I suspect that the members of the subcommittee who have labored diligently in bringing this bill to the House will agree with the statement that was made at that time. We can and do take a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that we feel that we are bringing a bill to you which deals with a very important matter, and of which all of us are proud.

This year the major load for presenting the requests of the Corps of Engineers to us was handled by General Chorpening, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. It is our understanding that before the sun sets today, General Chorpening will have received his orders for another assignment. I know that the members of the subcommittee would not like to have him leave us, because we did appreciate the broad knowledge that he had of his problems and the great candor with which he presented these matters to our subcommittee. If he must leave, we would not like to have him leave without wishing him well in whatever his new assignment may be.

I think the task of our subcommittee was eased by the complete sharing of responsibility and the harmony and spirit of self-denial that existed among all the members who held the hearings on this bill, because there was that complete harmony and cooperation among the members.

This comes to you as a subcommittee bill. It is not the architecture of any one member, although I suppose it could be said that there are individual items with which some of us might have individual differences. Nevertheless, it does represent the cooperative effort of the subcommittee to bring a reasonable and sensible piece of legislative appropriation to you.

I think everyone recognizes, in spite of some of the less complimentary names that have been attached to this particular appropriation, that it does deal with some of the greatest resources of our Nation. In fact, all of the members of our subcommittee just came from the White House, where we witnessed the pressing of the button that started the first generator at the Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota. In connection with the few remarks the President made, he referred to our water resources not as one of the greatest but as the greatest single resource of our Nation.

Last year we recognized the need for a better coordinated water resources program. Our report dealt with that problem at some length. This year we reiterate our feeling that there is a need for that greater coordination, and we continue to feel the urgency of the development of a sound water-resource program for our Nation. We can take some assurance and some pleasure in the fact that a considerable amount of progress has been made in the course of the last year in arriving at better coordination and better leadership in the development of that program. We have been able to discern a noticeably better coordination, for instance, between the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers. Their methods and calculations as to allocation of costs are getting closer and closer, so that we anticipate that by the time this bill reaches the floor next year those difficult differences that have existed will be erased and we will have a uniform method of handling at least these problems in the Congress.

I think the story of this particular bill is concisely told in the report which is before you. As was the case last year and in the 2 previous years before that, we adhered to some ground rules. For instance, every project included in this bill and every amount for each project set forth in this bill and in the report was previously approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Because of the large backlog of projects of this kind, because of the need for complete cooperation between the legislative and the executive branches in order to keep a reasonable and a concise program, the subcommittee for the past 3 years has felt that we were entitled to, in fact, that it was a necessity that we have all projects screened by the Bureau of the Budget before we presented them to the Congress. Seventeen new starts are included in the bill for this year which represents a departure from the approach that we took last year. These starts, generally speaking, are in conformance with some definite criteria. They are projects that either represent completely new starts or are resumptions of important construction projects that have been delayed by reason of the Korean incident. For the most part, they are small in overall scope, and entail a maximum amount of cooperation both as to endeavor and as to the money at the local level. There are no new multiple-purpose starts in this bill. I think that is completely consistent with what I have said because the multiple-purpose starts are much larger in scope, and the money involved is much greater. It was felt and our subcommittee felt that we are not yet ready to embark upon large, new projects at that time. I think in that connection it is worth comment that during the discussion of this bill in the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] said:

> It is no longer proper to refer to this as a flood control and navigation bill any more.

He pointed out, as you can note from page 7 of our report, that out of some $276,500,000 in this bill for construction, $192,500,000, in other words, more than two-thirds of the appropriations contained in this bill, as recommended to you, goes for multiple-purpose projects.

I think you can find the information that you will be interested in with respect to each of the projects in the report. As a general proposition, the amounts recommended conform quite

closely to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and where you find deviation from the budget recommended amounts, the explanation will be found in three things:

First, that we felt that a lesser amount of money would do the job than the executive department suggested ought to be done; or, second, that there are unobligated or unexpended balances from this current year or previous years that permit a lessening of the appropriation in the 1955 bill; or, third, that there are certain specific conditions with respect to the project which are clearly set forth and explained in the text of the report.

Mentioning briefly the field of general investigations, we do not and have not, for at least during the time that I have been familiar with this appropriation, attempted to specifically earmark certain amounts for certain investigations. If you wish to determine the tentative allocation of the Corps of Engineers for various studies, I suggest that you look in volume 1 of the hearings starting on page 107 where the Corps of Engineers has set forth its tentative allocations subject to this warning, however, that these are tentative. If you find a figure there for a certain study, or even if you find a certain study listed in the course of the fiscal year, it may not happen that the project will be studied and that that particular amount of money will be used on that study because those are tentative and subject to greater need or reduction in funds that may develop in the course of the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. May I ask the chairman of this subcommittee why the investigation money for Ice Harbor was stricken from the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. You are talking about planning money. I will come to that in a few minutes, if you will bear with me.

In the field of planning, projects are definitely listed. There again we have not set forth any specific amounts, but we have listed the projects for which planning funds are to be used during the 1955 fiscal year out of the funds included in this bill. You will find a list of those projects on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

In "Operation and maintenance" we have, generally speaking, allowed the amount in full that was recommended to us. As we said last year in our report, we felt that we are building up a backlog of construction difficulties and construction troubles unless we do provide necessary funds in order to operate and maintain the structures which have already been built.

Generally, I believe that furnishes the information that is required in order to permit an understanding, and to pave the way for the discussion that some of you perhaps will want to engage in with respect to these various projects.

Turning to the question asked by my colleague from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], we have been informed, at least twice in the past to my knowledge, that the planning work on Ice Harbor had been completed. In times past we have had requests for construction funds submitted to our subcommittee. It is our feeling that they have had sufficient planning funds on this project to have completed that job. We just do not like the idea of being told twice before that the planning would be done if we provided a certain amount. We provided substantially those amounts, and here is request No. 3 for additional funds. Basically speaking, I think that is an answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In other words, we think the planning is done or ought to be done.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to ask the very competent chairman of this subcommittee if he will amplify the reasons why he objected to the appropriation of $500,000 for the Kawainui Swamp project on the island of Oahu. I might say before the gentleman answers the question that I am prompted to make this inquiry after reading the hearings in which I noted a feeling that you and other members apparently had that this project was primarily of private rather than a public interest. I would like very much to know why the gentleman has that feeling, in light of the report that has been made and the history of the project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure that I know what the gentleman is referring to in the hearings. My recollection of this is that this request for Federal funds was made at a time when the city and county of Honolulu was contemplating embarking upon what is substantially a reclamation project. In other words, the draining of this swamp and the use of that land for a residential development.

I would say in summary, that after looking at the project we could not quite picture it as being entirely a Federal flood-control project. In our minds it more closely resembled a reclamation project, and it appeared to us that the city and county of Honolulu were in a position and had the power to handle this problem at the local level.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If I might have a little further time, I do not know whether the gentleman has inspected this area himself or not.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have not.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It is near the approach to the Kawainui Naval Air Station, which had been taken over by the United States Marines for their only permanent overseas regimental combat team base. Admiral Radford at the time he was in command in Honolulu recommended that this project be undertaken in order to relieve a condition that had developed recently as a result of heavy rains; and that not only threatens the population that had settled in that area because of floods, but also the military area because of the insanitary conditions that result.

This is a project that has been under study for a period of more than 10 years and twice has been set aside only because of the war.

I would like to ask, if the gentleman will permit me a minute to read a portion of a telegram I received from the Governor of Hawaii with respect to this project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wired the Acting Governor, Farrant L. Turner, about the action of the committee and in reply he said to me in part:

> Great floods in March 1951, impelled Territorial Legislature to appropriate funds for small channel along Federal project alinement as emergency relief, contemplating completion of project by United States Corps of Engineers. Project in critical unfinished condition pending anticipated Federal improvements approved by Congress.
>
> Emergency expenditures were made to protect from inundation because Federal Government had deferred action on account of World War II and later Korean conflict. Territorial funds spent as stopgap only and along right-of-way committed for Federal project. Denial of Federal project will result in great damage by floods overtopping emergency channel. Great need for protection from floods resulting from rainfall up to 20 inches in 24 hours. Emergency channel inadequate to carry.

That concludes the excerpt from the Acting Governor's wire.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of that wire and the fact that this project was recommended by Admiral Radford, that you will reconsider your point of view and support an amendment to restore this project to the bill. I thank the gentleman very sincerely.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I shall be glad to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have heard what the Delegate from Hawaii had to say with reference to this project. I have had the opportunity to see the project and I want to say that it impressed me very favorably. I was out and inspected it and talked with Admiral Radford about it. But I rise at this time for another purpose.

I came in a little late and I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill, this question: If he has outlined his tests, the rules, under which these new projects, 20 of them, I understand, were brought into the bill as construction projects? If you have not I would like very much to have you outline the criteria which you used in bringing them in.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have mentioned that there are 17 new projects in the bill. They are either new starts or the resumption of previously started projects that were discontinued for one reason or another, and the reason in most instances was the Korean incident. Now they are being brought in. The general criteria established was that they must not be large and expensive projects that will require work over a long period of time, and that they receive a maximum amount of local contributions financially and otherwise for the completion of the project.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman another question, then? Is it going to be the purpose of the subcommittee in the future to use as criteria, a necessary criteria, the maximum amount of local contribution in flood control and rivers and harbors projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Things are moving in that direction. The executive department of the Government is attempting now to set up some specific rules that will provide for considerably greater local contribution than has been the case in the past.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That will be the case regardless of what action the Congress has taken in regard to a project already approved? In other words, even though the Congress has approved the project and authorized it, we are to understand that the subcommittee lays out as a criterion that local contributions are in order and the greater the contribution the more likelihood of the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is a pretty fair assumption of the situation, all other things being equal.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I wanted to clear that up in my own mind.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the projects outlined to which consideration was given in reference to expenditure for studies for 1955 are outlined on pages 108 and 109 of the hearings?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Pages 107, 108, and 109.

Mr. HARRIS. That includes navigation and flood-control projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to say that this is merely for information of the Members of Congress and others interested and that the engineers in the various districts might very well not spend the money for this purpose but allocate it to some other project which they might deem in a particular district was more important?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes. I want to make it clear that those projects and those amounts on the pages of the hearing referred to do not represent a definite specific commitment by the Corps of Engineers to pursue their studies, either at all of those particular places or in those particular amounts.

Mr. HARRIS. How much funds are included in this bill for studies of flood control projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe we have broken it down for flood control projects only.

Mr. HARRIS. "Examination and surveys $1,950,000." Is that the amount available?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct and is the amount for all examinations and survey projects.

Mr. HARRIS. "Collection and study of basic data, $460,000." What does that have reference to?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. For the most part it is general information that is required for a particular river basin or for a group of these projects. It is general information that can be applied in respect to any of the projects. It is information that is collected in cooperation with other Government agencies.

Mr. HARRIS. The planning money provided here, that is, for studies, and so forth, is allocated from the Corps of Engineers' office in Washington—or is it divided up and allocated to districts throughout the United States?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is speaking of planning funds now?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I am talking about studies.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is allocated out of the Engineers' office here.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, it is not divided up and allocated to districts or divisions under the Corps of Engineers in the field before it is sent out of the Engineers' office here in Washington?

Mr. TABER. The whole thing is gathered together here. It is divided up before it comes down to us.

Mr. HARRIS. Wherever it is needed throughout the country.

Mr. TABER. They say that. Of course, there are enormous sums of money piled up that they can use and change those allocations to a considerable extent. They have the authority to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for this additional question about another project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is aware, of course, that there is a budget estimate, and I want to express my appreciation to the committee for including the funds budgeted for Little Missouri River below Murfreesboro. This is a project that was authorized in 1942, and the multipurpose that goes with it known as Narrows Dam was completed in 1950. That is the work below the multiple-purpose dam and reservoir. There is a small tributary on the Little Missouri River which the committee, of course, is aware I am interested in, and the estimated cost is anywhere from fifty to seventy-five thousand dollars. It has been my feeling that the amount budgeted could not only take care of the channelizing of the Little Missouri River but also these few miles on this tributary that is so badly needed in the area. Could the gentleman advise me whether or not consideration was given to including that tributary within this budget limitation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not able to tell the gentleman that it is included in there because the Corps of Engineers did not in its presentation to us indicate that the funds were to be used on that tributary. I suppose that a proper construction of the hearings and of the amount included would be that there are no specific funds for that tributary included in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say to the gentleman that two figures from the Corps of Engineers were presented, one was given a year ago and one was given this year in February, and from the variation of the figures they have given at two different times during the year I am fully convinced that this whole job can be completed with the funds budgeted here. If that is true, perhaps the committee objects to this small tributary being included in this category.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not suppose we would be in a position to object. As a matter of fact, the Corps of Engineers at no time informed us that they contemplated doing any particular piece of work with the money included in this particular appropriation.

Mr. HARRIS. And they also advised the committee that it would cost about fifteen to twenty thousand dollars more doing it piecemeal than doing it all at one time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe that is correct.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. A year ago I received a considerable amount of registered mail regarding Libby Dam in Montana. I notice on page 5 of the report that Libby Reservoir is included in the bill to receive some funds for continuing a study of it. Now, is that a study of the same plan or is it a new plan?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is a considerably different project than we had before us last year. We did, however, recommend planning this last year because we knew they were contemplating making this change of site in order to obviate a great many difficulties they had with respect to relocations and some difficulties in working out an arrangement with the Canadian Government. I think we are on pretty sound ground in going ahead with the planning of this project as we now know it.

Mr. DONDERO. There were two difficulties involved: One, it backed water into Canada and would subject the United States to a large bill for damages, and the other one a relocation of about 100 miles of railroad.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In 1946 a project in Arizona was authorized known as the Whitlow Ranch Dam. Was there any consideration given that project by the Committee on Appropriations at this time?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was not presented to the committee to the best of my recollection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I notice on page 4 of the report there is an amount of $2.2 million to be expended for the planning work, and subsequent to that figure there is a list of projects.

Is there any understanding by the committee as to how much will be spent on each project, or will that be left to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Generally speaking, the corps did in the hearings indicate the amount that they intended to spend for planning on each of these projects; however, the committee reduced the amount that was requested. We also deleted perhaps 2 or 3 of the projects for which they requested planning funds, so that we expect the general pattern of their presentation to be followed. But it is not possible to say that exactly the amount of money that the Corps of Engineers recommended will be used for planning. It is anticipated, however, that money for planning will be used on each of the projects that we have listed, and with the use of unobligated balances I think it is safe to assume that, roughly speaking, there will be about the amount of money used for planning on each of them as the Corps of Engineers presented to us in the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The hearings will disclose the approximate figures as to how much will be spent on the planning of each individual project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Approximate figures; yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. The bill carries appropriations for five dams in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; McNary, $24 million; Lookout Point, $3 million; Albeni Falls, $4 million; Chief Joseph, $27 million; and the Dalles, $29 million, or a total of $87 million.

Do these large appropriations recommended by the committee indicate that the committee is favorably disposed toward the continuation of those flood control, navigation, and power dams now under construction in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the recommendation of those large amounts of money is an indication of committee opinion. I think basically it represents our recognition of the fact that once you get these projects started, the economical and reasonable thing to do is to provide sufficient funds to get them finished, so that we will begin to get returns from them.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I agree with the gentleman's statement there. On the Dalles Dam there was a carryover, unexpended balance of $6 million. The committee has recommended $29 million in addition. Does that mean that we will have a total of $35 million for work on the Dalles Dam during the coming 12 months' period?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It does.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I notice that the committee has reduced the amount for the Dalles by $5,100,000 less than the Bureau of the Budget recommended. It is my understanding that that reduction was made for the reason that there was not legal authorization for that amount at this time. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] and I have introduced a bill which would provide additional authorization for the Dalles Dam construction. If that bill should pass the House in time, does that mean that the conferees, when they meet on this bill, would give favorable consideration to this $5,100,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, provided the Senate should insert it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It would depend upon the legislative situation at that time. I do not think I am in a position to say what the conferees would do with respect to it. Our report is quite explicit on the matter. It says that the reduction is based in part on unobligated and unexpended balances estimated to be in excess of $6 million at the end of the present year and it spells out the lack of authorization to support an appropriation any greater than that which is included in this bill.

So there are two factors, one of them the unobligated and unexpended balances, and the other lack of authorization. That is about as definite a statement as I can make in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is true, is it not, that when the Budget Director made the recommendation of $34 million for the Dalles Dam, the Budget Director knew at that time that there was going to be a $6-million carryover? I read that in the testimony at least.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have had difficulty for at least 3 years that I know of with the fact that the authorization has been trailing behind the construction program in the Columbia Basin.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct. And that has been due primarily to the fact that we have not had a river and harbor authorization bill for a period of 4 years. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask a question similar to the question asked a minute ago. The speaker indicated strongly then that if he knew just what the hearing showed maybe he could tell something better. With reference to the Greenup Dam down at Greenup, Ky., and across the Ohio River, I have traced this through just about as far as the gentleman went and considerably further in this respect, and I have here just what was said in the hearings. There is the figure of $50,000. According to the gentleman's deductions, I think we can feel safe in believing, then, that that $50,000 will be carried in the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Substantially so, yes. It would be improper for me to say categorically they are going to spend $50,000 for planning on this project, but in conformance with the information I gave the gentleman from Alabama, I think the gentleman is safe in saying that that is substantially the amount that will be available.

Mr. JENKINS. Anyway, the Army engineers here indicated that $50,000 was the round number, and the chances are that the gentleman's committee in going through their work included it in this approximately $2,200,000 that covers that category of work.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Substantially so, yes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. May I sincerely compliment the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on bringing in this bill. I understand they came back here last fall and worked several weeks. We know they have been in session night and day, sometimes 2 and 3 sessions a day.

I am also tremendously gratified that I finally got two little projects in my home district, in Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky.

There is one thing on which I would like to have a little advice. Our folks are constantly in fear of a devastating flood. I am wondering just how soon my friend thinks we will have enough funds to complete the project. I understand the Army engineers gave the chairman and the members of the committee some idea of how they could get along with that work. Of course, we do not have any protection from the floods, to build the walls high enough to stop the river. We are thankful for what we have received, but we would like to know what rules you have adopted or what your plan is to continue these projects so that the ultimate protection will be afforded the people.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say with respect to these comparatively small projects about which the gentleman from Kentucky is inquiring that it is certainly the policy of our subcommittee to push these projects along in order to get the benefit from them about as rapidly as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget believe they can be completed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. GOLDEN. May I say for the RECORD that the people there have furnished all the money the Government has required and there is a splendid spirit of cooperation in helping the Engineers to build them as soon as possible.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have in mind projects that are comparatively small ones, where the local cities or organized municipalities have already appropriated funds and have funds available to carry on these smaller flood-control projects. Are there funds in this legislation that would help projects of that kind? I have in mind levees especially.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure enough of what the gentleman is referring to to be able to answer that question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Here is a case where levee projects have been approved, not large ones, around cities where they have formerly had floods, and where, for

instance, a city has, on the theory it would get help from the Army engineers, raised funds by issuing bonds or otherwise. Anyway, they have the funds on hand to carry on the project. This project having been approved by the Army engineers, are there other funds in this appropriation to match such funds?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Not unless you find them specifically referred to in the report.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was under the impression that there were funds for that purpose generally, but not specifically.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; not generally. Oh, there are some of the smaller projects such as snagging and clearing and things of that kind. There is also a general fund for use where the project is small and of an emergency nature. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, I would say that unless he finds in the report a specific reference to that project, with an amount of money listed, the answer probably is that there are no funds for those particular locations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was impressed with the gentleman's replies to inquiries made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] when he made inquiry with respect to funds that might be available to match the funds of municipalities.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We are moving in that direction in an effort to get the greatest possible amount of local contribution and local cooperation in these flood-protection projects.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In my section of the country, and I know there are a number of other States, too, we have local boards on levees. Does the gentleman mean that the committee will take into consideration the amount of funds which the local levee board is expending on similar projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; the gentleman is speaking about the maintenance now, is he not?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Principally maintenance, but when you get into a levee project, it is difficult to distinguish between maintenance and new work in many instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have a rather general formula at the present time where the local interests, for instance, are required to make contributions usually within four categories such as rights-of-way and things of that kind. I think we are moving in the direction of more substantial local contributions along that line, but as of this date we cannot say, or at least we cannot definitively say what those criteria are going to be for future appropriations.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would like to ask a question, referring to the committee report on page 7. with regard to the Redwood City Harbor. You state there in the last sentence that there is not complete agreement as to the need and as to compliance with the requirements of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 as it concerns this project. I understand from the district engineer that this million dollars has nothing to do with the 1950 authorization. These funds are not to complete any of the work in the 1950 authorization, and the work required of the local port has all been completed. The district engineer out there was quite concerned about this, and telephoned about it, and could not understand why the point was brought up. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The particular million dollars, requested this year, does not refer specifically to the 1950 River and Harbor Act. Our discussion was on the general overall proposition of the Federal contribution for the improvement of the Redwood City Harbor. Last year we had a million dollar request for one particular phase of the work. It did not materialize. Now they come back with a request for the same amount of money. I think the committee has to know pretty well what we are getting into before it allows a million dollars for any specific part of the development of that project. That is the basis for the reference to the 1950 act, which I understood required local development of some terminal facilities and so on that have not been completely built. The entire authorized project must be considered as a whole.

The report does refer to Federal appropriations for the overall development at Redwood City. I think that is the light in which this language needs to be considered.

Mr. YOUNGER. They have the whole thing set out in an answer. Would there be any objection to inserting that in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin certainly is not in a position to object to any insertion or statement you might want to make with respect to it.

Mr. YOUNGER. I understand that is improper in Committee of the Whole, so I will make that request when we go back into the House.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. I notice on page 107 of the report seven items in the Great Lakes Division for planning money on harbors which have to do with navigation sites.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Those are studies; not planning funds, but studies.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand, but is that tied up in any way with the St. Lawrence Seaway, in anticipation of greater traffic in those harbors?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I could not tell you whether it is specifically tied up or not. I would guess that probably they have no connection, in view of the fact that the seaway has not been authorized yet, and these surveys have been under way for some time.

Mr. GEORGE. This is a continuing program of study that has been going on for years?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express the appreciation of one city in Oklahoma for the very courteous hearing which was afforded to the city's representatives by the chairman, at a very late hour in the day, when they presented a case to the committee for a Federal contribution for a flow line for the city of Muskogee. According to my information, the Engineers' report on the city's testimony was received after this bill had been marked up. May I presume from that that judgment by the committee has not been passed as yet, on the merits of the Army engineers' position, and the city's position with regard to the flow line?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We were aware that in view of the fact that your people were not satisfied with the original Corps of Engineers' report, that a subsequent study of this matter must be made. We had not yet received the results of that study at the time we marked up this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand that that subsequent report from the engineers has now been received by the committee, and I wonder if it is possible that that report would be taken into consideration in your conference with the Senate, if a conference results on this bill, which I presume it will.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is a safe estimation to make. I have not personally studied the report as yet.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. First, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for a job well done, which has been a tough job, and I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman and his committee for the personal inspection trip that he and his committee made in my district last year.

With reference to the Oahe Dam in South Dakota, I notice the gentleman from Wisconsin asked General Potter what the target date on that project was. General Potter stated that the first power is scheduled to come on the line in December 1961, and the closure would be 1958. It is my further understanding that there is $9 million in this particular bill. I believe that is correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. LOVRE. With that $9 million can the target date be met, and can this dam be closed in 1958 with power in 1961?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. All I can say in response to that question is that we have the testimony of General Potter. He gave us the target date. He testified in support of the specific amount of money. The subcommittee recommended that amount of money in full. So I suppose that that question might better be directed to General Potter and the Corps of Engineers than it would to this subcommittee, but the subcommittee acted consistently with the recommen-

dation of the Corps of Engineers that was presented to us.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman. I do want to make one comment and that is this: The question of power is very imperative in South Dakota. We do have a shortage of power, a number of our REA's are short of power today. It is necessary for them to have a reasonable assurance that this dam will be completed so they can make their plans, and I certainly hope this particular dam can be completed in 1958 and that we can take the power in 1961 which is the time schedule as of now.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to express my congratulations to the committee. I think they have done an amazing job. I have just a few questions in connection with Los Angeles County, for which was allowed an area item of $8,500,000. As I understand, that money can be used on any flood-control project within the Los Angeles flood-control area with the approval of the Army engineers and the flood-control engineer of Los Angeles County.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe it is quite that flexible. The Corps of Engineers did present a breakdown on parts of the overall project where they plan to spend the money that they requested. We fulfilled the request that was made, a request made, I am sure, after very close coordination between the Corps of Engineers and the people who are so active in this work at the local level in Los Angeles County. So I would feel that you would have to look to the hearings and find there the items that were requested in this overall amount and then assume from that, that inasmuch as the committee did approve the amount in full that those are the places that this money is going to be spent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In that connection, there is no item here under the hearing date that you refer to for the Saw Pit Dam, which is the dam immediately in the vicinity where the great burnoff was last fall and where the menace of floodwater coming off the hills at that point is going to be very dangerous to the people below.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not know just where in the hearings the gentleman is looking.

Mr. McDONOUGH. At page 240.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But you will find, however, there is testimony on that problem. You will find that your colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] appeared before the committee as soon as that burn occurred, and the Corps of Engineers are working I think admirably well on that situation. They suggested and the Bureau of the Budget approved the suggestion and revised their recommendation to our subcommittee that this $500,000 which had previously been allocated to the Whittier Narrows Dam should be used in order to get into the handling of this Saw Pit problem just as soon as the funds in this bill are made available. That is included in the $8,500,000 allowed by the committee, a discussion of that will be found on page 241 of part I of the hearings.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is fine; I appreciate that, except from page 240 of the hearings there is no estimate, nothing is set aside for it. So if the explanation of the chairman is sufficient to allocate us that $500,000 to be used to carry out the Saw Pit Dam project, that will hold the floodwater back in that area; and we are very happy to hear that.

The only other question is that in the channelizing of the Los Angeles River which is included in the $8,500,000 and which I understand has proceeded now up to a point in the San Fernando Valley and will proceed farther. I understand that the Army engineers in doing flood-control work and channelizing in Los Angeles County can use any part of the $8,500,000 and that they can proceed as far as the funds are available.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not familiar enough with the details to tell you whether or not they did specify any particular place in the course of the hearings. I cannot recall that detail clear enough at this time.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The part of the Los Angeles River we are discussing, Mr. Chairman, is out in my district. It is my understanding that—I know—the money has been appropriated to carry the Los Angeles River project from Sapulpa Boulevard to Reseda Boulevard. It was understood, I think, that the Army engineers would recommend other appropriations at this time to the Bureau of the Budget to get the present construction completed. As I understand, it is in the overall planning. It is planned, as I understand it, in the overall program in Los Angeles County to continue this progressive program in connection with the gentleman's committee. I want to compliment the chairman, also the subcommittee, for the fine job they have done in coming out there and inspecting that project.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to inquire as to the amount appropriated for general investigations on page 3. In connection with No. 1, examination and surveys, do the Army engineers determine where the money is to be spent or has it been earmarked for certain projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It has not been earmarked for certain projects. The committee provides the amount in a lump sum; however, if the gentleman will look at page 107, volume 1, of the hearings, you will see there and on the following pages a list of the tentative allocations of the total amount provided.

Mr. LANHAM. Under (2) collection and study of basic date, $460,000; just what does that authorize?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I mentioned that earlier. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that in large measure it represents studies on problems of a general nature. For the most part, they are conducted in cooperation with other Government agencies, such as the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey and other agencies of the Government.

Mr. LANHAM. It does not apply to collecting basic data on projects that have not yet been authorized?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not suppose you could say that it refers to any specific project. It is a study of matters of a general nature, information which for the most part is required for all projects or an entire basin or things of that kind.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on appropriations for civil functions brings to you today for your consideration the 1955 version of the civil functions appropriation bill. The civil functions bill is a multipurpose appropriation. It covers funds for the National Cemetery operations, for the Old Soldiers' Home, which funds for the Old Soldiers' Home are taken from funds which are collected from the Regular Army people for this purpose; it covers funds for the operation of the Panama Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company. These funds, of course, come from tolls which are collected from the Panama Canal.

Then in the regular civil functions appropriation there are funds for the construction and maintenance of harbors, inland waterways, navigable rivers, flood control, some irrigation, and multipurpose projects, which include dams for the production of hydroelectric power, one of which the President this morning pressed a key to start operating the first generating unit at Fort Randall. The bill carries an approximate total, as the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has told you, of $431 million. That is $34 million less than the requests made this year and $10 million less than was carried in the same bill last year. Out of the $278 million earmarked for construction work, approximately $200 million of the money appropriated is for large multipurpose projects: Operation and maintenance of Government facilities, $72 million; general expenses, $9 million; Mississippi River and its tributaries to try to take care of flood control on that great river, a little over $45 million; Niagara River remedial work, $2 million. As the chairman has told you, there are 17 new or resumption projects included in this bill. The total, however, for these resumptions, or these new projects, whichever you choose to call them, is less than $16 million, showing that these projects are of a rather small nature. The local people or local districts have contributed to 14 of these projects, so they are largely of a local nature. I mention this because there has been some question of the committee in regard to some very needed and very worthy projects all over the Nation. In this year of all years when we are trying to reduce Government expenses, trying to get the expenditures more nearly in balance with income, it behooves us to

make sacrifices. And, of course, a great many sacrifices are made in this bill. The Representatives all over the country are interested in developing our natural resources, particularly our water resources, that the President referred to this morning as one of our greatest resources. I note in passing, as shown by what the President had to say this morning in turning on the first unit of power at Fort Randall, that civilization has, to a large extent, followed pure water, and those countries which are most backward today are the ones that lack adequate and pure water for their use and purposes. We, in this country, are blessed with this great natural resource, and it behooves us to take care of it.

Mr. Chairman, the report which is brought to you today is strictly a bipartisan report and recommendation. Some of the members of the committee had projects in which they were interested, but they have foregone trying to exert pressure or influence for their projects, because they felt that they had no more right to ask for their projects, or the projects in which they were interested, than the other Members of the Congress. So we have adhered to the time-honored policy of not recommending anything that had not been previously recommended by the budget. We have consequently restricted our recommendations of appropriations to those projects which the budget recommended. It is true that we have not rubber stamped everything the budget presented to us. We reduced some and cut out others concerning which the information, in the opinion of the committee, was not sufficient to warrant appropriations at this time. As to some of them we felt additional information was needed. As to others there was some difference of opinion among the people in the communities where these proposed projects were to be carried out. Where there was violent differences of opinion, the committee felt that these opinions should be reconciled before the committee attempted to step in and make an appropriation.

I should like to thank the members of the committee for their consideration, their patience and their courtesy. The minority members of the committee were extended every courtesy. The witnesses who appeared before the committee, I am glad to report to this House, were extended every courtesy and every consideration.

The committee regrets that it is not able to take care of all the projects that appeared to have merit. But we have only so many dollars, as you know, to spend this year and so we had to cut the garment to fit the cloth. I hope very much that this House will see fit to go along with the committee in its recommendations.

It has been a difficult job to decide which of these projects should have appropriations and which should not. But in the larger projects the committee adopted the policy of continuing those projects which they felt could not, from an economic standpoint, be deferred without loss to the Government. That has been the policy all the way through, that those projects which would cost money to defer have had their requests for appropriations approved. In the multipurpose projects, of course, the sooner you get power on the line and produce electricity, the sooner the Government will begin to get returns from its investment. All of these multipurpose projects, I remind the House, are based on a 50-year amortization schedule and the rates of electricity are based on this 50-year amortization schedule. Those that do not fit within this criteria, of course, do not measure up to the standards which are necessary for the committee to recommend appropriations. Again I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bipartisan report from the committee. While there were some differences, we have brought this to you with a united front and I hope the House will stand by its committee and pass this bill.

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

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is there any money in this bill to start new multipurpose projects?

Mr. RILEY. No, there is no money in this bill for new multipurpose projects.

There is considerable money here for planning projects which have been authorized. I believe the gentleman is interested in one project between South Carolina and Georgia, which, by the way, is not in my district, but is in my State. Fifty thousand dollars has been tentatively allocated to the project which, the Army engineers tell me, will complete the plans for the project and it will not be necessary to appropriate any further money for planning until construction actually starts or until appropriations for construction work are actually made.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I hope we can get enough funds to start construction next year.

Mr. RILEY. I share the gentleman's hope.

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

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

Mr. REAMS. This is with reference to page 109, volume I of the hearings, and relates to the Detroit district, Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio project. It calls for flood-control studies. The question is this: The total estimated cost of that study is $187,200. One hundred and fifty thousand seven hundred dollars was allocated through the fiscal year 1954. Twenty thousand dollars is supposed to be allocated for this year, the fiscal year of 1955. Was the unexpended balance from last year carried over into this year?

Mr. RILEY. Yes.

Mr. REAMS. So whatever was not used in the fiscal year 1954 will be available in addition to the $20,000 which is allocated for this year?

Mr. RILEY. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. I rise in support of the bill before you which provides appropriations for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1955. This action on my part does not mean that I am satisfied with the bill. To be perfectly frank, I am disappointed over the amount that the committee has recommended for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. In expressing disappointment, however, it is only proper that I state that the committee allowed the full budget recommendation for this project.

When we speak of the lower Mississippi and its tributaries we speak of the main stem Mississippi River and off-river projects in seven States, namely, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, and parts of Missouri, Kentucky, and Illinois.

The Congress in its wisdom authorized an expenditure of $1,292,748,500 for this important project. Through fiscal year 1954, the Congress had appropriated $848,770,400. The overall project is now approximately 66 percent complete and we have reached the stage in construction where we need larger rather than smaller appropriations for this tremendous project to be completed on the most economical basis. The request before you is the smallest amount recommended for this all-important project in 9 years.

Some of us have been critical of the Budget's methods and recommendations; however, I consider that without the Budget's recommendations on all appropriations, the Congress would be greatly handicapped. I believe that the Bureau of the Budget serves a great purpose and, with few exceptions, I have supported the Budget's recommendations. I am of the opinion that if we should ignore the Budget's recommendations in making appropriations, we would sooner or later find ourselves completely confused as to what the many Federal agencies actually need to operate successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is understood by all that certain of our colleagues are called upon to assume greater responsibilities than others. Some assignments are harder than others. In my candid opinion, those Members assigned to the Army Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee have one of the most thankless and difficult tasks of any committee in the Congress, and even though at time I find myself in disagreement with the committee, I want to say for the RECORD that in my considered judgment no committee in the Congress is comprised of a more conscientious and fair group of men. The members of this committee sit for weeks and months listening to witnesses and well organized delegations from every section of the United States, and certainly it is an impossibility to act favorably upon the requests of all the witnesses. May I say this, that after observing the members of this committee in action for several years and understanding the hard tasks assigned to them, it is disappointing to hear them occassionally attacked by those without knowledge of their difficult assignment.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and also president of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. Incidentally, the compensation I receive as president of this great association is strictly limited to the satisfaction of seeing the work in the Valley States progress. As president of the association I appeared before the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee, along with many witnesses from the seven Valley States, and requested the committee to increase the Budget's recommendations from $45,200,000 to $56,885,000. The committee did not choose to follow our recommendations, therefore, I am following the committee's recommendations. Let me explain my position further.

During the recess last year, I returned to Washington and discussed the recommendations for this fiscal year with the Chief of the Corps, General Sturgis. Later, I returned accompanied by Senator McCLELLAN and others for a conference with Mr. Dodge, Director of the Budget, in behalf of appropriations for the Lower Mississippi and its tributaries. Evidently, we did not make as good a case as we desired.

This further prompts me to follow the committee's recommendations and there are other reasons why I am supporting the committee.

For instance, on Wednesday of this week we will consider a tax-reduction bill, and I predict that a great majority of the Members of this House will vote for tax reductions. We cannot continue increasing appropriations and reducing taxes unless we subscribe to deficit financing, which I am personally against.

Even though I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am not a member of this particular appropriations subcommittee. It is my understanding that there are one or more members of this subcommittee who need funds badly for projects in their respective districts, some of these funds on a matching basis, but steadfastly refuse to ask the committee to recommend funds because to do so would go beyond the budget's recommendations. This is certainly commendable and is positive proof of this committee's sincere effort to be realistic, fair, and impartial and do the proper thing even though its individual members may suffer certain embarrassment by not requesting funds for needed projects in their respective districts.

There are other reasons why I am supporting the bill. For instance, there are many other important projects that I hope to see the Congress authorize this year that will require funds that are equally as important as the lower Mississippi and its tributaries or, for that matter, other projects for which this bill provides money. For example, there is the St. Lawrence seaway project which, in my opinion, should be authorized. For many years I opposed this great project blindly and, may I confess, without actually reading the Corps of Army Engineers' reports. Those of us who have taken the time to study the St. Lawrence seaway project, without a doubt, will admit that it is meritorious, and I hope that a sufficient number of the Members have familiarized themselves with this project to be able to support the measure when it reaches the floor of the House. I might state further that the many reports and justifications I have read convince me beyond a doubt that the Congress would be making a mistake not to authorize this important project during this session of the Congress.

It is going to be necessary for the Congress to increase the authorization for additional work on the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. The Mississippi River Commission, an agency of the United States Government, declared on April 23, 1952, that the Atchafalaya River at its confluence with Old River will, if left alone, capture the Mississippi River and change its route to the Gulf of Mexico, and could be out of control by 1965. Such a diversion, if allowed to happen, would be disastrous to the economy of the lower Mississippi Valley. It would affect the movement of world trade of the entire midcontinent, would greatly damage industries using river water for their operations, and, finally, would do untold damage to the million and one-half people in the New Orleans area who depend solely upon the Mississippi River for fresh drinking water.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. There is nothing in the gentleman's remarks that is at all parochial. His stature in this House is greatly increased by the statesmanlike statement which the gentleman has made and the splendid position that he has, not only in the House as the representative of his people but also as head of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. The gentleman has been a stanch supporter, and his judgment, reflecting as it does today his interest in every section of the country, brings forcibly to the attention of this House the breadth of his vision and his general outlook for the benefit of the whole country. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the fine remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] in regard to the attitude of my good friend and colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. It was my pleasure to spend some time on the Mississippi River with him last fall, in which I became familiar with the problems you have in the lower Mississippi River area. I was at a meeting where the president of that Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], got up before that meeting and told them he was supporting the St. Lawrence seaway. I say that is an act of statesmanship, because whether we agree or not, there has been some violent opposition to that particular project in that section of the country.

I say to you that what is good for the Mississippi Valley area is good for the Great Lakes area from which I come, and vice versa. I hope this House will go on record for the St. Lawrence seaway when that bill comes before the House. It will be good for you people in the Southern part of the United States. I wish we had more money for you people in the Mississippi Valley area.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to say to my distinguished colleagues the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and [Mr. CEDERBERG] that I have been interested in the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for a long time. During 7 years of my tenure in the Congress I was opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway, in that I never took the time to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers. I was listening to opposition voiced by lobbyists, and I was reading opposition reports prepared by groups in some of these port cities, like New Orleans and Baton Rouge. Not until I decided to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers did I finally realize that I had been completely wrong all the way through. I want to reiterate what I said a moment ago, that if other Members from the valley States would take the time to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers and familiarize themselves with the merits of this program, I do not believe you would lose one vote in the entire South.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to join with other colleagues in paying a very deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for the splendid work and valuable contribution he has made.

As the gentleman knows, it was my privilege to appear before the Civil Functions Subcommittee in support of adequate appropriations for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries and urge that the amount recommended by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association be appropriated for this purpose; and I want again to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his valuable efforts along this line.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for backing your President and the witnesses from the valley States when they appeared before this great subcommittee.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. There has been some discussion in the committee in regard to the interest and support of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman

and of the members of the Appropriations Committee to the fact that 3 years ago, when this bill came before the House Public Works Committee for consideration, that the then colleague of the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Larcade, was the leader on the Democratic side in support of the measure, and time and again when the bill was acted on every representative on the committee from the Midsouth, the Deep South, voted in favor of it, not only this year but for the past 3 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]. I am sure he understands, as I do, that there is great merit in the St. Lawrence Seaway program. Take, for instance, your statement concerning our former colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Larcade. It was my understanding that for several years he opposed the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and only changed his position in favor of the project after he familiarized himself with the reports and ascertained for himself the favorable documents submitted by the Corps of Army Engineers. He remains a stanch supporter of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Certain Members who are deeply interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway are not unmindful of the plight of the Southern States along the Mississippi. We have had appropriations to take care of it and every time we have voted in favor of them.

I just want to say one other thing; I was surprised at the conditions developed regarding the flow of the rivers down there, especially the Atchafalaya—is that name correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman knows I am a member of the subcommittee. I do not think we can afford to see a diversion of the Mississippi River channel. I am interested in it because I think it is unthinkable to let the Mississippi River divert itself, and I want to be on record as being absolutely committed on it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank sincerely the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] for his fair and accurate appraisal of the situation.

I want my colleagues to understand that I have not changed my position with regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to get more favorable consideration for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. For the past 7 years I have opposed the St. Lawrence Seaway project, and may I confess again that it was because I did not take sufficient time to study the reports and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers but rather I listened to recommendations from those who opposed this project for selfish reasons. I shall support the St. Lawrence Seaway project regardless of what is done with respect to the problems of the lower Mississippi and its tributaries.

Let me make one further observation with respect to the old river control project. The construction of this desired project will require 10 years or more, and on account of the grave emergency which has developed in the past few years, those of us residing in the lower valley, especially Louisiana, urge congressional action to secure congressional authorization together with a prompt appropriation of funds so that construction can begin and be completed before the expected crisis in 1965.

Now, may I say to Chairman DAVIS, of the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee, and his colleagues on the committee, that I am disappointed over the low amount recommended by the Budget for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. However, I have nothing but praise for you and your committee and the very fair and impartial manner in which hearings on the bill before the committee at this time were handled. I shall support the committee's position on the entire bill, because I want to vote for tax reduction on next Wednesday.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in its consideration of appropriations for the civil functions of the Army for the coming fiscal year, the Committee on Appropriations was handicapped by a policy of the administration which I consider to be very ill-conceived and ill-advised at this stage in relation to the economic problems of the country. The budget submitted by the administration for all of these activities is entirely inadequate to meet the needs for the further development of this great economy of ours during the coming fiscal year. We know now that the signs of economic recession, which are obvious in many areas of the country, must be met by adequate attention to the problem on the part of private industry as well as on the part of our Government in the field of public works. All of us concede public works should be a major form of governmental activity to meet any economic recession.

The present administration, instead of offering a program to increase activity in this field, has taken steps to curtail it through the restrictions established in the budget sent to the Congress. As an overall example of what this means we might compare what the budget recommendation in this field is for the coming year with the recommendations that were made back in the years of full employment, and at a time when defense demands were even greater.

This year, in round figures, the appropriation request is in the neighborhood of $450 million. In the past few years it has been closer to $600 million. I submit that if we continue to cut back in the field of development and conservation of our natural resources we are going to feel it immediately in the lagging effect which that would have upon our national economy, and we are going to feel it in the long run by lack of development and lack of protection for our natural resources. This is a national problem that extends to every State in the Union. Unfortunately, not enough attention has been paid to the whole problem to focus public indignation upon this neglect of the problem.

I am familiar, of course, with the situation that exists in my own area. I would like to call attention to my own area because it is typical of the type of activity that has been going on in regard to appropriations for this field during the past few years at a national level. I refer particularly to the lower Mississippi Valley area. For the fiscal year 1951, $61,850,000 was appropriated for flood-control activities in the lower Mississippi Valley. For the fiscal year 1952, $61 million was appropriated and for the fiscal year 1953, $60,270,000 was appropriated. During all 3 of those years we were fighting the Korean war. Our entire economy was geared to that war activity, yet it was considered absolutely essential that that much of this work should be carried on, that is, to the extent of more than $60 million a year. During the past fiscal year, the current fiscal year, the one in which we are now living, after the Korean War has been brought to a halt, the expenditures for this area were limited to $51½ million. During the coming year it is proposed that these expenditures be reduced to $45 million. I raise the question: Is it proposed by the administration to have another five- or ten-million dollar cutback in the budget recommendation for this vital work during another year of peacetime in which we are not fighting a war overseas? This record means the curtailment of flood-control projects which, overall, have the highest ratios of benefit of any major project in which the Government is now carrying on conservation and flood-control activities.

Mr. Chairman, to carry this record a little bit further, I would like to call attention to the type of cutback that resulted in the work in the State of Mississippi, and the work that affects the area which I have the honor to represent. For a number of years, for the past 4 years to be exact, appropriations ranging from $9 million to $4 million were made each year as part of the budget for the work involved here. During the coming fiscal year this budget and this bill call for an appropriation of $908,000, a cutback of 90 percent in 4 years for work, as a part of any overall project, that has just as much benefit now as it had then. If the Bureau of the Budget continues along this pattern, the entire work will be eliminated next year. If the Bureau of the Budget continues further along this pattern in respect to the overall treatment of the conservation of natural resources in our country, there will just be no further action to conserve these resources at a national level.

Mr. Chairman, in our area the people have contributed through their tax money for more than 100 years something like $50 million for an overall program. This has added up to between one-quarter and one-third of the overall cost of the combined Federal flood-control activity in that area. I submit that no other major project has a better percentage of local participation than in the flood-control activities in the State of

Mississippi. The major project which was eliminated by the budget, which was requested by the Corps of Engineers in its minimum estimate to the Bureau of the Budget, which was eliminated this year, is the lower auxiliary channel on the Yazoo River which provides for an auxiliary channel to be used in times of flood to get the water out of the river basin a little bit faster.

The next step in the continuance of this important project is the construction of what is termed the lower auxiliary channel. The work will consist of constructing a channel and parallel levees to form a leveed floodway, leaving the Yazoo River near Silver City, Miss., and reentering the stream at the mouth of Big Sunflower River. This is a most important element in the authorized plan and its construction will produce immediate and sizable benefits. Flood flow lines along the Yazoo River will be reduced a maximum of 7 feet, with an average reduction of 3 feet from the mouth of Big Sunflower River to Greenwood, a distance by river of some 125 miles. Practically none of the 520 miles of levees contemplated in the overall plan have been constructed, nor can they be until these major channel improvements are made since the size and height of these levees is predicated on the operation of these channels. The existing local levees along this reach will, however, not be as seriously threatened during flood periods because of this lowered flow line. Completion of this channel will also considerably reduce the length of time that stages along the Yazoo River would exceed the elevation at which minor flooding begins.

This is an item of importance. Under present conditions the emptying period flow from the reservoirs, combined with local runoff, result in outlet drainage along the Yazoo River being blocked, for all practical purposes, during the entire growing season. Completion of this channel will reduce the period of blocked drainage from near 120 days to only about 25 days. Approximately 350,000 acres in this area will be greatly benefited by the construction of this channel. Until this channel is constructed none of the other improvements necessary in the plan can be undertaken except to a limited extent. Until these improvements within the delta are made the benefits contemplated for the 1,600,000 acres along this stream will not be realized and the results from such work as has been done will be extremely disappointing. Allocations for the prosecution of this project have been substantial during recent years as shown by the following tabulation:

Fiscal year 1950	$9,065,359
Fiscal year 1951	9,593,000
Fiscal year 1952	7,350,000
Fiscal year 1953	6,000,000
Fiscal year 1954	4,196,150
Average for 5 years	7,240,901

Excellent progress has been made through these allocations and the point has now been reached where the introduction of major improvements within the delta area are possible and the benefits to be derived from these past expenditures may begin to be fully realized. For this project to be brought to any such abrupt and untimely halt as would result from this year's budget proposal of only $908,000 is thoroughly illogical. The amount of $908,000 will not complete the local protection works now under way at Yazoo City, and this figure should be increased to $1,190,000 which will fully complete that part of the work. In addition, no less than $2,500,000 should be provided in order that substantial progress can be made toward construction of the lower auxiliary channel.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish to add my voice to the words of my distinguished colleague. I congratulate him for the splendid presentation which he has made, and the forthright manner in which he has presented the case for our area. I had intended speaking on the same subject, but inasmuch as the gentleman has made a much better presentation than I could have hoped to do, I will not seek time under general debate. Again, though, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which he has made.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this time in order to direct a question or two to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], with reference to the Old Hickory project in Tennessee and the appropriation approved by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations for that project.

The budget request for this project was $14,350,000. The Appropriations Committee has approved an appropriation of $12 million.

It is my opinion that the subcommittee would not knowingly delay this project. There is a feeling, may I say, shared by the Army engineers, particularly the district engineer in charge of the project, that, because of this cut of more than $2 million, the project will be delayed perhaps 6 months. Feeling assured that the committee does not intend to delay the project, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he could give me some assurance at this point as to just what effect the $2 million reduction might have.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], I would say that there were a couple of factors in the thinking of the subcommittee that explain the cut of some $2 million made from the budget request. First of all, there has been a loan made to this project of something in the nature of $2 million that the Corps of Engineers contemplated repaying.

In view of the overall situation with respect to unobligated funds in the corps, it appears to be highly doubtful that there will be the necessity to repay that amount from this project. Secondly, the overall estimated cost of the project has been reduced by something over $2 million. So there is another factor that we felt justified our reducing it by that amount.

There were 2 things, each of them involving items of $2 million, that entered into the thinking of the subcommittee in making the reduction in the request.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask another question with reference to this loan, or this shifting of funds? I think the determination of that question possibly would answer the question of whether there will be a delay or not. I have gone rather fully into this situation. I spent a half day on this project last year when I was home during the recess. If the corps has to replace from this $12 million the $2 million, approximately, loaned from another fund, then I feel rather confident that there will be a delay. If they are not required to do so, then I think it is quite possible that there will not be any delay.

I am not sure whether the chairman of the subcommittee could give us any assurance that that loan would not have to be deducted from the $12 million appropriated. I hope that he can, if the amount is to remain at $12 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This shifting of funds is an item that has been left to the judgment of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers in order that he might have some flexibility in respect to his appropriation, in order that he could keep urgent projects going on schedule. That was done with Old Hickory. So I am not in a position to say that the corps is going to have or is not going to have to repay that $2 million. But I think that the possibility with respect to that situation and the consideration of the decrease in the cost of the overall project makes it quite apparent that there is not going to be any harm to the orderly progress of this project by reason of the reduction that the committee did make.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure that the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee realize the importance of the completion date insofar as it relates to furnishing a pool of water for the steam plant near Gallatin. That is one of the urgent reasons why there should not be a delay in this project, also the fact that delay does not seem to be in the interest of economy.

May I ask one more question? If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and if the subcommittee should learn later on authenticated figures that there would be a delay, the gentleman would have no objection if this amount were written in the other body. Am I justified in making that assumption?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not prepared to commit the other members of the subcommittee and the probable conferees with respect to this, but it is not unusual at all that we do have additional information available to the committee by the time we go to conference, and we do try to take those additional facts into consideration in arriving at the final figure on every one of these projects.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman has always done that, and I am sure he will if such information subsequently is developed in this particular circumstance.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, we are very fortunate in the State of Alabama to have one of the finest river systems to be found anywhere. At the present time there are 728 miles of navigation channels, ranging from 3 to 9 feet in depth. In addition, 545 miles of river channel have already been authorized for improvement by Congress. Altogether, Alabama has over 2,100 miles of river channel. It also has one of the finest gulf ports at Mobile and 63 miles of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. These waterways handled 17½ million tons of commerce in 1951.

Reaching from Birminghamport to Mobile, the 467-mile Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway carries the bulk of all commerce moved on the inland waterways of the State. This waterway carries more commerce than all the other 27 navigable inland waterways in the southeastern coastal area from and including the Savannah River in Georgia to and including the Pearl River in Mississippi. With 1,929 miles of channel, these 27 waterways carried 1,681,802 tons of commerce in 1951, while in the same year the 467-mile Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway handled 2,712,891 tons of commerce. One hundred and fifty shippers used this waterway to move over 50 different types of commodities, and 20 different companies operated equipment on this river system.

Fourteen of Alabama's 67 counties are adjacent to the Warrior-Tombigbee-Mobile Waterway. These 14 counties contain 27 percent of the land area of the State, which directly supports 40 percent of the State's population. Thirty-five percent of Alabama's manufacturing facilities, employing 42 percent of the industrial workers, is also located along this waterway.

It would be misleading to state that the creation of this set of economic circumstances is coincidental. There are sound reasons why this condition exists, and the fundamental reason is the waterway itself. There is no question in my mind that this river system has added materially to the economic development of Alabama. Certainly Alabama's industrial and agricultural production is essential to the Nation's economy. For that production to prosper we need all forms of transportation, including a fully usable avenue of transportation in the Warrior-Tombigbee.

The development of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway has a long history and is certainly nothing new. A drive was begun as early as 1860 to have the Warrior River channeled. The first authorization was approved for the lower Tombigbee-Warrior in 1871, and the first three locks and dams on the Warrior River were built between Eutaw and Tuscaloosa in 1895. The initial phase of the channelization program continued through 1915 when the United States Corps of Engineers completed the last of 17 locks and dams on the waterway at a total construction cost of $9.1 million. Five of the installations were of concrete construction; the other 12 were timber.

Locks and dams 8 and 9, that will be replaced by the Warrior lock and dam, were built at the turn of the century—lock and dam 9 in 1902 and lock and dam 8 in 1903.

The foresight of those responsible for the development of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers for navigation is demonstrated by the large tonnage carried over the waterways today and by the growth of industrial centers along these rivers.

We have now reached a time when those locks and dams built at the turn of the century must be replaced. They are not only obsolete, but worn, in some instances to the point of being dangerous.

In order to modernize the water system from Mobile to Tuscaloosa, the Corps of Engineers have made a number of recommendations.

First. The completion of the Demopolis lock and dam.

Second. Construction of the Warrior lock and dam in the vicinity of present lock 7 to replace locks and dams 8 and 9.

Third. Construction of the Jackson lock and dam in the vicinity of lock and dam 1 to replace locks and dams 1, 2, and 3 on the Tombigbee River..

Now, what has been done to date on these recommendations?

First. The Demopolis lock and dam has, as you know, been under construction for several years. The 1st session of the 83d Congress appropriated $4½ million to continue this construction. Barring any unforeseen difficulties, this dam will be closed in August of this year, on schedule. When this is done, the job will, I understand, be about 80 percent complete.

Included in the bill now under consideration, you will find an item of $3.4 million which will virtually complete the Demopolis installation. The committee is to be commended for including this amount, as a reduction of funds at this stage of construction would certainly not constitute an economy. I therefore respectfully urge the House to appropriate the amount for the Demopolis lock and dam contained in this bill.

Second. The remaining lock and dam to be built between Demopolis and Tuscaloosa, Ala., is the Warrior lock and dam. This structure will replace locks and dams 8 and 9. Not only are these present locks and dams dilapidated and obsolete, but many believe they are in danger of partial, if not complete, failure.

The Corps of Engineers has stated they believe that in order "to maintain navigation for 10 years over the Warrior River from the Demopolis pool to the Tuscaloosa lock and dam, it will be necessary to either build the Warrior lock and dam or to replace lock and dam 9 with a new structure and rehabilitate lock and dam 8 with a 4-month closure of the waterway."

Additional information on the dangerous condition of these structures was disclosed by a study of lock 9 made only last November by J. M. Faircloth, professor of civil engineering at the University of Alabama. The study by Mr. Faircloth, one of the outstanding civil-engineering authorities in the South, was made at the request of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association with the permission of the Mobile district office of the United States Corps of Engineers.

The full Faircloth report has been thoroughly reviewed by the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and for that reason I will refer only briefly to Mr. Faircloth's conclusions contained in the last paragraph of his report.

Mr. Faircloth states that it is his opinion that—

> Both the lock and dam No. 9 are in exceedingly poor condition. To keep these structures in even a reasonable state of repair, that will permit the operation of the lock, must involve a tremendous maintenance effort—

Mr. Faircloth said:

> To put them in acceptable state of repair is obviously impractical and probably impossible. While this report does not intend to suggest imminent complete failure of either the lock or dam it does not rule out the possibility of such failure.
>
> There is, however, basis for the premise that even now there is not time for adequate replacement before failure. Structural failure to any degree will probably involve very little risk of direct damage to life or personal property, but one cannot refrain from contemplating the effect that even partial failure could have on the multi-million-dollar Government investment in the present Warrior River system as well as the effect upon private industry and the large geographical area dependent upon the facility.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that it will be necessary to spend about $6½ million dollars in the near future on locks and dams 8 and 9 in the event the Warrior lock and dam is not constructed.

Construction of the proposed Warrior lock and dam would save annually an estimated $157,363 in operating costs alone by the elimination of antiquated locks 8 and 9. The building of this dam would also eliminate multiple locktages now required by this waterway, and would thereby reduce considerably the time of travel. This would, of course, increase the speed of all water movements, including that of critical defense materials. At the same time, it would bring about a significant saving in transportation costs.

According to estimates made by the Corps of Engineers, the cost of building the new lock and dam to replace the two dilapidated locks and dams will be about $19 million. The new lock and dam is designed as a modern structure 110 feet by 600 feet with a maximum lift of 22 feet.

From a long range point of view, it would appear to be much more economical to begin immediate construction on the proposed Warrior lock and dam rather than to incur the tremendous expense of repairing and rebuilding the two antiquated locks and dams. At the same time, through construction of the Warrior lock and dam, we will be continuing the program already approved by the Congress for the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system.

These same conclusions were evidently reached by the Bureau of the Budget. After sending an engineer to Alabama last fall to examine locks and dams 8 and 9, the Budget Bureau included in

the 1955 budget an item of $2 million for the Warrior lock and dam.

This sum has been reduced by the Appropriations Committee to $1.5 million and I am, of course, disappointed that the committee felt it necessary to make any reduction whatsoever. Yet, I am very pleased that the committee has wisely recognized the urgency for the immediate construction of the Warrior lock and dam by the retention of a substantial sum in the bill now under consideration.

In order that a possible stoppage of traffic on the important Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway may be averted and in the interest of long-range economy, I respectfully urge the Members of the House of Representatives to approve the sum contained in this bill for the Warrior lock and dam.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express appreciation to this fine subcommittee for the consideration given to the testimony the witnesses presented that I caused to appear before the committee in behalf of projects in the district I have the honor to represent. However, the committee has not seen fit to recommend what we asked. I realize that the committee has many problems and cannot give every Member of Congress and every group everything the particular group would like to have. We feel that our projects were deserving and were entitled to what we asked, but the committee has taken a different position. I am not criticizing the committee, but just asking it to give the matter further consideration and study in the hope that we will get it through this Congress.

I refer particularly to the Texarkana Dam, where we had asked for a $4 million appropriation and received a $3 million appropriation instead, and the Ferrells Bridge project, that I feel is very much needed in the Southwest. We asked for $1 million to start the Ferrells Bridge project, that I feel is very much needed in the Southwest. We asked for $1 million to start the Ferrells Bridge project, but the committee decided it would not give us anything at this time. That is one project on which I am particularly asking this study, because I believe it is so deserving that eventually you will give us this starting and construction money for that very constructive and worthy project.

Notwithstanding our disappointment, we are obligated to the committee for the fine and impartial consideration that was shown our group when it appeared before your committee.

We cannot make appropriations without having the money to pay these appropriations; at least, we should not. Last year I voted against increasing the national debt limit, not that I was opposed to increasing it, because I was not, for, looking at it from my own standpoint, I feel if I vote for appropriation bills that aggregate more than the national debt limit it is my duty to vote to raise the national debt limit to take care of the appropriations that I voted for; in fact, I would feel that I was not doing just right if I did not.

I voted against it last time because there was plenty of money in 11,000 commercial banks on deposit to the credit of the Government which, if used, would mean we would not need to raise the debt limit. That is the reason I voted against it at that time. Subsequent events have proven that those of us who voted against it were entirely correct in our assumptions and our judgment, because they did have enough money without raising the debt limit.

The tax bill that is coming up soon affects our revenue; and if it affects our revenue, it affects the bill we are passing here today. We cannot carry out these deserving projects unless we have the money to do it. I want to mention just one feature of the tax bill and invite your careful attention and consideration of this one matter which I intend to invite to your attention.

SO-CALLED DOUBLE TAXATION

I merely want to invite your attention to a few things about double taxation, which I doubt has received the consideration of all the Members of the House. First, over a period of years I sought an answer to that question of double taxation on the corporation and the recipient of dividends. It did not seem right to me, and I tried to find an answer. But I could not find an answer and have finally come to the conclusion that we have double taxation throughout our tax system; that we cannot escape double taxation unless we resort to something that is worse, namely, the single-tax system. Therefore, as long as you do not have a single-tax system, you are going to have double taxation in one form or another. I think double taxation on the corporation and the recipients of dividends is less obnoxious and less objectionable than other forms of double taxation. For instance, with reference to corporations, they fix their prices on what they sell so that they will get a good return for their stockholders, a sizable amount for retained earnings and enough to cover their taxes. In other words, the prices are fixed taking into consideration the taxes that they must pay. You know that and I know it too. That is what is always done. Thus, the consumers pay those corporation taxes—they pay them directly in the price of the goods that they buy. If we go ahead and exempt the recipients of dividends of the stockholders, then neither the corporation nor the stockholders will be paying any tax at all. That would not be right. This particular provision in the tax bill is, I know, just the camel's nose under the tent. If it is a good theory, it should be expanded and should take the place entirely of the corporation tax. It is either good or it is bad. If it is good, we ought to work toward the elimination of double taxation. If it is bad, we should not even start it. We should not let the camel's nose get under the tent just a little bit as we are doing in this bill, otherwise it will affect our whole revenue system. For instance, when an individual buys an automobile he pays a Federal excise tax of let us say $100. He also pays the income tax on the money which he uses to pay for the car. He has either paid the tax or he is liable to pay the tax, and he will pay it. When he pays the Federal excise tax, he will be paying the taxes twice. That is double taxation. There is no way to escape it. The corporation benefits there more than the individual because if a corporation buys an automobile, it is charged up as a business expense, and the taxes deducted so the corporation is not at the disadvantage that the individual is in such a case.

Just consider the amount of taxes paid last year in the form of excise taxes. It amounted to over $10 billion. That means that practically all that money, which, of course, is on transportation, tobacco, and admissions to theaters, and purchases of furs and jewelry, and other things, amounted to over $10 billion last year. Practically all of it—except where the purchases were made by corporations—was paid by individuals and was double taxation. There you had billions and billions of dollars paid by the poorest people in our country. Why should we offer the recipients of dividends, the stockholders of corporations, this exemption and not offer it to the others? There you get into something else. I think the answer is that there is no satisfactory way to grant exact justice to all taxpayers. When I first went to the legislature of the State of Texas we had a tax bill up and one of the members of the committee explained it this way. He said, "I am going to be perfectly frank with you. We have brought in a tax bill to raise a lot of money, and in agreeing on this tax bill we are presenting to you a bill that will do what we would do if we were out on a farm picking a goose. In picking a goose you want to get the most feathers with the fewest squawks." That is exactly the kind of bill we are presenting to this Congress—one that will get the most money for the fewest squawks. That is the way most tax bills are—the most money for the fewest squawks. But there is only one way by which you can eliminate double taxation entirely and that is by the single tax. I do not believe there is one Member of this House who would want to adopt the single tax system. But that is the only way you can eliminate double taxation.

Furthermore, we must recognize there is no way of granting to all taxpayers exact justice.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no way to grant exact justice to taxpayers. There is just no way to do it. Over the door of the Supreme Court just across the street you will see this motto: "Equal justice under law," written plainly for everybody to see. That is right. That is all our American form of government promises our people, "Equal justice under law." It does not promise "exact justice." Exact justice is absolutely impossible.

Over the years that I have had the privilege of serving in this body, I have known Members who felt that they should have exact justice provided in every bill that came before this body.

Although they would agree with 90 or 95 percent of the bill that was presented, there would be something that they did not like, and they would vote against the entire bill. They were looking for exact justice, and that is something you cannot get. It is the same way in taxation.

A corporation that collects taxes from the people and then pays dividends to its stockholders is benefited in another way. They retain a large part of their earnings, retained earnings, upon which they have paid the tax that the purchasers of the goods paid to them to pay. They have paid that. But these retained earnings go into the corporate funds, and they are used by those corporations for expansion purposes; to put in new establishments, new businesses, and to expand existing businesses. If we continue to do that, I want you to keep in mind there is another thing to be considered. As these concerns get larger and expand more and more, and a unit is put in a little town in your district, the money to put in that unit of the big concern in your little town will come from retained earnings. That is costless capital to the concern that put that unit in. What chance has the little man in that little town in your district who must go to a nearby bank or lending agency and borrow money and pay interest on it—what chance has he got in competition across the street with that concern that has costless capital to use? He would have no chance at all. So whenever you begin to give more benefits and more opportunities for relieving them of more and more taxes, I think it is worthy of our consideration to just stop and think and see where we are going and where it will lead us. Will it lead us to industrial or business monopoly, Government control, a few people owning all the businesses of the country? It certainly will not lead to decentralization. So, in considering this double-taxation elimination, I hope you keep in mind those points. We just cannot possibly have a perfect tax system.

So in considering this tax bill I hope you carefully weigh and carefully consider that part which starts out upon a new theory, a new trend—not only a new trend but a new economic policy by our Congress of getting the camel's nose under the tent to stop what is called double taxation, but which I believe would cause more injustices and inequalities than it would correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the other members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Appropriations Committee, for their excellent work in consideration of the many projects covered in H. R. 8367. I am sure all of us realize the enormous task that they had in endeavoring to provide adequate funds for the numerous civil-functions projects coming under their jurisdiction, with the available moneys to cover them.

I call attention to a statement in the committee report, page 8, with reference to the projects of the Pacific northwest in which the people of my district, as well as in that entire area, are deeply interested:

> Funds in the amount of $29 million have been allocated for the Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington, a reduction of $5,100,000 in the budget request. This reduction is based in part on unobligated and unexpended balances estimated to be in excess of $6 million at the end of the present fiscal year. The project, however, is a part of the comprehensive Columbia River Basin program for which $267,300,000 has been authorized to be appropriated. Actual appropriations through fiscal year 1954 total $232,991,600. Funds requested in the President's budget were greatly in excess of the remaining authorization of $34,308,400. Rather than abritrarily reduce the various projects to be within the authorized amount the committee has limited the funds available for the Dalles project to an amount sufficient to place basinwide appropriations with the present statutory limit.
>
> The committee recommends $1 million for the lower Columbia River fisheries program, a reduction of $360,000 in the budget estimates. At the end of fiscal year 1954, $558,900 of previous appropriations is estimated to be unobligated. This amount, when coupled with the committee allocation will provide sufficient funds for an orderly continuation of this program.

While there is allocated for the McNary lock and dam $24 million and the Lookout Point River project $3 million, the Dalles lock and dam $29 million and the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington $27 million, we are disappointed in that $5,100,000 of the requested budget has been eliminated from the Dalles lock and dam projects and some $11 million, I am advised, from the amount requested to keep this project on schedule.

I was interested to note that the chairman of the subcommittee in his opening remarks stated that it was the belief of the committee that projects of this sort which were under construction should be completed as soon as practicable in order that the Federal Government might receive the revenues from the sale of hydroelectric power which they will produce when the generators are put into action. This is particularly true of the Dalles dam. It is my understanding that the $5,100,000 eliminated from the budget request as stated in the report, was due to the fact that there was no monetary authorization for it. I have a bill pending in the House, H. R. 8377, which will supply this deficiency and not only covers the $5 million deficiency but also $11 million to keep the Dalles project going full speed ahead to finish on schedule. I hope that before the bill reaches the President these items will be restored to the bill in order that the project may be completed on schedule at the earliest possible time so that revenues from power sales will be available to the Government and we will not be threatened with a blackout to meet the demands of hydropower in the area.

I appeared before the subcommittee urging that appropriations be allowed to complete these projects in the Columbia Basin area which are now under construction going forward without delaying their completion by failure to appropriate the necessary funds to keep up with the schedule of construction as recommended by the Army engineers.

My congressional district borders on the Columbia River and these projects now under construction on the Columbia River which provide hydroelectric power for the Pacific Northwest are vitally important to the economy of the whole area in which my district shares very heavily.

The Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects since their completion have proven to be profitable investments for the Government, which are returning revenues to the Government rather than losses as is the case in so many other public works constructed by the Federal Government. The Bonneville project is ahead of schedule on repayment to the Government for all of the cost allocated to power.

Unless construction on the Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph projects is continued according to schedule there will be a heavy dearth of hydropower in the Pacific Northwest needed to keep abreast of the increased demand for power. I urge that the appropriations required for continuing construction of these projects on schedule be allowed in order to forestall the hardships that will result to the area in the event that the power is not made available. As I will point out this will not result in losses to the Federal Treasury but will on the other hand make a profit for the Treasury from the revenues received from power from the completed projects. A year's delay which will result of the slowdown now proposed is adopted would bring about a loss of revenues from power of some $21 million.

The appropriation in this bill for the Dalles lock and dam project, Oregon and Washington, would result in a slowdown of construction whereby the schedule of installation of power generators will be delayed 1 year, so I am advised. Up to this point the fastest economical schedule in construction has been maintained. In the Northwest the need for additional electric energy remains urgent.

Also, for the Chief Joseph Dam project in Washington, the appropriation requires a delay of 1 year in installation of all generators after the first 4.

It is most important that these projects be placed back on schedule to avoid a brownout in the winter of 1956–57 and following years. If the present schedules should prevail and the Pacific Northwest experiences a dry year when streamflows reach minimum proportions, the shortage of power would probably be even more severe than we experienced in 1952, a dry year for lack of rain.

Under such conditions, the utilities and industries in the region would suffer a heavy financial burden inasmuch as they would require greater reliance on operation of high-cost thermal plants.

Any slowdown in this program would also cause a possible loss in production and employment. The industries in the Northwest which are dependent on power for their production would curtail operations or shut down, thereby causing a loss in output of products as well as wages for employees, with attendant reduction in tax collections by the Government. There is another important point I have considered in determining what course of action would achieve

economies. The delay in these projects will cause the Federal Government to lose over $21 million from power revenues, as I have said, which could never be recovered. Since a good portion of the total cost of these projects has already been invested, it would be sound business to install all the generators in accordance with the original schedules of the Army engineers in order that these projects may repay the investment of the taxpayers as quickly as possible.

The Bureau recommendations for the cut in the Dalles Dam which reduces the expenditure in the appropriation approximately $14 million is not in any sense a saving to the Government, but a loss. The loss to the Treasury from power revenues which would otherwise be received from this project if construction continues according to schedule would be $11 million. In the Chief Joseph Dam the loss to the Federal Government would be approximately $9 million, and the combined loss for the projects would be, as I have stated above, over $21 million from revenues alone.

In view of the fact that heavy expenditures have already been made by the Federal Government, good judgment would dictate that the projects should be completed at the earliest possible moment so that these revenues from power can be received into the Treasury and obviate the necessity of having a heavy investment held over for a year in idleness.

For these reasons I can find no economies achieved in a slowdown of these three important projects, and urge that sufficient funds be allotted to properly maintain the construction schedules on the basis of the urgent needs, and hope that before this bill reaches the President these cuts will be restored to the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], who previously spoke on this particular bill, in that it is certainly a nonpartisan bill. We, on this subcommittee, have worked long hours and many days in trying to perfect a bill which is extensive and in which many projects are considered.

It would be wonderful if we had more money, but the simple facts are we have to work within certain limitations. There are projects that are worthy throughout the entire United States, there are those that I feel personally are more worthy in the country than some that were proposed in the budget; nevertheless, it is a difficult job and certainly one that this subcommittee cannot really do properly to try to differentiate as to those which should be given priority of consideration.

I might say that our subcommittee spent last summer and early fall going through the West and down into California looking at civil-works projects of the Corps of Engineers. Late in the fall we spent some time on the Mississippi River from Memphis to New Orleans trying to familiarize ourselves with the problems of the folks in the lower Mississippi Valley. All these trips were most enlightening to us, and we found that there are many problems, and we have, I believe, been able to legislate more wisely for having taken the opportunity to go down and take a look at them.

I would like to say just one thing while I am here, and that is that if you will look through this particular bill you will find no project that involves the district of any member of this particular subcommittee. There are those of us who have projects in which we are vitally interested; there are those of us, shall I speak frankly at this time, who are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway project which will be before the House in a few days, we hope. We trust that those of you who have not taken the time will take the time to study the merits of this particular project. I assure you it is meritorious, as meritorious as many of the navigation projects which we have in this bill today. I think most of them in this bill are meritorious.

We have spent millions and millions of dollars on the Mississippi River, millions of dollars on the Ohio River, millions of dollars on the Monongahela River, and millions of dollars more to be spent on the Warrior and other navigation projects throughout the country. But every one of these particular projects is vital to the economy of the United States. They have done much for our entire economy.

I feel the same way about the St. Lawrence Seaway project, which can be proven to be meritorious in every sense, a project that will not only benefit a particular section of the country but will be of real interest to the entire economy. Certainly the port of New Orleans, the port of Houston, the port of Los Angeles, and the port of Baltimore have a direct and profound effect on Michigan, Wisconsin, or wherever you may live. I hope when the time comes that you will take the opportunity to see the merits of our particular project as some of us who have had the opportunity to study these projects that are before you in this particular bill have given to your particular projects, because we feel they have merit. We only want a project to be considered and sold on merit. A project that is not meritorious has no place before the Congress of the United States.

In closing may I say that I have enjoyed working with every member of this particular subcommittee and, as I said before, there have been no partisan considerations in this particular bill. A project must stand on its own merits or it will fall. We have a wonderful bill here. Of course, it cannot satisfy everyone. We never will present a bill that will satisfy everyone, but we do have a bill here that is as acceptable as one can be and we trust it will receive your favorable support.

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

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Fallon	McCormack
Addonizio	Feighan	Mailliard
Albert	Fernandez	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Fine	Merrill, Ind.
Barden	Fino	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett	Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.
Battle	Forrester	Morano
Becker	Friedel	Morgan
Bentley	Fulton	Morrison
Bentsen	Gamble	Moulder
Blatnik	Garmatz	Multer
Bolling	Granahan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Green	O'Neill
	Gwinn	Osmers
Bosch	Halleck	Patten
Boykin	Hardy	Philbin
Bramblett	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Brooks, La.	Hart	Preston
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	Radwan
Busbey	Heller	Reed, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Canfield	Holifield	Roberts
Carnahan	Holtzman	Rodino
Celler	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Chelf	Hruska	Scherer
Chudoff	Javits	Shafer
Church	Jensen	Sheehan
Clardy	Jonas, Ill.	Shelley
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Sieminski
Cooley	Kearney	Sikes
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N .Y.	Staggers
Curtis, Nebr.	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Thompson, Mich.
Dawson, Ill.	King, Calif.	
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Tuck
Dingell	Klein	Velde
Dollinger, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Warburton
Donohue	Krueger	Weichel
Donovan	Lane	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Latham	Yorty
Evins	McConnell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8367, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 314 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we heard some talk from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue about the Ides of March, the implication being that if the unemployment situation had not improved by that time the administration would give some serious thought to launching a program of public improvements.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of this subcommittee on appropriations dealing with the Civil Functions bill to the fact that I did not appear before their committee in behalf of a project in my district. If the administration is going into a program of public improvements in an effort to forestall increased unemployment, there is a project in my district, the Sutton Reservoir project, the contract for which can be let on 30 days' notice; and it could well be, I think, the first project that would go into an undertaking of this kind.

I am just calling the attention of the subcommittee to the fact that we may

later be asking for a special appropriation for some other projects if this program is entered into.

At this time I would ask the chairman of the committee for some information about which I inquired at the committee desk: I inquired as to how much present appropriation there is for the Army engineers to handle small projects involving the expenditure of less than $150,000; I would like to ascertain a comparison of the figures for fiscal 1955 with fiscal 1954.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have no new money at all in the 1955 bill for that purpose. But that does not reflect a desire on the part of the committee to discontinue that type of work. It does reflect an unexpended balance of something over $1,500,000 estimated at the end of the 1953 calendar year. I do not believe that I have the figures that would give the gentleman an estimate as of June 30th or the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. BAILEY. How does that compare, Mr. Chairman, with funds available in the current budget? As I recall there was some money available, an unexpended balance last year of something like $3 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is estimated that during the current fiscal year the obligations will be about $1,600,000, which gives you an idea as to the general scope of this program and of the carryover that is anticipated. The Bureau of the Budget recommended a small amount for that purpose and we have not provided any new funds for it.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman know what obligations are against the current funds in the way of projects under way at the present time?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; we would not have that.

Mr. BAILEY. Then there is no way of telling how much funds would be available after July 1 of this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We are not in a position to give that estimate at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I may be in a position to offer an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 8367, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

I commend Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions very highly for their good work over the many years it has been my privilege to observe their study and action in this most difficult field. Civil functions include flood control and navigation matters that affect the economy of our entire Nation and particularly the economy of the areas adjacent to our rivers such as the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers bordering Iowa. In wartime many of these projects were necessarily postponed even though their very postponement was expensive and harmful to the areas needing help. I have been particularly interested in three items in the field of civil functions throughout the years, namely, the rebuilding of the Keokuk Lock, the protection of farmlands along the Mississippi River by adequate construction of levees and drainage facilities and the Coralville Dam on the Iowa River which flows into the Mississippi River in my district. There are several other flood-control projects in which I have been interested but these three have been the most urgently needed.

All 3 of these projects have been in serious need of attention throughout the past 15 years, but World War II caused a long delay in getting to them and the Korean war caused a further delay that has been exceedingly hazardous. Throughout my many appearances before the Appropriations Committee and my discussions of these projects here on the House floor in years gone by, I have urged action at the earliest possible date because of the seriousness of the threat to the safety of my constituents both because of floods and because of navigation hazards.

This is the first time in many years that the Appropriations Committee has been able to consider these projects without the interruption of war, and the people of the First Iowa District are extremely happy to know that provision has been made for each of these projects in H. R. 8367.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions has in this legislation made good on their decisions of bygone years that these projects are meritorious, and I extend them my sincere commendation on their action.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of our subcommittee [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I hope to make my remarks on this bill quite brief. I do want to emphasize for just a moment what the Chairman said in his excellent opening this afternoon, and that is that we have felt definitely obliged—not because we think it is a good rule for all time—to keep within budget estimates on this bill.

It has not always been pleasant to do that. It has resulted, I think, in some inequities in the bill. But this is the first budget of this administration and we have a part of the over-all responsibility to keep within that budget under present circumstances. I would not like it to be understood that as far as I am personally concerned I believe we must always follow the rule of following the budget, either for minmum figures or for maximum figures.

I want to refer to two of these inequities. I am for the committee bill, I intend to support it, I do not intend, of course, to offer any amendments to it. But there are two mistakes which greatly concern me as the result of following this rule which I want to call to the attention of the committee, and to the Bureau of the Budget.

BEACH EROSION

One, dollarwise, is a very small program and a very small amount of money indeed. In the 79th Congress we passed legislation to help local areas with shore erosion problems, and we did that on the theory, as has been said to me by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], that salt water is just as wet as fresh water, and that when coastal areas of our country are flooded by ocean storms they are entitled to some protection as well as the river and interior areas. There is no territory in this country on any coast, the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, on the Gulf, or on the Great Lakes, that is not affected by this problem.

In following the recommendations of the Budget in this bill—and I support it with some reluctance—we are cutting down that entire problem, and, mind you, I am not talking about construction funds, because we never have except in one instance, recommended construction funds for these projects. We are cutting out the planning money for this very important national problem. We have $80,000 for general studies of the Federal Government, and $25,000 for cooperative studies. That is a very inadequate amount; yet, as small as it is, it would not take a great deal of additional funds to implement this present program because this is not, as I have said, a construction program yet. It is a study program. It has done an immense amount of good already by teaching our local areas what to do, because in our Beach Erosion Board we have a collection of experts in this country who know what to do to help one area without harming another area. That money has been well spent and must be increased in the earliest possible moment.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I commend the gentleman and back up everything he said about the necessity of this study. Only recently the Beach Erosion Board—and when I say "recently," it is within a week—filed a report of their study of the northern coastline of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, which is about half the coastline. It is an extremely interesting and comprehensive study, and the first one that has ever been made. It was made with the help and cooperation of the State authorities. I am told that the Beach Erosion Board is starting to make a similar study of all shorelines of the United States, including the Great Lakes, and the study is now underway in the district represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], for the southern coastline of New Jersey. It is a shame that we should reduce that budget. It is a small item, and I hope that in the wisdom of the committee an additional $100,000, which is all that is presently necessary, might be found to supplement the appropriation, and do this work.

Mr. HAND. I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman because, of course, he is one of the pioneers in this problem, and had a great deal to do with the original authorizing legislation passed in the 79th Congress.

I want to emphasize that while the gentleman from New Jersey and I are both deeply concerned because of the nature of our districts, representing, as we

do, the entire coastal area of New Jersey, that this problem is by no means confined to New Jersey. It is found everywhere where there is a developed coast, from the oceans to the Great Lakes of this country. There must be 125 Members concerned with this problem, and I hope that eventually Congress will give some real and adequate attention to it, and that quite soon.

THE DELAWARE RIVER

The second problem to which I would like to make a brief reference is not a problem which is of direct concern to my district, but it is a problem of great concern to the economy of this country. Again, in following our budgetary limitations, we have, I think, temporarily neglected very necessary repairs and improvements to the Delaware River, one of the great ports of this Nation. I would like to read just a very brief extract which is found on page 574 of part II of the hearings, in which a witness from Philadelphia said in part:

Back in 1938 Congress authorized a width of 1,000 feet in Delaware Bay and 800 feet starting in the river up to the naval base at Philadelphia, with a depth of 40 feet for the entire length, and with auxiliary anchorages.

Now, there never has been a time since that authorization in 1938, except for 1 or 2 years during the war, when wartime traffic had to have it, that the authorized depth of 40 feet has been maintained in the Delaware River, and the situation now has gotten into such a deplorable state that you cannot say there is a controlled depth of as much as 35 feet, and the charts will indicate that in many cases the depth is less than 29 feet.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am cognizant of the fact that the gentleman who is addressing the Committee is well informed on the subject on which he speaks. As far as it relates to the Delaware River, he has that intimate knowledge that enables him to speak with a great deal of authority. He understands the importance of the Delaware River. It has become an even greater industrial valley in the last 2 years and is growing at a tremendous rate. Some recognition of that fact, of course, is being given to the lower Delaware, but we are also interested in that portion of the Delaware between Philadelphia and Trenton. Could the gentleman give us some information as to the status of that matter with respect to appropriations that will enable us to utilize the river to the fullest extent for the benefit of the people and of the great industries?

Mr. HAND. I will say to the gentleman I am glad he raised that point. That section of the river has no status before the Committee on Appropriations at this time, but it is pending in immediate plans of the Army engineers, and I take it it will be pending before the Committee on Public Works at this session. Now, that is a very necessary improvement, because that will serve what the gentleman has referred to as the expanding Delaware River Valley, the "Delaware Valley Empire," and its many plants. There are 8,000 plants now functioning on the Delaware River, 8,000 industrial plants. One is the huge Fairless Steel Works recently constructed in the vicinity of Trenton. So that section of the Delaware is going to be crying for improvement, and justly so.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, it is very regrettable that the importance of that portion of the river has not been recognized by the Congress up until this time. I am encouraged, however, by what the gentleman says, that we may expect some consideration of the subject, probably at this session of Congress.

Mr. HAND. I hope so. I know of the gentleman's great interest. Let me say further that the other section of the river to which I was previously referring has gotten into such serious shape that $12 million in property damage was done recently as a result of the collisions of vessels trying to scrape their way along that inadequate depth, which is not sufficient for larger vessels. This is an immediate problem. The other problem is also one for present consideration.

The committee has given careful attention to this matter and has been concerned by it. I call your attention to a section of the committee report, page 10, where we say:

The committee is deeply concerned with the status of maintenance in the Delaware River from Philadelphia, Pa., to the sea. This project has been constructed to an authorized 40-foot depth, but lack of maintenance over the past several years has considerably reduced this depth and the effectiveness of the channel. The committee expects the Corps of Engineers to review the tentative allocation—

I stress that because this is not a limit in this appropriation bill. This tentative allocation must be reviewed by the Corps of Engineers—

and allocate such funds as will be required to maintain the project to a degree of effectiveness consistent with the needs of the vessels transiting the channel.

If there is any river in this Nation which requires attention at this time it is the Delaware. I trust that the Corps of Engineers, within the limit of their overall appropriations, will do everything they possibly can to make navigation safe and efficient for this port which, as my friend pointed out a moment ago, has doubled in importance in recent years. It has always been one of the greatest ports in the United States.

There are just 1 or 2 things I should like to add in conclusion. The chairman earlier mentioned that we have a problem for the future, in that we have got to provide proper local contributions to all these projects, local contributions of a more equitable character than are now being afforded to the various flood-control and other projects throughout the country. I suggest to the thinking of the committee at least that we must emphasize navigation projects, and it might not be unwise to require some contribution by way of tolls. I am suggesting the possibility of a study of tolls for these river transits as we now have tolls in the Panama Canal and as it is proposed to have tolls in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

These are just a few random thoughts that I have in mind in connection with the bill. The bill, on the whole, is a very good bill. I expect to support it, although in these two respects it disappoints me bitterly. I trust that the Congress will realize that if I, as a member of the subcommittee, am disappointed, they might be able to swallow some of their disappointments, too, and go along with this this year, in the best interests of the national welfare.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin what I have to say by complimenting the subcommittee, as so many of our colleagues have already done, on doing an excellent job under trying conditions. I know it is a difficult job to sit on that subcommittee and parcel out or divide out the limited amount of money which is available under the budget estimates for the vast work carried on under the civil functions appropriations throughout the United States.

I do not disagree with the subcommittee or its able chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], in attempting to follow the recommendations of the budget. I think we must have some limit or program to follow in handling the affairs of civil functions. If we do not follow the budget recommendations we are in grave difficulty to keep within any kind of reasonable limit the expenditures that we are called upon to make in the Congress.

This bill in my judgment ought to be called not the Civil Functions Appropriation Act but the National Development Act. It should be called this because the expenditure of every penny of the money in this bill is intended for the purpose of developing the internal resources of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here and listened to the speakers and those who have addressed inquiries to the members of the subcommittee, I have been impressed by the fact that this bill covers the length and breadth of the whole United States. I checked the list of the projects of the various States of the Union and I find every section of the Union represented by expenditures under the terms of this bill.

The total amount allocated for all purposes is only $276 million. I have seen the time when in this Congress we appropriated some $600 million for the joint purposes of flood control and navigation. It is cut down now to $276 million, which I think is an all-time low in appropriations for this purpose under the President's budget. Of this $276 million, only $34 million is placed in the bill for navigation.

I have seen the vast developments in Europe. I made a study of water navigation in Europe. I found how useful this type of development for a country may be. In fact, I have figures in my pocket which I am going to use at some later date showing the developments in different parts of Europe, even since World War II, for navigation purposes. They far outstrip the expenditures which we

are making in the United States in this bill.

So I say this bill is national in character. It is a national development bill. It affects California, Oregon, Massachusetts, New York, and every part and section of the country. Still, it is cut to a very low overall program.

I am not against any of the programs presented here. I think they all have worthy objectives.

I may say there is not a single project in this bill that is located within the district it has been my pleasure to represent in the Congress of the United States. It is true that the Red River bank stabilization may affect parts of my district. We have projects in Louisiana to be built, one of which has already been mentioned, and I think it is extremely important. It certainly ought to be studied now, and in time it should be authorized by this Congress. That is what is called the Old River closure project. It is extremely important.

I was born down in the section of the country where this project is to be located. I know the area where the Atchafalaya and the Red Rivers come together in confluence with the Mississippi River. I know that if the channel of the Mississippi ever chooses to use that of its tributary Atchafalaya as the main channel into the Gulf of Mexico, great cities like New Orleans and Baton Rouge and other cities along the lower Mississippi are going to be left off the main stem. I think a project of this sort is of transcendent importance. I am sure when we get to the point that this project is authorized and is ready to be presented to the subcommittee, the subcommittee will give it the same conscientious effort, thought, and consideration they have given these other projects.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank my distinguished colleague from Louisiana for endorsing the Old River control-structure project. I have received encouragement from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], on that project, which is in my district. The committee is going to consider the Old River closure project, also the St. Lawrence Seaway project. I certainly hope the committee will report both bills favorably so that we may have an opportunity to vote for them on the floor of the House. I again thank my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank my colleague from Louisiana. He will find that I do not limit my support to projects located within my home district in the State of Louisiana. This is an excellent project, and it should receive the careful and serious attention of the Congress.

There is another project which I have in mind of great importance. It is a project which was approved in 1946. It is the Red River lateral canal. Some people do not realize that the Red River of the South is one of the great streams of the globe. It is 1,200 to 1,300 miles long. It flows from New Mexico all the way through Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana to its confluence with the Mississippi at Old River and the Atchafalaya at Angola. This project would lateralize for canal purposes the Red River from the city of Shreveport to the mouth of the Red River at Angola. This is the project which has already been approved by the engineers. It is a project which is thoroughly feasible and economically justified by figures which were sent up at that time and approved. Those figures have been verified since then. It is a project, likewise, that should receive careful study and thoughtful consideration and proper action on the part of the subcommittee. I commend it to the consideration of the subcommittee in handling the work of the civil-functions appropriation bill. I hope construction will soon start on this worthy project.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting each and every item of this bill. I am supporting them because it is a bill of national character, with projects all over the United States. I am a vice president in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. We are interested in development throughout the United States. I myself would have liked to see the amount expended for these purposes larger, but I am not critical of the subcommittee. The subcommittee followed the Bureau of the Budget to a large extent, and they have brought to the House a bill which, of course, I am going to vote for.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, addressing oneself to an item in this bill is somewhat like making a speech to a judge to reverse his decision when his decision is against you and is already in his desk drawer. Actually, however, I do think there is some occasion for the Congress to consider very carefully the way we have been handling these problems. When I say that, I must first pay the highest compliment to the members of the subcommittee. I have the highest regard for them. I know they perform each year a most unpleasant task. Sometimes the courage of the committee is not conducive to a great deal of comfort, since hundreds of witnesses are heard each year, and after all is said and done, we come out with the budget figures as they were to start with. Now, like most who have addressed ourselves to this problem, I, too, have a problem that is covered, or should be, as I see it, by the terms of this bill. In 1936 the Congress of the United States passed a large flood-control project for the Yazoo Basin in my State. The Congress put that program through and it became law. It provided for the building of several large dams and reservoirs, but in order to have a well-rounded project, included in it, too, was the straightening out of streams below those reservoirs, and certain related work, so that those in the area affected could live with it. Beginning a few years later, Congress appropriated funds, and, prior to my coming here, two big dams were built with the result of flooding thousands of acres of fertile land in my district.

When I came here I went before the Appropriations Subcommittee in an effort to prevent the construction of the other two dams and reservoirs in this area because of their local effect. At that time I was told that all of this was 1 project; that since the Government completed the 2 dams the committee could not justify the elimination of the other 2 dams which were such a vital part of the 1 overall project including the related works I now support. So they have constructed the other two major dams and the Government has flooded additional thousands of acres within this area.

Then, when I went to the Corps of Engineers for these related works, which are so vital to the overall project, and so vital to the people of that area, at first they told me, "You will have to wait until we have completed the dams." Now that they have completed the dams their statement is that we have to wait for these related projects until they open up the outlet to these streams.

In this bill the Corps of Engineers has not provided any detail concerning any substantial work toward opening up those outlets which have to come first, before they will do the related projects in the area, according to their statements, so that the people there can live with what the Government has already done.

In connection with starting out any overall project which the Congress approves and authorizes because it is an overall project, it must have some definite fairness in it. We need some way to see that the funds appropriated are used to carry forward the related parts of this program at the same time as the major items, else we will find ourselves in the fix that I am here. Funds are made available in this bill for the lower Mississippi. Funds are made available for flood-control projects, but the related, relative minor works, that are so vital to my people and a part of the overall project, leave us where we are apparently being held behind the completion of major works in other areas.

As I am told, the Budget Bureau has not frozen these funds to the point that we could not get relief in my area from the engineers, but the direction and the decision as to where the funds are to be used is left to the Corps of Engineers and the president of the Mississippi River Commission. We expect to do everything we can to get the Corps of Engineers to review and revise the allocation of funds so as to treat our area with some degree of fairness. But I would like to say, if we are to have a limited amount of money each and every year, and we know we always will, if within the limits of the money that we find we can appropriate for the lower Mississippi or any other part of this country, you are to leave it up to the Corps of Engineers as to where the limited funds go you will always find that they want to build the big structures. Who wants to dig a ditch when you can build something big of concrete and steel and write your name on it? I say it is a mistake when the discretion is left to the Corps of Engineers as to where to use, what many of us

think is too small an amount of money to start with, because they will always use the money to get the big structures started somewhere else, rather than carry out the responsibility which the Government has to build the relatively minor parts to complete a project that they have already started.

Now this is not a criticism of this subcommittee. It is a criticism of the system whereby we in the Congress virtually turn over to the Budget Bureau, first, the public works program, and if they do not say you can have it, it is all out. Then if the Budget Bureau says you can have it, then leave up to the Corps of Engineers the determination of what to do with such funds as are appropriated, because always they will be building, primarily the big project they can put your name on, which will stand there for years to come, even though that major project half completed in my area might have carried with it related smaller projects about which there is no great acclaim and no place to write one's name.

I hope to address myself to the Congress tomorrow under the 5-minute rule. My plans are not to offer an amendment, but I do think the Congress and the Government is committed, having forced the construction of four major dams and reservoirs for our area, to proceed to the completion of this project so we can live with it. I hope we can convince the Corps of Engineers as to the wisdom of doing that and of their responsibility about it. I understand that is in line with the law as it stands, although it is not contemplated by the Corps of Engineers at the present time.

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

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the upper Kentucky River Valley, a region of rugged hills surrounding fertile valleys, was among the earliest developments in the State. Daniel Boone traversed this valley to establish the first permanent settlement of Boonesboro on the Kentucky River.

The agricultural development in the area had denuded the slopes of a great part of their forests with the result that the flood stage was substantially raised. These floods became not only a hazard to the agricultural valleys but a serious menace to the industrial centers of the coal development in that the increase of the flood stage seriously damaged these trade and industrial centers. In 1938 the Congress authorized a comprehensive flood-control plan including the Buckhorn Reservoir and the Jackson Cutoff. Before actual construction could begin on any of these authorized projects, war interfered. All efforts were bent toward strengthening our national economy for a wartime effort. The demand for coal continued high and the region suffered from periodic spring floods followed by fall droughts creating conditions that discouraged the development of new industries that would normally thrive in an area that produced millions of tons of coal each year.

The inevitable result is that a one-industry economy has developed, subject to the usual cycles of one-industry communities. During the past 2 years, the coal business has suffered severely and at the current time almost one-third of the industrial workers in the region are unemployed. The fact that the known coal reserves are more than adequate for 200 years at the current rate of production, gives good reason to believe that this condition is temporary but that does not lessen the current problems. At this time, the upper Kentucky River Valley does not produce enough to sustain the population of the area. This constitutes an economic drain upon the country as a whole and the waste of manpower resulting from the unemployment is a national loss that can never be recovered.

The 1955 budget for the civil functions of the Department of the Army includes planning funds for the Buckhorn Reservoir and the Jackson Cutoff. These two projects, essential for flood control in the Kentucky and Ohio River Valleys, can now be constructed by using the unemployed labor of the area which otherwise will be a total economic loss to the country. It will not only give these industrious workers a chance to earn their own living but also relieve them and their families of untold suffering. The conditions in this valley have long since passed the recession stage and constitute a major depression approaching that of the early thirties with thousands of families actually starving. The Surplus Commodity Corporation is distributing some of the agricultural surplus food in the area, but this is both inadequate and unsatisfactory even though it may prevent death or serious illness among the unemployed. These people only ask for a chance to work for their own living. The only immediate opportunity for this is the construction of these much needed flood-control projects.

It is very important that our Army engineers be given the necessary funds to complete the plans at the earliest possible date so that construction can begin during this local recession, at which time the cost will not be a drain on the national economy but an actual saving of our national resources.

The same holds true for the construction of the proposed navigation dam in the vicinity of Greenup, Ky. The construction of this dam is very much interwoven with the canalization of the Big Sandy River because it is a matter of common knowledge that we need better harbor facilities.

The completion of this project would provide a wider, deeper, and more stable pool which would be a decided benefit to navigation interests, and harbor and terminal facilities. A considerable reduction in lockage and travel time would result from the replacement of 4 structures with 1. Harbor facilities along the Big Sandy River would be considerably improved for several miles above the mouth by raising the pool elevation.

The construction of this dam would also reduce the flowage damage chargeable to the Big Sandy River project; as a result, reduce the cost of the canalization of the Big Sandy by making the Big Sandy navigable several miles upstream. In other words, lands which would be flooded out would have to be acquired under the cost of construction of this project instead of being chargeable to acquisition costs under the Big Sandy River project.

Building the dam will make the Big Sandy River navigable for commercial navigation approximately 12 to 15 miles above Catlettsburg going up the Big Sandy, or approximately one-half the distance between Catlettsburg and Louisa, Ky.

This dam will increase the marketability of our eastern Kentucky coal by making available suitable sites for the construction of unloading facilities to transfer the coal from rail cars to barges up the Big Sandy as far as the site of old lock No. 2. At the present time there are no facilities on the Kentucky side for unloading coal from rail to barges. On the West Virginia side we do have such facilities at Kenova, W. Va. The West Virginia coal now has an advantage on account of the switching charge that would be added to the price of Kentucky coal.

The construction of this dam would provide a most feasible spot for unloading on the Big Sandy between locks Nos. 1 and 2. These unloading facilities would undoubtedly be installed forthwith and would enable our eastern Kentucky coal to reach the industrial markets along the Ohio River.

The canalization of the Big Sandy is the complete answer to markets for Big Sandy coal. The construction of this dam in the meantime will be of great assistance to our whole area. This will make available many places where new industries interested in using a river can advantageously locate.

On the 29th of November 1949, in Huntington, W. Va., I spoke in behalf of the proposed navigation dam in the vicinity of Greenup, Ky. I think my concluding statement at that time is applicable today:

> I am very happy to make this statement in behalf of the Greenup Dam. It seems to me that the construction of this dam, in order to have a great industrial region in this area, is indispensable from that standpoint. It also occurs to me that with the construction of this dam in a few years to come that towns on the Ohio will grow tremendously because of the steel plants and other plants that will be recommended by the Defense in Washington to be constructed in areas of this type, that the surrounding areas for hundreds of miles will benefit from the construction of this proposed dam. It seems to me that it will furnish employment for many men with the improvement of the harbor facilities and the growth of industry in this region. It seems to me that employment will increase tremendously in this area. For those reasons, and it is natural with the prospective construction of the Big Sandy Valley canalization project, that we need better harbor facilities in this area, and for those reasons I have appeared here this morning at the request of Dr. Thompson to put in my appearance in behalf of this proposed project. I think it is a step forward and the people in this area should get behind it and assist the Army engineers in every way possible to get it constructed at the earliest possible date. I thank you.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there is not anyone in the Congress who has been and is more interested in seeing to it that all subversives and security risks be removed from Federal employment than I. I have been impressed in recent weeks with stories that I have seen in the press, heard on the radio, seen and heard by way of television, wherein various astronomical numbers have been used as to the number of so-called security risks that have been fired from Federal service.

I have been caused to wonder seriously as to just how these large numbers were arrived at until last Saturday morning when a colored man by the name of Ezekiel Johnson, residing here in the District of Columbia, formerly residing in my district, being from Waycross, Ga., came to my office and told me this story.

He said in effect that in September last he was accused of having engaged in the so-called bug racket here in the District of Columbia. Engaging in the "bug" racket is defined by statute as being a crime. Johnson was taken to the United States District Court where he was duly tried and acquitted of the charges filed. He thought he had been given a clean bill of health.

To his utter consternation, dismay, and surprise, shortly afterward he was haled before a so-called Security Hearing Board which had been established within the General Services Administration and was peremptorily dismissed from the Federal service as a security risk.

This led me to the conclusion that perhaps many more of these so-called security risks about which the press, radio, and television commentators have talked in recent weeks, were determined to be security risks on just such specious ground as having been accused—mind you, he was not convicted—he was accused and exonerated by the United States District Court, of some such crime as was Johnson.

I would like to say this, knowing something of the propensities of this man's particular race, that if this number of 2,200 or 2,400 is to be increased on some such basis as this—in other words, if the Federal employees in the District of Columbia are to be fired from the Federal service for having been accused of playing the "bug," then the complexion of Federal employees in the District of Columbia is about to undergo a very rapid bleaching process.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Will you explain what this "bug" is?

Mr. WHEELER. It is synonymous with shooting craps. It is gambling by lottery.

Mr. DORN of New York. Did the gentleman talk to anyone else besides the man who came to his office about this?

Mr. WHEELER. I have a certified record of the hearing, signed by all three members of this security board.

Mr. DORN of New York. And the only charge is what?

Mr. WHEELER. They say in their memorandum of the hearing that they are not constrained to pay any attention whatsoever to the fact that this man has been exonerated in the United States district court.

Mr. DORN of New York. Was there any other charge besides this?

Mr. WHEELER. No other charge.

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

Mr WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that Vice President NIXON on Sunday night almost exonerated all of those who had been separated from the Government rolls? Did the gentleman hear the Vice President's remarks on that?

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman may place his own interpretation on the effort of the Vice President.

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

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

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman think that the man in question, being a colored man, is subject to any particular discrimination?

Mr. WHEELER. I asked him if he had been to the NAACP. He said he had, but he was advised that since no discrimination was involved he was beyond the vale of their help.

Mr. AYRES. I have a colored gentleman who may be faced with similar circumstances, and if his case proves to be the same as the gentleman's, I would be glad to work with the gentleman from Georgia on this matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not attempting to justify this man's participation in the so-called bug racket; I am attempting to say he was charged with having violated the law and was exonerated, then on the basis of that charge and that charge alone was labeled a security risk.

The thing that impressed me about this Negro man's story was this: He said, in effect, to me: "If they had fired me for having played the 'bug' I would not have complained, but they have placed the label on my record which causes my friends and neighbors and my prospective employers to think I am a Communist. I have had 15 years of service in the Federal Government, 3 years of which was in the military service in World War II. I am not a Communist, nobody has accused me of being a Communist, but they have labeled me with this all-inclusive term security risk and my neighbors and friends think I am a Communist."

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am mystified and intrigued by the term "bug racket." Is that a social game?

Mr. WHEELER. It is sometimes referred to as the numbers game. Perhaps that is where the gentleman, Mr. Stevenson, in Miami about a week ago last Saturday, got this nomenclature, "numbers racket."

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be well to consider the fact that developments on the rivers of the Northwest and the rest of the Nation are not a regional but a national concern, for their benefits in lower cost and more plentiful production of food, aluminum, and manufactured items are benefits to the whole Nation.

Therefore the threatened delay in completion of the Dalles Dam is of importance to all of us, so to all the Members of this House I say that this wasteful, needless delay is wrong and should not be allowed. I have opposed in committee, and must oppose here, in the strongest terms I know, this unbusinesslike, unnecessary dragging out of the work at The Dalles.

There are only three large sources of quick new power on the Columbia River, the greatest untapped power source in the country. The sources are the new Federal dams now in progress at The Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph. Other sources, however good they may be, are not quick sources. They will take time to develop. That is why I deplore the false economy represented in an appropriation throwing completion of The Dalles off schedule by a full year.

We have an urgent need for power in the Pacific Northwest. In the winter of 1952–53, low water in the Columbia River reduced the power output to a point where brownout restrictions were necessary, generating equipment was run at overload capacity, power for aluminum production had to be interrupted or else replaced with expensive steam generation, and I am told that power companies rejected applications from any potential new industries for power in excess of 500,000 kilowatts.

I have been told that the Bonneville Power Administration estimates that the growth of the Northwest by 1958 will require 4 million kilowatts of new power. If this pace of growth continues, I feel sure that the 1,092,000 kilowatts from the Dalles Dam will be needed as soon as we can get it.

The project at The Dalles is underway. The money to be spent must be spent sooner or later. To delay the project a year does not save money. It costs money. It costs money in extra carrying charges on the investment in the dam. It costs more money and the waste of a resource to let the water of the river run past a partly completed dam for a needless year, without taking from the water the power that is there. The sooner the dam begins to operate, the sooner its cost will be repaid.

A job that has been started is a job that should be finished. It is unbusinesslike, simply for the sake of a delay—not an economy, a delay—in the invest-

ing of $16 million to sacrifice a year's time at the Dalles Dam.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Committee on including the 25 percent increment for the workers in the Canal Zone in the bill under consideration. I notice, however, on page 13 of the report of the committee, a criticism leveled at the report by Booz, Allen & Hamilton, management consultants. They made an extensive survey of conditions in the Canal Zone and their conclusions are the same as those I arrived at as a result of a recent visit to the Panama Canal. As you know, I am a member of the subcommittee on the Canal Zone of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and I felt it my duty as a member of that committee to investigate the living conditions, the cost of living, and the manner of life of the residents of the Canal Zone who work for the United States Government. I found that they do not have equal housing conditions with their fellow workers in the United States, that the conditions under which they live are much below the conditions of similar workers in the United States, and that the climate cannot be compared to the climate in any part of the United States.

The children of the workers do not have the same advantages as do similar children in the United States. When they grow up, they are unable to find suitable employment in the Canal Zone. They must be separated from their fathers and mothers and return to the United States. The employees themselves cannot own their own homes because there are no homes for sale in the Canal Zone, the workers not being permitted to purchase land.

When the employees are retired, they must leave the home that they have known practically all of their lives and to which they have become accustomed because the United States will no longer rent an apartment to them.

I do not believe the committee should have taken a small extract from the report of the management consultants. The overall contents of the report amply sustains the findings that the Canal Zone workers are entitled to a 25-percent increment, and I wish to make the positive statement that as a result of my investigation, I found they are definitely entitled to the 25-percent increment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am an enthusiast for navigation facilities. More than a half century ago we started in an attempt to dam and lock the Ohio River. Around 30 years ago we finished the last one of these navigation facilities. Since that time the Ohio River has increased its potential so far as tonnage is concerned as much as 10 to 12 times. Some of these dams are 50 years old. Many of them are becoming obsolescent. Many of them have gotten to the point where it is almost impossible to give complete navigation facilities, and much delay is caused because of this fact.

There are now being planned, as some Members know, some high level dams. We have one on the Ohio River which is near Gallipolis, Ohio, which has displaced about 3 or 4 of the dams mentioned above. There is another one planned at Greenup, Ky., which would likewise displace about four of the above dams.

The cost of operation of these large roller-type dams is comparatively small when we take into consideration the total cost of the number of dams that are eliminated by reason of the replacement with the larger dams.

It seems to me that good judgment in the allocation of funds for rivers and harbors improvements, particularly for these inland waterways, would be to devote more funds toward the improvement of the already existing facilities rather than to try to find new areas in which to spend money.

Ohio River navigation is an established fact. It is a paying thing. All up and down the Ohio River we have been able by reason of water transportation facilities to locate very splendid industrial facilities of one sort or another. They are going to have to depend largely upon water navigation. If we are going to protect these installations which we have been occasionally referring to as installations in the modern American Ruhr, then we must not forget the fact that these existing facilities must be taken care of.

I appreciate the effort that has been made by this committee in using the funds as best they saw fit, and I think, too, they have done a good job. But I do feel we should not neglect navigable streams that already exist, that have been built up to the point where they are already a going concern, and which should be furnished money with which to maintain their facilities.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's district, as he knows, runs along the Ohio River for probably 100 miles.

Mr. NEAL. Two hundred miles, almost.

Mr. JENKINS. And mine runs about 175 miles. He and I both have seen the growth of navigation on the river. There is no question but what the growth of navigation from Parkersburg to Cincinnati has increased far more than 10 times. The traffic is terrific. The need for these facilities, especially at Greenup Dam, is imperative.

Mr. NEAL. It is imperative.

Mr. JENKINS. We just have to have it.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I concur with my colleague from West Virginia in his remarks on the need for this improvement at the Greenup facility and the Ohio River below Huntington. It is a great waterway and it will be immensely useful to the coal industry of West Virginia in providing cheaper transportation. I think it should be included in a future budget.

Mr. NEAL. The gentleman has made an excellent statement.

One of the things that interferes with present-day traffic on the Ohio River is the fact that these dams are not only obsolete, but even on as large a stream as the Ohio River, one that usually has enough constant flow to keep up a good pool, by reason of the fact that we do not have anything in excess of these dams that are being put out of condition occasionally may require flooding from one dam to the other in order to permit navigation. These are the things on which we need the expenditure of some of our money. I hope the time will come when we can curtail some of our foreign expenditures and devote that money to our own American waterways that need it so much.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for the money placed in this appropriation bill for the continuation of the work on the flood wall at Vincennes. I wish to report that the work on this flood wall is progressing in an excellent manner. While there is considerable work yet to be done after this appropriation is exhausted, the work will have progressed far enough that we would be able in a few years to realize security from floods at Vincennes.

I wish that every member of Congress could understand the importance of this project, and know the gratitude of the people of Vincennes for this most worthwhile project. I trust that this body will accept the recommendation of the Committee and permit this project to go forward.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a comment by the gentleman from West Virginia prompted me to take this time to discuss a project we have in Stockton, the Stockton Deep Water Channel. The harbor was finished in 1933 so it is 20 years old now. Many millions of tons of military and civilian freight have passed up and down that river between our city and San Francisco Bay.

When the turning basin was made in 1932 it provided for the type of vessel of that day. Since that time the vessels plying up and down that river have increased almost 200 feet in length, and they have a lot deeper draft than they had before. I have taken up with the Budget Bureau the enlargement of that turning basin to fit the present-day vessels.

Mr. Hughes has listened to me very courteously. I have furnished him the data which shows the necessity for the enlargement of the turning basin. We are putting up $600,000 of our own money to help pay for this cost. We have the necessary land, or options on it, required for the enlargement of the turning basin and for spoils areas. I

am hoping that Mr. Hughes or the Budget Bureau will authorize the project as one of the new starts we have heard so much about.

I know this committee could not consider this project because it was not in the budget recommendations, but perhaps over in the other body they will give serious consideration to the enlargement of the turning basin of the Stockton Deep Water Channel. It is my opinion that the data I furnished shows conclusively, and they were furnished me by the port director of that port, that we must have a larger turning basin, which will take good care of the new type of vessels, some of which are 500 feet long and over, that are plying up and down that river. This is a service that the shippers and ship operators are entitled to.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, once again I wish to urge that the House approve the request for appropriations for projects in the Twenty-fifth District of California, as contained in the bill we are now discussing.

In order that lives and property in my area may be protected, it is most important that work continue on San Antonio Dam, and Whittier Narrows Dam. In addition, funds should be appropriated to initiate construction of flood-control projects in Eaton Wash, Arcadia Wash, and Sawpit Canyon Wash. The forest fires in southern California earlier this year have created a flood hazard greater than has existed previously. Already large amounts of mud and debris have been washed down from the foothills into the Duarte area, and also in Monrovia which is in the neighboring district represented by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point my letter to the Secretary of the Army of December 23, 1953, and also my statement before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations.

Hon. ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As the time is approaching for submission to the Congress of the President's budget for the fiscal year 1955, I wish to direct your attention once again to the urgent flood-control needs of the 25th Congressional District. Since the Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for flood-control projects, I am directing this communication to you with the request that the following facts be considered when funds are requested by that agency.

As you know, there are a number of projects which vitally affect the welfare of the people of this district. In my home area, Arcadia, we are intensely interested in alleviation of the flood hazard in the El Monte Avenue area. It is my understanding that this project is connected with the improvement of channels for Arcadia, Eaton, and Rio Hondo washes. I urge that these projects be given highest priority.

In the eastern section of the 25th district, I am deeply concerned with the need for sufficient funds to continue work on San Antonio Dam. The tremendous growth of population in the Pomona Valley area has increased the potential hazards in the event of a flood such as occurred in 1938.

Funds will be needed also for the completion of the Whittier Narrows Dam which has been under construction several years.

The expansion and development of industrial facilities in the 25th district which are participating in the national defense program have brought in thousands of families and caused the construction of a vast number of new homes. Many of the industrial plants and houses would be imperiled if there should be another flood disaster. The protection of lives and defense facilities, therefore, makes these flood-control projects well justified.

You may rest assured that I shall be happy to cooperate with you toward the completion of these projects which are so important to our rapidly expanding area in southern California.

Most sincerely,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. HILLINGS. I am pleased to be here with my colleagues and I concur with the statements of Mr. Griffith and Colonel Hedger, both of whom have performed an outstanding service in my opinion to the State of California and to Los Angeles County.

I have always received the finest cooperation from these two gentlemen and their colleagues serving the needs of the people of my district.

I regret that I was unable to see the committee, Mr. Chairman, when it visited southern California. By having been on the scene you have a good picture of our problem there.

As Mr. HIESTAND has already said, the lives of the people in the foothill areas, 500,000, have been placed in jeopardy by the recent rains and floods. The fires in the mountains burned away some of the protection which we normally might have had.

My district, as shown on the relief map, is under the two dark patches here which indicate the forest fires. We are interested in the protection that we would have from further construction and completion of the San Antonio Dam, the Whittier Narrows Dam, and of course, the washes that are outlined on the map, such as Eaton Wash, Arcadia Wash, Sawpit Canyon Wash, and so forth. Particular attention should be directed to flood hazards in the Duarte area.

I would appreciate very much the serious consideration of the committee of these problems. I would like to say again that I concur in the statements previously presented.

I would like to insert a resolution of the City Council of the City of Arcadia, Calif.

I thank you gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. HILLINGS. We will be glad to accommodate you.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

" 'Resolution 2324

" 'Resolution of the City Council of the City of Arcadia, Calif., urging prompt action to alleviate flood hazards

" 'The city council of the city of Arcadia does find and resolve as follows:

" 'SECTION 1. That the city of Arcadia has long been plagued with floodwaters arising above and beyond the confines of the city of Arcadia. That the city of Arcadia has for many years led all cities and communities in this area in the amount of new residential construction, with the result that the city is almost entirely developed to single-family residential use. That such development has necessarily decreased the amount of natural percolation of rainfall and has greatly increased the runoff of surface waters within the city of Arcadia. That the surrounding areas have likewise experienced a phenomenal development, which has added to the conditions creating flood problems and hazards. That the city of Arcadia has neither the jurisdiction nor the means by itself adequately to remedy the situation.

" 'SEC. 2. That the people of the entire County of Los Angeles have recognized the urgency of the flood conditions prevailing in this county, have appreciated the inability of cities and communities to solve these problems on a purely local basis, have plainly indicated the desire of the overwhelming majority to remedy the conditions wherever they exist by voting a $179 million bond issue for flood-control purposes, and that work has already commenced to carry out the purposes of such bond issue.

" 'SEC. 3. That in some locations and particularly in the city of Arcadia, the effectiveness of the county flood-control program is largely dependent upon and at times must await completion of flood-control projects by the United States Army Corps of Engineers. That the Arcadia Wash in the city of Arcadia and the Eaton Wash adjacent to the city are and for some seasons have been the cause of alarm to all the residents of the community and of considerable damage and loss to many persons in our area. That the immediate completion of the Federal projects concerning the Arcadia Wash and the Eaton Wash is of utmost concern to the city of Arcadia and its inhabitants, and is of absolute necessity and must be completed before other correlated flood-control projects in this city can either be completed or become effective.

" 'SEC. 4. That the city manager be and he is hereby instructed to send copies of the within resolution to Vice President-Elect RICHARD NIXON, Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL, Congressman HILLINGS, Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, urging prompt action by all in power to expedite Federal flood-control projects concerning the Arcadia Wash and Eaton Wash, and requesting the integration of related county programs therewith, to the end that the ever-increasing hazard of flood damage to life and property may promptly be reduced to a minimum.

" 'SEC. 5. The city clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution.'

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Arcadia held on the 6th day of January 1953, by the affirmative vote of at least three councilmen, to wit:

"Ayes: Councilmen Dow, Hulse, Kennett, Nottingham, and Schmocker.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: None.

"W. M. CORNISH,
"City Clerk of the City of Arcadia.

"Signed and approved this 6th day of January 1953.

"JOHN A. SCHMOCKER,

"Attest:

"W. M. CORNISH, *City Clerk."*

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

The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 1.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 8367) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their

remarks in connection with general debate on the bill H. R. 8367.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having introduced the original authorization for additional flood protection for Beardstown, Ill., I wish to publicly thank the Civil Functions Subcommittee members and Chairman DAVIS for its inclusion in the appropriation bill before the House of Representatives today. I want the full House Appropriations Committee and Chairman TABER to know of my personal appreciation.

The protection is needed and justified or I would not have introduced the authorization resolution.

The subcommittee, the full committee, and the House of Representatives will never regret the included amount of $400,000 for the prosecution of work on the flood project at Beardstown, which is so badly in need of repairs and strengthening.

This Illinois city of 6,000 people, with its complement of churches, schools, factories, stores, and railroad shops, I am sure, join with me today in even more appreciation than I can transmit.

THE DANGERS OF JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, events in recent years have focused public attention on the threat of communism, fascism, and other foreign political philosophies which constantly seek to undermine, overthrow, and destroy the constitutional freedoms of our people. This is as it should be; in recognizing these evils and in taking the necessary steps to eradicate them from our society, we are merely acknowledging the truth of the old axiom which says that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Because of conditions as they exist in the world today, the perilous international situation that prevails, with the clouds of another global war hanging ominously overhead, it is only natural that our thoughts and activities should be directed toward preparation for war and the preservation of American institutions against the constant, real, and deadly challenge of Russian communism and its evil menace, both external and internal. Nor is it less important or natural that we should be giving serious thought to our domestic economic condition, which finds us owing more than all of the nations of the world combined, and with taxes taking about a third of our income for the operation of our Federal, State, and local governments.

With all these problems confronting us, their dangers to freedom and liberty conceded, the average American citizen would probably construe the greatest threat to liberty and our form of government to be that presented by communism. But, without meaning to minimize communism as a very real and serious threat to our form of government, or to individual liberty, I would point to another which I believe to be even greater. That is the purpose of my taking the time of the House this afternoon.

Because communism is foreign, and is in direct opposition to the basic fundamentals of America's system, it finds itself when properly exposed, without support or sympathy among the great masses of the American people. It is held up to the public, and properly so, as the enemy of freedom and a challenge against our institutions. The same becomes true with respect to any other foreign inspired philosophies when their real nature becomes apparent to our people.

Unfortunately, other equally insidious and lethal assaults on our form of government are not so easily detected, nor are they so readily apparent to the masses of our citizenry. Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution provide that our Federal Government shall be composed of three separate and distinct branches, each to be independent of the others, with each to discharge certain duties and to have such powers as are specifically delegated to them by the Constitution. The checks and balances so exercised by each of the three branches in relationship to the others were designed to insure that one would never be permitted to infringe upon the rights and duties and prerogatives of the others. Further, another limitation upon the powers of the Federal Government—including all three branches—was imposed by the 10th amendment, which positively and affirmatively denied to the Federal Government the exercise of any power not specifically delegated to it under the Constitution, such powers being reserved to the States or the people. The language of that amendment is clear, precise, and easily understandable. In order that I might not be misunderstood in what I say here, or that I be accused of using certain portions of that amendment out of context, I am including herewith the complete text of that amendment:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Therefore, in order to provide a maximum of individual freedom to our citizens, the framers of the Constitution set up a sort of double checks and balances system: The checks of each branch of the Federal Government against the abuse or usurpation of power by the others; and the reservation to the States of such powers as are not specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

It is in the complicated check and balance system, the division of governmental authority and prerogatives and powers between the Federal Government and the several States individually, which has prevented the tyranny of any one over the other. It is this system which has made impossible the concentration of powers in the hands of a few which leads inevitably to an oligarchy, makes impossible any semblance of government by will of the people.

This then is the real strength of our form of Government, enabling it to endure throughout the years as the first, and now—the oldest—representative form of government in the world. It is because our Founding Fathers believed that government derives its just powers by consent of the governed, and proceeded to write that belief into our basic law in unmistakable language and in no uncertain terms, that the great citadel of freedom which is America has been able to attain its present position as leader of the free world.

What shall we gain in America, if we repel the alien forces which seek to destroy us from without, and yet permit our Constitution to be destroyed from within, so that we shall indeed have lost the very thing we have striven so long to preserve?

At the risk of being labeled a rabble rouser, or a demagogue, or a reactionary or what-have-you, I am going to say that our constitutional processes are under real and immediate danger of being destroyed—not by some predatory enemy from without or by foreign agents from within; but rather, at the hands of the highest Court in the land, whose sworn duty it is to guard zealously those processes.

In recent years, since an ambitious Chief Executive sought to change, and did change, in effect, the status of the Court from its constitutional nature as a separate and independent entity of our Government to that of a mere arm of the executive branch, that great tribunal has lost much of its former prestige. Certainly it is not looked upon with the same great respect, an almost reverent regard, which it enjoyed and deserved in former years. Nor has the present occupant of the White House added stature to that sagging body through the appointment of a political friend whose greatest claim to judicial or professional qualifications for such appointment is to be found in the fact that his personal influence conceivably might have meant the difference between victory and defeat for his party in his home State.

When we reach the place where we can no longer expect or depend upon our courts to interpret the law as the law is, but must predicate our activities on the presumption that the Court may rule according to what it thinks the law should be and without regard for what it is, then we shall have no such thing as law. You may say that such will never be the case; that our people will never permit that to come about; that such fears are entirely groundless. My friends, I wish it were not true, unfortunately, the Court must already answer to history for some of its recent decisions.

If you were a judge, and you should be asked to base your decision in any case on premises alien to the law, or to disregard the law in rendering your opinion, should not you consider such to be an insult? Certainly, I would consider it an insult, perhaps of such gravity and brazenness as to be in contempt of court. Yet, listen to what was argued in a recent case before the Court, the case of Henderson against Southern Railroad:

> What we seek is not justice under the law as it is. What we seek is justice to which the law, in its making, should conform.

Mr. Speaker, that quotation was taken from the brief filed by the Justice Department of our Government, presenting itself as a "friend of the Court." Actually, it was presenting itself as a political spokesman for the administration of President Truman, then in power, to argue a case in which the United States Government could have had no interest whatsoever, other than to serve the political needs of the administration.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that plea of the Attorney General and the Justice Department was the most brazen insult to the intelligence and integrity of the Court that had ever been directed against it. Where is the authority of the Supreme Court to interpret the law—not on the basis of what it is, or what it was intended to be—but rather, to draw from the law what is not in it, and make it conform to what they think should be in it? Obviously, for the Court to follow such a course is for it to assume the powers of legislation, specifically given to the Congress and it alone, by the Constitution.

Did the Court resent this kind of phony argument and promptly repudiate it by decree? Obviously, it was a confession by the Justice Department that the law was on the other side and did not support their position. On the contrary, the Court overruled every precedent and completely overturned existing law to find in favor of the complainants—the side espoused by a politically minded Attorney General and his Justice Department. In doing so, the Court wrote new law; it legislated by judicial decree that which Congress had refused to enact.

Nor was that the first time in recent years that this body has overreached its authority to upset existing law in order to construe or remake it as they thought it should have been. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], listed in a speech in this House on June 18, 1953, 32 such decisions rendered between 1937 and 1953, each of which overruled a case previously decided by the Court, construing the Constitution and established principles of law accepted and relied upon by both the courts and the public for long periods of years. At this point I will insert this list showing the names and citations of the overruling case, the year in which it was overruled, the vote by which it was overruled, the name and citation of the overruled case, the year in which that case was decided, the vote by which it was decided, and the age of the overruled case at the time it was overruled:

Overruling case	Term	Vote	Overruled case	Term	Vote	Age (years)
1. *Helvering* v. *Producers Corp.* (303 U. S. 376)	1937	5 to 2	*Gillespie* v. *Oklahoma* (257 U. S. 501)	1921	6 to 3	16
			Burnet v. *Coronado Oil & Gas Co.* (285 U. S. 393)	1931	5 to 4	6
2. *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U. S. 64)	1937	8 to 0	*Swift* v. *Tyson* (16 Pet. 1)	1842	Unanimous	95
3. *Graves* v. *N. Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466)	1938	7 to 2	*Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113)	1870	8 to 1	68
			N. Y. ex rel. Rogers v. *Graves* (299 U. S. 401)	1936	8 to 0	2
4. *O'Malley* v. *Woodrough* (307 U. S. 277)	1938	7 to 1	*Miles* v. *Graham* (268 U. S. 501)	1924	8 to 1	14
5. *Madden* v. *Kentucky* (309 U. S. 83)	1939	7 to 2	*Colgate* v. *Harvey* (296 U. S. 404)	1935	6 to 3	4
6. *Helvering* v. *Hallock* (309 U. S. 106)	1939	do	*Helvering* v. *St. Louis Trust Co.* (296 U. S. 39)	1935	5 to 4	4
			Becker v. *St. Louis Trust Co.* (296 U. S. 48)	1935	do	4
7. *Tigner* v. *Texas* (310 U. S. 141)	1939	8 to 1	*Connolly* v. *Union Sewer Pipe Co.* (184 U. S. 540)	1901	7 to 1	38
8. *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100)	1940	Unanimous	*Hammer* v. *Dagenhart* (247 U. S. 251)	1917	5 to 4	23
			Carter v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238; limited)	1935	do	5
9. *United States* v. *Chicago, M. St. P. & R. Co.* (312 U. S. 592).	1940	do	*United States* v. *Lynah* (188 U. S. 445; overruled in part)	1902	5 to 3	38
10. *Nye* v. *United States* (313 U. S. 33)	1940	6 to 3	*Toledo Newspaper Co.* v. *United States* (247 U. S. 402)	1917	5 to 2	23
11. *California* v. *Thompson* (313 U. S. 109)	1940	Unanimous	*DiSanto* v. *Pennsylvania* (273 U. S. 34)	1926	6 to 3	14
12. *Olson* v. *Nebraska* (313 U. S. 236)	1940	do	*Ribnik* v. *McBride* (277 U. S. 350)	1927	do	13
13. *Alabama* v. *King & Boozer* (314 U. S. 1)	1941	8 to 0	*Panhandle Oil Co.* v. *Knox* (277 U. S. 218)	1927	5 to 4	14
			Graves v. *Texas Co.* (298 U. S. 393)	1935	6 to 2	6
14. *State Tax Comm'n* v. *Aldrich* (316 U. S. 174)	1941	7 to 2	*First National Bank* v. *Maine* (284 U. S. 312)	1931	6 to 3	10
15. *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (317 U. S. 287)	1942	do	*Haddock* v. *Haddock* (201 U. S. 562)	1905	5 to 4	37
16. *Brady* v. *Roosevelt S. S. Co.* (317 U. S. 575)	1942	Unanimous	*Fleet Corp.* v. *Lustgarten* (280 U. S. 320)	1929	Unanimous	13
17. *Jones* v. *Opelika* (319 U. S. 103)	1942	5 to 4	*Jones* v. *Opelika* (316 U. S. 584; reversed on reargument)	1941	5 to 4	1
18. *Oklahoma Tax Comm'n* v. *U. S.* (319 U. S. 598)	1942	do	*Childers* v. *Beaver* (270 U. S. 555)	1925	Unanimous	17
19. *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624)	1942	6 to 3	*Minersville School Dist.* v. *Gobities* (310 U. S. 586)	1939	8 to 1	3
20. *Federal Power Comm'n* v. *Hope Gas Co.* (320 U. S. 591).	1943	5 to 3	*United Railways* v. *West* (280 U. S. 234; overruled in part)	1929	6 to 3	14
21. *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid-Continent Co.* (320 U. S. 661)	1943	5 to 4	*Leeds & Catlin Co.* v. *Victor Talking Machine Co.* (*No. 2*) (213 U. S. 325; limited).	1908	Unanimous	35
22. *Mahnich* v. *Southern S. S. Co.* (321 U. S. 96)	1943	7 to 2	*Plamals* v. *Pinar Del Rio* (277 U. S. 151; overruled in part)	1927	do	16
23. *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649)	1943	8 to 1	*Grovey* v. *Townsend* (295 U. S. 45)	1934	do	9
24. *United States* v. *Underwriter's Assn* (322 U. S. 533)	1943	4 to 3	*Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168; overruled in part)	1868	do	75
25. *Girouard* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 61)	1945	5 to 3	*United States* v. *Schwimmer* (279 U. S. 644)	1928	6 to 3	17
			United States v. *Macintosh* (283 U. S. 605)	1930	5 to 4	
			United States v. *Bland* (283 U. S. 636)	1930	5 to 4	15
26. *Angel* v. *Bullington* (330 U. S. 183)	1946	6 to 3	*Lupton's Sons Co.* v. *Automobile Club* (225 U. S. 489; rendered obsolete by prior change in law).	1911	Unanimous	35
27. *Sherrer* v. *Sherrer* (334 U. S. 343)	1947	7 to 2	*Andrews* v. *Andrews* (188 U. S. 14; overruled in part)	1902	5 to 3	45
28. *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern Co.* (335 U. S. 525)	1948	Unanimous	*Adair* v. *United States* (208 U. S. 161)	1907	6 to 2	41
			Coppage v. *Kansas* (236 U. S. 1)	1914	6 to 3	34
29. *Commissioner* v. *Church* (335 U. S. 632)	1948	6 to 3	*May* v. *Heiner* (281 U. S. 238)	1929	Unanimous	19
30. *Oklahoma Tax Commission* v. *Texas Co.* (335 U. S. —)	1948	Unanimous	*Choctaw & Gulf R. Co.* v. *Harrison* (235 U. S. 292)	1914	do	34
			Indian Oil Co. v. *Oklahoma* (240 U. S. 522)	1915	do	33
			Howard v. *Gipsy Oil Co.* (247 U. S. 503)	1917	do	31
			Large Oil Co. v. *Howard* (248 U. S. 549)	1918	do	30
			Oklahoma v. *Barnsdall Corp.* (296 U. S. 521)	1935	do	13
31. *United States* v. *Rabinowiz* (1950) (339 U. S. 56, 66, 85)	1949	5 to 3	*Trupiano* v. *United States* (1948) (334 U. S. 669)	1947	5 to 4	2
32. *Joseph Burstyn, Inc.*, v. *Wilson* (1952) (343 U. S. 495, 502).	1951	Unanimous	*Mutual Film Corp.* v. *Ohio Industrial Comm'n* (1915) (236 U. S. 230).	1914	Unanimous	36

Within a few days, or weeks at most, the Supreme Court will render a decision in several other cases in which it has been asked by the administration now in power to upset precedent and to establish, by judicial fiat, new principles of law never approved by Congress or the people. These are the highly publicized cases involving the right of the several States to maintain separate, but equal, school facilities for their children. I refer to the case of Davis against County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, and companion cases.

In these cases the Attorney General has attacked the separate, but equal, doctrine as being in violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, despite the fact that it has been upheld consistently by the courts since the War Between the States.

For 50 years at least, minority pressure groups and other leftwing elements have constantly petitioned Congress to legislate their wishes into being without regard for the rights of the several States. They have been persistent in their demands, even to the point, on occasion, of threatening or bringing about the defeat of conscientious Members of Congress who insisted on placing the Nation's welfare above that of these groups.

Having failed in their efforts to compel Congress to surrender to their demands, they have turned in desperation to the other branches of our Government, in the hope that the President or the courts would be willing to bypass Congress and enact these laws by judicial decree or Executive fiat. Thus far, they have succeeded to a marked degree. Can it be that our Supreme Court will permit itself to become a vehicle to be used by minorities in their desire to control the majority? Can it be that the Supreme Court will let itself become the means by which legislation rejected by Congress may be forced on the people notwithstanding?

I am not so much concerned over the immediate effects of an adverse court ruling in these school cases as I am over the effect such decisions may have on

the future structure of our Government. Having sworn to protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and regarding that oath as inviolable, I feel compelled to protest, as vigorously as I know how, what I consider to be open attempts to destroy the meaning of that Constitution.

Until recently, no one questioned the constitutional validity of State laws which provided for separation of the races: This had long since been decided by the Court. Nor do we in the South, where these laws maintain, intend that our separate school systems shall become integrated school systems regardless of what the Court might rule. We can handle that problem when and if it becomes necessary, and we will maintain separate schools, even if it means the elimination of public schools in favor of a private segregated-school system. In event of such a contingency, could the Court honestly say that it is serving the best interests of the Negroes by an antisegregation ruling, when it means that they shall have lost that which they already have?

Throughout the South, legislatures are striving diligently to provide equal school facilities for Negroes and are succeeding at a rapid pace. This is being done in spite of the fact that Negroes, who constitute a large percentage of the population of those States, nevertheless, pay an infinitesimal proportion of the taxes that go to the support of the schools.

Who is being made the victim of unfair discrimination through segregation if facilities and opportunities are equal? The Supreme Court, in the case of *Gong Lum et al.* v. *Rice et al.* (275 U. S. 78), in a full bench decision, held that no unfair discrimination existed "when equal facilities for education are afforded both classes." This opinion was written by Chief Justice Taft, an Ohio Republican, who refused to permit himself to be influenced in the discharge of his judicial duties by the pressures of political expediency. Listen to this, quoted from the Court's decision in that case, rendered in 1927:

> The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear.

Plessy v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), decided in 1896, is perhaps the controlling case establishing the validity of the separate-but-equal doctrine. In this case, the Court, in upholding the validity under the 14th amendment of a Louisiana statute requiring the separation of the white and colored races, speaking of permitted racial separation, said:

> The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced.

Can the law be stated more simply or clearly? Certainly not. In the case of Gong Lum et al. against Rice et al., which I mentioned a moment ago, the Court, referring to the validity of State separate school systems, said:

> Were this a new question, it would call for very full argument and consideration, but we think it is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

In support of their opinion, they cited the following host of previous opinions of the Court:

Roberts v. *City of Boston* (5 Cush. (Mass.) 198, 206, 208, 209); *State ex rel. Garnes* v. *McCann* (21 Oh. St. 198, 210); *People ex rel. King* v. *Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438); *People ex rel. Cisco* v. *School Board* (161 N. Y. 598); *Ward* v. *Flood* (48 Cal. 36); *Wysinger* v. *Crookshank* (82 Cal. 588, 590); *Reynolds* v. *Board of Education* (66 Kans. 672); *McMillan* v. *School Committee* (107 N. C. 609); *Cory* v. *Carter* (48 Ind. 327); *Lehew* v. *Brummell* (103 Mo. 546); *Dameron* v. *Bayless* (14 Ariz. 180); *State ex rel. Stoutmeyer* v. *Duffy* (7 Nev. 342, 348, 355); *Bertonneau* v. *Board* (3 Woods 177, s. c. 3 Fed. Cases, 294, Case No. 1,361); *United States* v. *Buntin* (10 Fed. 730, 735); *Wong Him* v. *Callahan* (119 Fed. 381).

In the case of *Cummings* v. *Richmond County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528)—another case in point—Mr. Justice Harlan, in delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

> We may add that while all admit that the benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, should the Supreme Court invalidate the separate but equal doctrine in favor of forcing an integrated school system upon the States, it would have to disregard entirely and completely the doctrine of stare decisis. It would have to create new law by judicial decree, and thus bypass the intent of Congress and the letter of the Constitution of the United States.

We, who are citizens of States in which separation of the races is maintained by law, bitterly resent the implication that such separation is an unfair discrimination. In the State of Mississippi, for instance, where 49 percent of the population is colored, there is no agitation among either race for abolishing the separate school system. On the contrary, our negroes realize that the southern white man is their friend, and is helping them to promote the interests of their own people. They realize that segregation does not necessarily make for second-class citizenship; rather, it provides an opportunity for both races to promote their own welfare with help from the other race. Abolish segregation, and you pit Negro and white against each other; you rekindle the flames of racial hatred which have long since been extinguished in our part of the country. Abolish segregation, and I predict that you will see a rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan.

Take the word of the greatest Negro, perhaps, of all times, Booker T. Washington, who said:

> In all things which are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

To the Democrats who claim to be disciples of Thomas Jefferson, an abolitionist himself—he said, in speaking of the slave problem:

> Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than these people—
>
> Meaning the Negroes—
>
> are to be free; or is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.

Perhaps Jefferson went further along those lines than we should go today. But he did reflect the thinking of the writers of our Constitution, who recognized the incontrovertible fact that a mongrel America cannot live in peace; nor can a mongrel America hold the respect of the world.

The great founder of the present day Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, the man to whom Republicans refer as the Great Emancipator, whom they claim as the political patron saint of the American Negro, debating the slave issue with Douglas at Springfield, Ill., on June 26, 1857, said:

> A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as an immediate separation is impossible, then the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

Segregation has obtained in this country for so long a time that it has become an established tradition or institution. It has been approved, not only by the people who established it, but by the courts and the Congress. Suddenly, the highest tribunal in the land is called upon to sweep away the bulwark existing in our social and political orbit. They are being asked to deny to our people the fundamental constitutional right of a continuation of this established, approved, and successful practice.

America has grown great and all powerful under our time-honored social and political system. There is a reason for this: The people have an inherent right to shape their own respective destinies. The architects of our dual system of constitutional government purposefully retained in the people themselves through their duly elected representatives the right to legislate laws, repeal laws, and inaugurate policies for the general welfare of all the people. Nowhere can that right and authority be found except in the legislative—and not the judicial—branch of our Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have lived in the South all my life, and have been raised among Negroes. I know how to get along with them, as do my neighbors. We are their friends, and they are our friends. I feel that any step which is taken to abolish the separate school system in our States, and to destroy the independent school system which we have set up for our Negroes, will do the cause of the Negro more harm than they suffered as a result of Reconstruction. But,

as I said earlier, we do not fear the immediate effects of such an adverse court ruling; we are fully capable of handling that problem. However, in the interest of America's future, in the determination that our tripartite form of government with its checks and balances may be preserved for posterity; in the interest of preserving the constitutional rights of the States to order and control their own affairs, it is to be vigorously hoped that the Supreme Court, in deciding the public-school cases now before it, will disregard the pressures of political expediency, and confine itself to ruling on the law as the law is written.

If they follow that course, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. As he has so well pointed out, whenever the laws of this land are to be changed, that is a function which falls exclusively to the legislative branch and not to the judicial branch.

I have watched with great concern the increasing encroachment of the judicial branch upon the legislative branch of our Government within recent years. And as the gentleman has so clearly pointed out in his remarks, whenever one department of our Government usurps the functions of another department of our Government, that means a serious breakdown of the principles upon which we have established our Government; to provide liberty and freedom to the individual and the preservation of individual rights through our system of State governments in this Republic.

The gentleman has rendered a great service by pointing out these things to the Congress and to the Nation. I have on different occasions taken the floor here to point out the same things, and I want to commend the gentleman on the service which he has rendered by making these remarks today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. In my opinion, he is one of our great Americans.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman on his contribution to Americanism. I should like to point out, also, that this administration which has advocated States' rights so much, has ordered the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, to issue a directive to abolish the segregated school system on 21 bases in 7 Southern States. This, in direct conflict with the Constitution, or State laws, of those 7 States.

I immediately called Secretary Wilson and I was referred to Secretary Hanna. I was then referred to an assistant and I requested, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, for them to point out one instance, since they were charged with the defense of this country, wherein that had added one thing to the defense of America.

I further asked the question if it was strictly a political pressure move from the White House, such as we encountered under President Harry Truman's administration. I was requested to give them a day or two to make a reply. I was called over the telephone.

The only answer I have had to this date was that it came from the White House. Even though President Eisenhower himself stated that he would not use the military for a reform of this country until the civilian population went through with this question of segregation, apparently their own leadership, although they say they are not recommending the civil rights program as did the Truman administration, are moving in leaps and bounds along that line; and while America sleeps, believing he meant what he said, I am fearful what the consequences may be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has spoken the truth. I think it is obvious that both major political parties have surrendered completely to the demands of the minority groups. Our only hope for salvation lies in the Supreme Court; and if the Supreme Court refuses to discharge its sworn duty under the Constitution, to uphold and defend that Constitution, then I think that our Government is doomed.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might associate myself as being in complete agreement with the lucid and forceful argument just made, or in the process of being made. I should like to say further that the argument that is being presented to the House currently by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will, by generations yet unborn, be used as a classic in the study of constitutional processes; that is, unless some Supreme Court later were to decide that this sort of treatise should be banned from the public schools—as they have banned even the reading of the Holy Writ.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am flattered by the gentleman's remarks; I am most grateful.

INDOCHINA: DO WE KNOW WHAT GOES ON THERE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country do not want another Korea; they do not want another war. At this time, however, they are concerned about our policies which may lead to another war without the formal declaration of one.

The President must be conscious of this apprehension, for on last Wednesday at his press conference he said:

> There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it.

Of course he was talking about the formality of the constitutional requirement that Congress must declare war. The important question, however, is not related to this formal act but policies that lead to a state of war prior to a request for a declaration of war. The record is clear that in the past Presidential requests have always followed prior acts of war under international law. This was true in World War I and true in World War II.

Our people are asking the question about possible involvement in view of action heretofore taken in Indochina where we have increased our aid for military assistance and where we have recently assigned military planes and personnel. If we are not at war in Indochina, we are dangerously close to it, declaration or not. This raises the question as to when we are at war.

One authority on international law says that war may be fairly described as a condition of armed hostility between states and that it may exist prior to the use of force. In Indochina we have not yet reached that state. It does not follow that the absence of force means we are not at war.

Mr. Speaker, there are different types of war. A general war is one in which opposing states regard the whole domain of the other as hostile territory, and thus prosecute the war against any or all of that domain on a general basis. A limited war, on the other hand, does not require a declaration of war in general terms, and may be conducted on any scale which the belligerent states may choose. Between 1798 and 1800, for example, the United States conducted a limited war against France, American vessels being authorized by Congress to resist searches by French vessels, to capture armed French vessels found anywhere on the high seas, and in other ways to counter the depredations committed by the French against American ocean commerce during the war between France and Britain. No authority was given to capture unarmed French vessels or to conduct land operations.

Just as there are different types of war, so are there different ways in which, according to international law, a state of war may be initiated—first, by the commission of hostile acts by one country directed against another with the design of making war upon it; second, by any unequivocal act on the part of the government of a state, indicating that it regards the conduct of another, whether or not deemed by the latter to produce such an effect, as having brought into being a condition of war; third, by noncompliance with an ultimatum containing a declaration or clear warning that war will ensue in the event of failure of the respondent state to yield to demands made upon it within a specified time; and, fourth, by declaration of war.

Regarding this last method of initiating a war, the Constitution of the United States vests the power of declaring war in Congress exclusively. But in the past this power has been exercised only to the extent of declaring the existence of a state of war, usually after relations with the hostile nations have reached a stage at which such congres-

sional declaration was inevitable; and in every case the declaration has been in response to a request by the President.

In actual fact, the powers of the President in this matter are considerable. Although the Congress is empowered by the Constitution to declare war and provide for the support of the Armed Forces, the powers of the President, as commander in chief and as chief executive, have long been recognized as a dominant influence in bringing about declarations of war and in directing the Armed Forces in time of war. Moreover, these formal powers of the President have been supplemented heavily by congressional delegations of power during periods of national emergency. The declaration by Congress in 1846, for example, that "by the act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States," came after President Polk had sent American troops into territory over which the two governments were negotiating and within which American troops were fired upon by Mexican forces. The beginning of the Spanish-American War likewise was precipitated by Presidential actions, the battleship *Maine* being ordered to Havana harbor by the President during a period of crisis in the relations between Spain and the United States.

According to Professor Corwin:

> Our 4 great wars—all great for their results, 3 of them great for the effort they required of the country—were the outcome of Presidential policies in the making of which Congress played a distinctly secondary role. I mean, of course, the war with Mexico, the Civil War, and our participation in World War I and World War II.

To this might be added the hostilities in Korea, which the United States entered on order of the President. The support of this action by subsequent congressional enactments might possibly be construed as endorsement, but the decision to commit United States military forces was made by the President.

Once the United States has become involved in a struggle with a foreign power the emergency powers exercised by the President have been extremely broad. In most cases special powers delegated to the President by Congress have been the basis of these extraordinary Presidential actions, but apparently specific congressional action is not always necessary. In December 1950, for example, the President himself proclaimed the existence of a national emergency, and subsequently used this proclamation as the basis for exercising emergency powers. Other notable examples of emergency powers being assumed by the President occurred during the administrations of Presidents Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In every case the powers exercised were far reaching.

Many of the armed conflicts in which the United States has participated, however, have been treated as virtually routine actions carried out merely under the authority of the President as Commander in Chief. United States marines, for example, have landed on foreign soil on some 285 occasions, a great many of which were not in connection with a declared war. They first landed in Korea in 1871 on a punitive expedition. Altogether the United States has participated in more than 100 undeclared wars, including the better known cases of: The seizure of Veracruz in 1914, General Pershing's expedition into Mexico in 1916, the naval war with France in 1798, the conflict with Tripoli from 1801 to 1805, and, of course, the recent Korean conflict. These examples illustrate the extent to which the President has been able to conduct wars without first obtaining a declaration of war from Congress.

Today we are confronted with a new type of situation. We are in what generally has come to be regarded as a cold war. According to international law one might say that this is a general war made up of a series of undeclared limited wars. We recognize the Soviet Union as our real enemy; the ultimate objective of the Soviet Union is believed to be the subjugation of the United States. The difference between the present situation and previous states of war is a common recognition that total war involving direct assault with all available weapons likely would destroy both nations. The war in Korea was conducted according to ground rules tacitly accepted by both sides: The United Nations did not bomb the home bases of Red China and the Soviet Union, or even the staging area of Manchuria, and the Communists refrained from attacking our shipping with submarines and our bases in Japan and Okinawa with aircraft. War was never declared by the United States, but great quantities of American military equipment and fighting personnel were committed to the conflict.

This condition, however, is not limited to Korea. Since the end of World War II the United States has committed itself to the defense of virtually the entire free world against Communist aggression. We have security agreements with more than 2 dozen foreign nations, and have other commitments which might arise under the United Nations Charter. Warlike actions almost anywhere in the world are practically certain to involve the United States.

Out of this condition it is natural that there should arise a question of whether we are at war. According to international law, we are at war; we are in a condition of armed hostility with another nation. But according to the American Constitution, we are not at war because Congress has not declared the existence of a state of war.

This question is of particular importance with respect to conditions in Indochina. Supposedly, the war which has been going on there for several years is one between the French and Vietnamese, on the one hand, and the Communist rebels, on the other. In actual fact, it is much more than that. It is clear that these Communist rebels have been trained and equipped by Red China and the Soviet Union, and in an effort to prevent the spread of Communist aggression the United States has contributed to the French and Vietnamese effort. In this connection, a Senate committee recently reported that—

> Since 1950 the United States has borne approximately 40 percent of the cost of the war and at the present time is carrying approximately 63 percent of the total cost.

It is not merely an academic question. The fact that present conditions do not precisely fit conventional definitions does not alter these conditions. Conventional definitions do not necessarily apply in a time of ideological war. What is important is that we should know precisely what we are doing. We do not want to be inched into an untenable position; we do not want to become involved in a war which we might avoid by assessing our actions in terms of their logical implications and the ends toward which we are striving. These considerations, and not particular definitions of war, should govern our conduct in world affairs. Understand this and we shall better understand the crisis now confronting us in the prosecution of the cold war.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this body will be asked to pass on the most important tax bill to come before Congress in more than 20 years.

That legislation is known as the tax-revision bill.

It should more properly be labeled as the most brazen attempt by certain business interests, aided and abetted by the Eisenhower administration, to rewrite the entire tax code for their own special privilege and benefit.

This legislation is an open attempt to switch the burden of taxation from the investor to the wage earner—from the corporations and large stockholders to the persons of the lower income-tax brackets.

It is an attempt to make the man who earns his daily bread from the sweat of his brow to pay more and more of the $50 billion cost of the cold war with Russia, more and more of our $5 billion in foreign-aid spending, more and more of the $2 billion cost of our atomic-energy program, while at the same time letting the investor, the corporation president, and the large stockholder pay less and less.

True, there are a few sweet pills placed strategically in this bill to help working widows, parents who can afford to send their children to college, and so forth, but these pills are mere windowdressing which the administration felt necessary to sell such a shocking piece of special-interest legislation.

Now, I do not plan to analyze the specific provisions of this bill at this time. That will come later.

However, I do plan to raise a very important question which all Members of this body should consider in connection with this piece of legislation.

The question is a very simple one.

It deals with the author of the dividend tax-credit section of this legislation and how he will personally benefit from this section.

I am sure that not a handful of the Members of this body knows that the author, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, never sold a dime of his hundreds

of thousands of dollars worth of stock as other Cabinet members were forced to do before taking office.

Secretary Humphrey never sold his stock because a private law firm, the same firm that represented corporations which he formerly headed, gave him an opinion stating that he was under no legal obligation to sell such stock. I repeat the words "no legal obligation." It is of great interest to note also that Secretary Humphrey has made it clear that in his opinion he has a right to receive in addition to his regular annual Government salary of $22,500 dividend payments from his stock.

Now, it is true that Mr. Humphrey, as required by law, resigned all offices and directorship in the corporations with which he was previously connected.

Although it should be noted here that Mr. Humphrey is on leave of absence without pay as an employee of Industrial Rayon Corp. which permits him to retain certain group insurance; also as a former employee of M. A. Hanna Co., his retirement rights continue.

But that is not the issue or the question.

The important question and the issue is Mr. Humphrey's stockholdings, and whether his authorship of the provision which sets up credits for taxpayers who receive dividends is in conflict.

The dividend provision as originally drafted by Mr. Humphrey was designed to eliminate over a period of years all taxes on dividends. However, the proposal was so shocking and so raw that it was toned down by Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee. But the amended section is still in the bill, and it extends to holders of stocks a special privilege which is not enjoyed by wage earners.

Now, there may or may not be a legal conflict in Mr. Humphrey's stockholdings and his authorship of the dividend provision which will indirectly benefit him. But there is certainly and definitely a moral conflict, and I would say, a deep moral conflict.

Anyone can see the wisdom of the requirement made by Congress to have Defense Secretary Wilson sell his stock. The plain intent of that action was that no man having the custody of the national funds should be in a position to enrich himself by the use of them directly or indirectly; no man shall take advantage of that high office, either for himself or for his friends, directly or indirectly.

It will be of interest to this body that on January 19, 1953, Secretary Humphrey, when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, promised to furnish that committee a list of his holdings. Also to furnish a list of his family holdings. He made that promise under oath in answer to questions asked by Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma.

Here is the official exchange as contained in the transcript of that hearing. I read:

Senator KERR. I came in a little late, Mr. Humphrey. Did you furnish the committee with a list of your holdings in the various companies with which you have been associated?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I did not, but I will be glad to do so if you would care to have me; I will file it with you.

Senator MILLIKIN. He didn't furnish us a list, but he was asked the question of the largest percentage of stock that he holds in any company in which he is interested. I think he said some 5 percent. He said also in his testimony that he would not attempt because of his stock ownership or relationship with those businesses in the past to influence their policy or attempt to direct them in any way whatsoever.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is my direct holdings. There are some family holdings in addition to that, but that is my direct holdings.

The CHAIRMAN. If you added your family holdings?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It would be less than 10.

Senator KERR. Did I understand you to say you would be glad to furnish the committee such a list?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will.

But now let us take a look to see whether Mr. Humphrey has fulfilled his promise.

I took the liberty of having a friend of mine call at the committee's office a few days ago and ask the clerk if such a list had ever been filed by the Secretary. Her answer was, and I quote, "No. I guess he forgot about it."

In the past 48 hours a published story stated that a list of the Secretary's stockholdings was furnished. If that is the case, why was the list never made public or given to our committee? The entire holdings of Defense Secretary Wilson, and other members of the Cabinet, were made public.

How much stock does Mr. Humphrey hold?

How much in the way of dividends did he receive during his first year in office?

How much will he benefit from this dividend provision which he has authored? This year? Next year? The third year?

These are questions that Mr. Humphrey should answer.

It is only known that according to Secretary Humphrey's own testimony he has retained ownership in stock of four companies with whose management he was previously associated. These companies according to Humphrey's own admission are: M. A. Hanna Co., Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., National Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.

These companies, according to Humphrey's own testimony, own interests in a number of other companies.

Again I quote him:

I have accumulated these interests over the period of my connections with these companies, which in the case of M. A. Hanna Co., goes back almost 35 years. The M. A. Hanna Co., in turn owns substantial stock interests in National Steel Corp.; Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.; Industrial Rayon Corp.; Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Phelps Dodge Corp.; Seaboard Oil Co.; Iron Ore Company of Canada; Durez Plastics & Chemicals, Inc.; Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., and smaller interests in a few other companies.

I am advised by counsel that there is no legal reason why I should not continue to hold the securities which I now own.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 62 of the bound, permanent edition, pages 3013 and 3014, on February 24, 1922, Senator Watson, of Georgia, made, along with some other comments, the following remarks:

Now, Mr. President, I have called attention to section 243 of the revised statutes, a statute adopted at the first session of the 1st Congress, which organized the Treasury Department and which provides: "no person appointed to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, the first Comptroller, the first Auditor, or Treasurer, or Register, shall, directly or indirectly, be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner, in whole or in part, of any sea vessel, or purchasing by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States." * * *

Anyone can see the wisdom of that law. The plain intent of it is that no man having the custody of the national funds shall be in a position to enrich himself by the use of them, directly or indirectly; no man shall take advantage of that high office, either for himself or his friends; neither, directly or indirectly, shall he deal in United States bonds or interstate commerce or foreign commerce. He shall not even own a vessel. The man who framed that law was wise as any who sat in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury owes it to Congress to make a clear statement of his holdings and to answer the questions which I have raised today.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the extent of Secretary Humphrey's holdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. His own testimony in that respect shows that he was the owner of stock in many companies. I have them listed in my remarks. I am sorry to say that it does not show the value of those holdings.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. The reason I ask is that I recall when I first came to Washington some 20 years ago there was a resolution of impeachment against a former Secretary of the Treasury who had certain holdings. I just wondered if we had any concise picture of the holdings of Secretary Humphrey.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What we have is the number of companies in which he does hold stock. We do not know the number of shares in each of these companies nor do we know their value. That is one thing I would like to have determined.

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

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

Mr. PRICE. On the point the gentleman from Missouri discussed, does the law require a listing of holdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. All I know is that the law passed by the first session of the 81st Congress is very specific in that it requires the Secretary of the Treasury not to engage in trade or business either directly or indirectly, nor to own any seagoing vessel or profit by any operations of any seagoing vessels. Whether the Secretary owns any stock in seagoing vessels I do not know, but

according to his testimony he does own stock in the M. A. Hanna Co., which in turn owns large holdings of stock in other companies which may operate ships.

Mr. PRICE. In the gentleman's opinion, would there be any similarity between the case of the present Secretary and the case of former Secretary Mellon?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think there is some similarity and that is one of the points which I wish would be pursued. Former Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, against whom impeachment proceedings were entered and concerning whom hearings were held before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House on the charge that he was profiting personally from operations of those companies while he was Secretary of the Treasury, therefore, he was violating the law. I think in this instance concerning the present Secretary of the Treasury, it may well be that the Congress should look into his holdings a little more thoroughly and especially the Members of the House should look into the matter.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. At least there would appear to be a conflict of interest. Would the gentleman not agree to that?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think there is any doubt but that there is some conflict of interest because the Secretary himself is interested, for instance, in these coal companies by reason of the ownership of stock in those companies and he, himself, is the collector of the taxes paid by those companies. So, it would seem to me, there is a conflict of interest.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of holdings of stock by the Secretary of the Treasury, was that matter not gone into by the Senate Finance Committee when his nomination was before that body?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would say that it was gone into to some extent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Was it not gone into quite completely and to the satisfaction of all Members of the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would not agree with the gentleman in that respect at all. My prepared text will show the exact status of the matter, and if the gentleman will just be patient, I will come to that and explain to him exactly how it was handled according to the printed record.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to have the gentleman's views on that, but I want to state to the gentleman as well as to the other Members who are questioning him that the whole thing is in print and can be obtained from the other body, and it can be found from the record just what questions were asked and just what answers were made to the questions.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can you tell us what the present holdings of the present Secretary of the Treasury are? Can you read that from the printed record?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I can tell you what companies he has stock in because it is in the hearings. It is right there.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can you advise us as to the extent of his holdings?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not know why I should or why he should as far as this particular proceeding here is concerned.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Perhaps, if the gentleman will permit me to read from the law, he may have a different idea after I finish reading the law, and if he would read the record in the case of the impeachment proceedings brought 20 years ago against the Secretary of the Treasury, and if he would read the history of other cases where the other body refused to confirm someone because they were engaged in business. Then, the gentleman might have a different opinion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is not contending though that this matter has not been gone into by the committee of the other body, is he?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly think it is pertinent for the Members of the House to know that he has holdings and extensive holdings in various companies. I think it is pertinent for the public to know this because the recommendations coming from the Secretary of the Treasury directly concern the companies, and these shareholders get special benefits from whatever he recommends.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not suggesting that nobody should be interested in this. Certainly, it is a proper question, but my only point is that it has been gone into in the other body, and I would not want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to leave the impression that he now for the first time is bringing this matter up. This matter has been discussed thoroughly and was discussed thoroughly at the time the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Finance Committe of the other body and answered the questions about all of his business operations.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the gentleman then agrees that I am right in making more public information which has already secretly, perhaps, been made to some members of the Senate Finance Committee. I am only emphasizing the fact that the Members of the House should know this. Members of the House do not know.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Why not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Because I personally sent a gentleman over there to request from one of the committee aides a copy of the listings by the Secretary of the Treasury of his ownership of stock, and the committee aide said there were none available. That happened in two specific instances. If the gentleman will produce that list and make it public, that is all I want. That is one reason I am taking the time of the House this afternoon. If the gentleman will permit me, I am not making any charge that this thing is absolutely—that is, I would not want to be accused of finding the Secretary of the Treasury guilty of violating the law——

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You would just like to infer it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is proper that this be brought to the attention of the public and to the attention of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman has already said that the Secretary was the author of this dividend provision——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to decline to yield until I have finished the text of my remarks. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let us start with the matter of authorship. The gentleman says that the Secretary of the Treasury is the author of the provision in the revision bill relating to dividends. What is the gentleman's authority for stating that the Secretary is the author? The first time I ever heard the proposal publicly was in the President's budget message of January 21, 1954.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman from Wisconsin realize that the President certainly conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury recommended this to the President, which the President took up? So in this administration from its chief fiscal officer we have this recommendation to give special benefit to holders of stock whereby they pay a less rate of taxation, in effect, than those who earn their wages and salaries by the sweat of their brow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman was present at a number of the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee in 1953?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He will recall witness after witness who appeared asking the committee to take action in the matter of at least to some extent mitigating the double taxation of corporate income. He remembers that, does he not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say in answer to that question that I have heard the suggestion many times previously. The fact of the matter is that the Secretary is the author insofar as this administration is concerned of this particular special privilege.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman does not know that because the Secretary has not testified before a committee on this subject.

Mr. EBERHARTER. His representative testified. A representative of the Treasury, who appeared on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury, said these were the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think if he will

check he will find it is the administration policy, he will find that the President made this recommendation in his budget message of January 21.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Perhaps there is a difference between President Eisenhower and the Secretary of the Treasury on this particular subject. I will be very much interested in listening to see whether the President tonight takes issue with the Secretary of the Treasury on this particular recommendation of the Secretary.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would it not be a question whether the Secretary of the Treasury takes issue with the position announced by the President as being in favor of this proposal? I would suspect that the Secretary of the Treasury is in favor of it. I am not questioning that, but I am questioning very seriously the gentleman's right to say that the Secretary of the Treasury as such is the sole author of this particular proposal. I would like to ask another question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We are just splitting hairs, you know. If he wants to deny that he is author I will be very happy indeed to have him do so. The gentleman will not deny that he recommends it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I suspect he did. I will not deny that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman suspects that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman says that the Secretary should have furnished our committee—I assume he meant by that the Ways and Means Committee—with a list of his stockholdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be proper.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Has the committee ever asked for that? Did the gentleman ever ask for that in committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I had not the slightest suspicion that the gentleman, being Secretary of the Treasury, would be treated any different than, for instance, the Secretary of Social Security, or whatever her exact title is, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. She furnished a list of all her stockholdings, the par value of them and the number of shares, and when they were purchased.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. To our committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. She furnished them to the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman to say he should have furnished them to the Committee on Ways and Means. Is that what the gentleman means, or did he mean he should have furnished them to the Finance Committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would have made a big difference if the Committee on Ways and Means knew that he was still holding his stock. It would have made a tremendous difference. Why is the gentleman from Wisconsin complaining so much because I am making public this information?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not complaining. I say it is the method the gentleman uses to make the information public. This information has been made public before, and the gentleman can reiterate it all he desires.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin will join with us in a request to the Secretary that he make public a list of his holdings and the extent of them?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is my understanding that the Secretary has; that he has furnished in full compliance with the Senate Finance Committee request a full statement of his stock holdings. That was to the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. But it has never been made public. The general public has no knowledge of that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is not for me to criticize the Senate in what the Senate might do with the document they request. We have not requested it in the past, but I am requesting it today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would not be surprised if you would probably get it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That would be wonderful, and I hope the gentleman will join with me. As I say, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will join with the gentleman from Missouri and me in requesting this information. Does the gentleman join us in that request that he make public a list of his holdings, the par value, and the number of shares, and when they were acquired?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly would not resist his making that public, but I would say this to the gentleman, and I intend to take the floor when the gentleman is through, I see where no good purpose can be served one way or the other at this point.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. In view of the fact that the issue has been raised, it would be a good idea to make this public at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Wisconsin evidently will not join with us in requesting that this be made public.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not think, in view of the position the gentleman from Pennsylvania is taking here today, that I would join him in any maneuver.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I am glad of that. I am so surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin is so much shocked at me telling the entire truth about what happened. The New York Times on Saturday contained a story written by a very well-known and reliable correspondent by the name of John Morris. The story by him, under his byline, says that copies of the hearings and information as to the holdings are not available at the committee's office. Now, if the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to contradict the correspondent from the New York Times, that is up to him.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, I will contradict him to this extent, that I called and spoke to Senator MILLIKIN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and asked him whether the Secretary of the Treasury had complied with the request made during the committee hearings on his confirmation. The Senator, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, advised me that he did, that he fully and completely complied with the request within a very short time after the request was made upon the Secretary. That is the extent of my information.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I see. The gentleman, of course, then, I would assume, agrees that this testimony should be kept secret; that is, that his list of holdings should be kept secret. Is that the gentleman's position? I would like to know if that is the gentleman's position. He would not join with us in asking that this information be made public. He objects to my making it public, and I see his argument.

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

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

Mr. PRICE. I would like to ask the gentleman about the tax relief on dividends. What would it amount to, financially, for stockholders?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It would amount in the first year to dividend holders the sum of $240 million, and in the third year of its operation—you see, it gradually creeps up—in the third year it would benefit the stockholders $850 million, nearly a billion.

Mr. PRICE. How many taxpayers would benefit by that type of relief?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Out of 47 million families in the United States, 335,000 families get the benefit of 80 percent of this $850 million.

It would be less than 1 percent that would get 80 percent of the benefits of this dividend provision.

Mr. PRICE. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman has had long experience in the field of taxation and has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee for many years. Does the gentleman feel that this sort of tax relief on dividends would have any adverse effect on the municipal bond market?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Naturally, if stockholders are going to receive special benefits, they are going to put all their money in stocks and will not buy any municipal bonds. Municipalities will therefore have to raise the interest rate on their bonds, which will affect the citizens of every local community. Also, so far as the bond issues are concerned, that would be true in the case of new projects being started, because interest rates would be too high. That would also affect wages and salaries.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has always been very adept at laying down smokescreens, but I never expected him to stoop to substituting poisonous gas for a smokescreen. The gentleman refrains from a

direct accusation that the Secretary of the Treasury has used his high office, or is using his high office, for financial gain. He does not do that directly. He does it by inference and inuendo and misstatement.

The Secretary of the Treasury's first sin, I take it, as far as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is concerned is that he has been successful in business. I recognize that there was a time when not being successful was a qualification for holding high public office, but I am glad to say that is not the case today.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been an officer of some important corporations. That, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is bad and disqualifies him from being a Secretary of the Treasury. He has saved some money and this money he has invested in stocks under the American capitalistic system. That is bad and disqualifies him from being a Secretary of the Treasury. Those are the sins of the Secretary. In my judgment, it is a healthy sign that we have a Secretary of the Treasury who has ability and has shown it by his success; a Secretary of the Treasury who has confidence in the future of America and American institutions and is willing to put his money into them. I think we are lucky today to have a man like the Secretary of the Treasury who is willing to make the sacrifices that he has made in order to serve his country.

Secretary Humphrey gave up a salary of $300,000 to take over the job of Secretary of the Treasury at $22,500. This information is not new, either. This is in the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on the matter of the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey. Many of these things are.

The difficulty is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not willing to have us read the record completely and fully. He wants us to look at those parts taken out of context that he wants us to see and that he wants us to read.

A gentleman of the stature of the Secretary of the Treasury certainly did not take the job of Secretary of the Treasury to get some tax laws changed for his own enrichment, and that is the inference made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think all honest, clean Americans will resent the inference made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me just read to you what the Secretary of the Treasury himself said before the Senate Finance Committee:

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, Senator, I am coming down here for just one reason. I had no idea, as you well know, of taking this job. It was suggested to me and I spent 3 or 4 days thinking of all the reasons why I should not do it. I wanted to refuse it. My wife and I talked it over and we finally concluded that we really had no decision to make, that when we were asked to try to assist in this program it was a duty and a responsibility that we could not refuse.

I do not want to come here unless everyone is satisfied and happy about it and the feeling is not exactly not only in accordance with the letter of the law but in accordance with the spirit of it and with the confidence of the people. I do not want to do it under any other circumstances.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania not only questions the integrity and the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, he also questions the integrity and the judgment of the Senate of the United States and of the Senate Finance Committee. His stockholdings and all of these matters were made a matter of public record and public hearings. The Secretary received the unanimous approval of the Senate Finance Committee. He was confirmed by a unanimous vote of the United States Senate after these hearings.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin furnish me with the list that he just stated was made public?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I did not state that the individual holdings or amounts were; I said that everything that the Senate wanted it got, and everything except that one matter was all a matter of public record. Nobody questioned the need for additional facts before voting on the confirmation of the Secretary of the Treasury, nor did the Senate ask for more information before voting to approve the nomination by the President.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I take it the gentleman objects to my asking that these holdings be made public?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not object to anything the gentleman from Pennsylvania might ask. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants is a Secretary of the Treasury who has no savings, who has no job, in fact, who has been a failure. That is the kind of fellow the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants, because that is the only type of person who can qualify under the test suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me point to another thing that was brought to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee during the hearings on Mr. Humphrey's confirmation.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Just as soon as I finish this quotation. They were discussing this section of the law to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania was referring. I think it is section 243 of the Code. The Secretary posed this question to the Senate Finance Committee:

Suppose I sold everything that I had. I have thought of that, of course. It would be a tremendous hardship, and whether it could be done or not is a problem, but suppose you did. How would you account for what you received for it? Would you leave it in cash in the bank? If so, would you then be under the compulsion of perhaps favoring in some way that bank because, of course, the Secretary deals with that bank in one way or another. Would you put it in Government bonds? If so, there is nothing that the Secretary of the Treasury could so influence by his conduct as Government bonds.

I can, as Secretary of the Treasury, have more influence on the price of Government bonds and the value of them, a whole lot, than I can on the value of M. A. Hanna common stock when I am no longer an officer, representative, or connected with the firm.

Now you get yourselves into a situation where, if you do not be practical about this thing, that you can so draw the laws that you just cannot have a Secretary of the Treasury unless he is a man who has nothing.

That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants. As far as I am concerned, I want a Secretary of the Treasury in whom I can have some confidence by reason of his past success and his demonstrated ability.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said before that he did not object to any position I take, but the gentleman is certainly taking up the time of the Congress this afternoon making a speech objecting to the position I take.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly will differ with the gentleman on many occasions, and this occasion I certainly differ with him. Of course, I cannot object to anything the gentleman might decide to do. He must determine that by his own conscience. I do not have to be responsible for that.

One would gather, too, from the gentleman's remarks that the Secretary of the Treasury is the father, the mother, and the attending physician of this provision in the revision bill which would somewhat reduce double taxation of corporate earnings. I do not know how ridiculous one can be, but this certainly should get some kind of a prize because similar proposals have been advanced ever since double taxation got on our statute books in 1936. In 1931, Cordell Hull opposed double taxation and it was not included. You did not have double taxation in the act of 1913 nor did you have it until 1936 when, if you will study the history of the matter, it got in by accident in the other body. I introduced a bill in 1949, H. R. 3272, to mitigate double taxation by allowing a credit to shareholders. I might say to the gentleman, if I must qualify, that I did not have then, nor do I now have, any share holdings. It is possible to propose changes without having a selfish interest. Hearings were held on the tax revision bill in 1953. Representatives of over 28 organizations asked us to do something about double taxation. The minority themselves in the report in 1947 and 1948 admitted that this was a problem that the Congress had to do something about. In every hearing on tax revision conducted by the committee since I have been a member, which is 8 years, and the gentleman knows this as well as I do, representatives have been before the committee requesting that we do something about this problem of double taxation of corporate income. So this is no new idea of the present Secretary of the Treasury. The present Secretary of the Treasury is not even the man who announced it. It was announced by the President of the United States in his budget message of January 21, 1954.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is just what I want to call to the gentleman's attention. President Eisenhower, himself, said that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey was the person who made this recommendation as well as others on this double taxation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly must assume, as the gentleman must certainly assume, that the President of the United States in drafting recommendations for tax changes is going to call upon and lean upon his Secretary of the Treasury. There is no question about that. But in the light in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania tries to place this matter, it would appear that the Secretary of the Treasury by some devious, quiet, covered maneuver sneaked into the revision bill a proposal to mitigate the double taxation of corporate earnings, and that he did so to enrich himself. That is what I deny because I have more confidence in the integrity and judgment of our Secretary of the Treasury than to make such an inference.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would not the gentleman agree that the present Secretary of the Treasury has the philosophy of taxation and views it from the point of view, I would say, of wealthy individuals?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would not say that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would deny that. The Secretary of the Treasury views the problem of taxation from the long-run standpoint for the benefit of the general economy of America, and I do not think that the Secretary of the Treasury is approaching this problem of tax revision or this particular proposal from any selfish, individual standpoint, and I resent, I say to the gentleman to his face, I resent his inference that the Secretary would do it for a selfish, personal reason.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would not say that Secretary Humphrey does not have the viewpoint of the wealthy individual in so far as taxation is concerned? You would not say that, would you?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, I would not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would say he has the viewpoint of the wage earner and the salary earner?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think right now he has the viewpoint of an honorable public servant who is trying to do equity for all of the people. That is what I think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you not think it is proper for Members of Congress to know all the facts concerning persons in the position of making recommendations?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think it is more important to the Members of Congress to know what the recommendations are, and to study them on their merits. There was nothing that forced the Ways and Means Committee or the President of the United States to accept this or any other proposal just because Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey recommended it. We have turned them down in the past. We have turned down some of the other recommendations that the Secretary has made. It is up to the Ways and Means Committee itself; it is up to this House itself to decide what proposals it is going along with. This decision should be made on the merits of the proposals and not on the basis of who made them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say to the gentleman that I am awfully sorry he feels it is necessary to help defend the viewpoint of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Oh, I think the Secretary of the Treasury is in a position to defend himself. I just do not like to see the record stand as it would have stood at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, casting aspersions on the integrity of the Secretary of the Treasury. I am not going to sit here and let it go by unanswered.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My purpose was to let the people of the country know through whom the recommendations came, and his viewpoint as being that of the viewpoint of the wealthy taxpayers who will get special benefit from this provision.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, that is the gentleman's conclusion. I think I will have to refuse to yield further. That is just the gentleman's conclusion. Anybody else is certainly at liberty to analyze the proposals and what they do, analyze the bill and what it does, and see what conclusion they come to as to who will get the benefit, and whether there are selfish interests involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of some of the various organizations which have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee supporting the proposal for relief from double taxation on dividends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE OF RELIEF FOR DOUBLE TAXATION OF DIVIDENDS IN THE HEARINGS OF 1953

American Farm Bureau Federation.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
American Gas Association.
American Institute of Accountants.
American Taxpayers Association of Washington, D. C.
Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce.
Commerce and Industry Association of New York.
Research Institute of America.
Council of State Chambers of Commerce.
Georgia State Chamber of Commerce.
American Mining Congress.
National Machine Tool Builders Association.
New York Stock Exchange.
Independent Natural Gas Association of America.
Investors League, Inc.
Philadelphia Securities Association.
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
Association of Stock Exchange Firms.
American Stock Exchange.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
Edison Electric Institute.
Lake Superior Iron Ore Association.
National Coal Association.
Federal Tax Forum.
Southwestern Public Service Co.
General Public Utilities Corp.
Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE IN THE HEARINGS OF 1950

Illinois Manufacturers Association.
Smaller Business Association of New England.
Investment Bankers Association of America.
New York Board of Trade.
Committee for Economic Development.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE IN THE HEARINGS OF 1947–48

Independent Telephone Companies Association.
National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association.
Chamber of Commerce of the City of Newark.
American Retail Federation.

In addition, the principle has been advanced by:

Association of American Railroads, Committee on the Federal Corporate Net Income Tax of the National Tax Association, report of August 1950.
Ruml, B., and Sonne, H. C., Fiscal and Monetary Policy, National Planning Association, July 1944.
Kimmel, Lewis H., Postwar Tax Policy and Business Expansion, Brookings, 1943.
Seligman, Eustace, A Postwar Program for Taxation of Corporations and Stockholders, Commercial & Financial Chronicle, March 2, 1944.
Eccles, M. S., Possibilities of Postwar Inflation and Suggested Tax Action, Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1944.
The Twin Cities Plan, Postwar Taxes, Twin Cities Research Bureau, Inc., June 1944.
Revenue Revision, 1947–48, Report of the Special Tax Study Committee to the Committee on Ways and Means, November 4, 1947.
Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, 1947.
House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, 78th Cong., 2d session, 1944.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables which I have prepared.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives has criticized the Republican-sponsored Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300. The demagogic attack led by the Truman wing of the Democratic Party on this legislation has disregarded the facts and has endeavored for political purposes to mislabel this legislation as a bill designed to aid only corporations.

Such unfounded allegations could not be further from the truth. These irresponsible charges have been made in the face of the facts which point up that the tax relief afforded by this legislation will offer a reduction in tax liability to individuals of $778 million and will be largely paid for by an increase in the tax liability of corporations of $581 million. The net revenue loss resulting from the bill for fiscal year 1955 will be $197 million. A more detailed statistical statement of

the tax benefits resulting from passage of H. R. 8300 is as follows:

Effect on receipts, fiscal year 1955, of measures contained in your committee's bill

[Millions of dollars]

	Loss	Gain
Individuals:		
Items having permanent effect:		
Full split income for head of family	50	------
Dividends received, exclusion and credit [1]	240	------
Taxation of annuities on life expectancy	10	------
Deduction for certain dependents regardless of earnings [1]	75	------
Dependent deduction for member of taxpayer's household who meets support test	10	------
Retirement-income credit	125	------
Deduction of interest charges in installment contracts	10	------
Medical-expense deduction	80	------
Child-care deduction	40	------
Personal exemption for estates and trust	3	------
Premium test on life insurance	25	------
Increase in charitable contribution limitation from 20 percent to 30 percent	25	------
Subtotal	693	------
Items which merely shift deduction or income between taxable years:		
Soil- and water-conservation expenditures [1]	10	------
Depreciation [1]	75	------
Subtotal	85	------
Combined effect for individuals	778	------
Corporations:		
Items having direct revenue effect:		
Natural resources [2]	27	------
Treatment of income from foreign sources [2]	147	------
Subtotal [2]	174	------
Items which merely shift deductions or income between taxable years:		
Depreciation [1]	300	------
Net operating loss deduction [1 2]	100	------
Accounting provisions [2]	45	------
Subtotal [2]	445	------
Total [2]	619	------
Extension of 52 percent rate for 1 year	------	1,200
Combined effect on corporations [2]	------	581
Grand total, individuals and corporations	197	------

[1] Items with substantial incentive effects.
[2] A small part of this estimate applies to individuals, but this cannot be clearly segregated.

NOTE.—Many other provisions in the bill which do not involve an important revenue loss at the present time are also expected to stimulate production and employment. These include such provisions as the new treatment for research and development expenditures and the more liberal capital gains treatment provided for inventors.

The American public will not be deluded by these misrepresenations of the Democratic Party. Millions of individual taxpayers will directly benefit from enactment of H. R. 8300. Among the provisions included in the bill which will aid our overburdened taxpayers are a broader definition of dependents; permitting children to earn over $600 a year without loss of the exemption for their parents; an exemption of up to $1200 of retirement income; a greatly liberalized medical deduction; a broader exemption of death benefits paid to the widows of employees; fairer treatment of home owners where they sell their homes; liberalized deductions for contributions to schools, churches and hospitals; allowance of deductions for child care expenses of working mothers; extension of the income tax exemption of members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; and many other reforms.

The Truman Democrats criticize the Republican Party for granting this type of long overdue tax relief. They advocate instead an increase in personal exemptions of $100 which would cost the Federal Treasury $2.3 billion and give little relief to an individual taxpayer.

Let us examine the sincerity and benefit of this Democratic proposal.

First of all I will deal with the question of how sincere are the Democrats in advocating an increase in personal exemptions. During the 20 years of Democratic misrule they led us down an endless path of tax and tax, spend and spend. When the Republicans left office in 1932 personal exemptions were $2,500 a year. The Democrats whittled away at this allowance until they had reduced it to $500. The Republican 80th Congress finally raised the personal exemption to $600, raised the dependency allowance to $600, gave an additional $600 exemption for the blind and for our old people. We can well ask ourselves why the sudden solicitude for our American taxpayers by the minority Democratic Party. The record of the past 20 years contains nothing to suggest such concern while the Democrats were in the majority.

Now let us examine the so-called benefits to the American taxpayer which the Democrats would grant in lieu of the substantial benefits contained in H. R. 8300 I previously enumerated. The following table sets forth the tax saving that would be realized by individuals in various income categories with dependents as listed from the Democratic proposal to increase personal exemptions by $100.

Gross income	Amount of tax reduction per week		
	Single person	Married couple	Married couple, 2 dependents
$700	$0.38	----------	----------
$1,000	.38	----------	----------
$1,400	----------	$0.77	----------
$2,000	.38	.77	----------
$2,800	----------	----------	$1.54
$3,000	.42	.77	1.54
$4,000	.42	.77	1.54
$5,000	.50	.77	1.54
$8,000	.58	.85	1.69
$10,000	.65	1.00	1.69
$15,000	.90	1.15	2.31
$20,000	1.02	1.31	2.62
$25,000	1.13	1.46	2.92
$50,000	1.38	2.27	4.54
$100,000	1.67	2.77	5.54
$300,000	1.75	3.42	6.85
$500,000	1.75	3.50	7.00
$1,000,000	1.75	3.50	7.00

The Democrats would force the Republican administration to abandon its efforts to achieve fiscal solvency in our Federal finances in order to give tax relief of 50 cents per week. These irresponsible advocates of deficit financing would grant this 50-cent relief at a cost of $2.3 billion.

The Democratic tax program would perpetuate existing tax inequities and create new ones. They would deny to business, to labor, and to the farmer the stimulation to our economy that will inevitably result from passage of H. R. 8300.

THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HUMPHREY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad I was here to listen to the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] for the fine reply which he made to the attack on my distinguished fellow townsman, George Humphrey. I know of no man who is giving more to his country than is George Humphrey. I know of no more brilliant public servant, wholly unselfish, and deeply concerned about the public welfare.

The Secretary of the Treasury is a man of triple talents. In the years since George M. Humphrey graduated from the University of Michigan law school, he has succeeded as an attorney, industrialist, and financier. In Cleveland, where he has lived for many years, and in industrial centers across the land, he is regarded as a man who gets things done. He deserves this reputation.

Mr. Humphrey left a thriving law practice in 1917 to join the staff of the M. A. Hanna Co., now the largest of Cleveland's many ore dealers and an important contributor to the growth of that city. In 1920, at the age of 30, he was made a partner; 5 years later, vice president and general manager. His genius pulled the company out of a serious postwar slump and started it on a continuing program of expansion. Under his management, Hanna obtained control of the biggest coal company in the world, one of the larger steel companies and a rayon and plastics corporation. It sponsored exploration into undeveloped ore fields. It acquired its own fleet of boats to expedite the movement of ore from northern regions to Pittsburgh furnaces. It produced private investment money to build 385 miles of modern double-track railroad into remote Canadian ore country.

When genial George Humphrey moved into the Cabinet circle, he was chairman of the board of Hanna and its subsidiary companies; director of a Cleveland bank and two Canadian companies. He has served on the boards of numerous business, educational and charitable organizations and holds the Rand medal for distinguished achievement in mining administration. For him, there are always new horizons.

As a businessman, George Humphrey liked to compare the Nation's wealth to a pie which must be divided among more and more people. Under a controlled economy, the slices become thinner and thinner. Under a free economy—the American economy—the enterprising citizen is encouraged to "bake another pie."

George Humphrey is no longer in the banking business. But while he was, he developed sound judgment, a great capacity for work and a grasp of economic principles which are proving invaluable to him in his job.

George Humphrey is the servant of all the people and is giving the people of America the same fine service that he gave to the stockholders of his company and to the citizens of my community.

I am surprised that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], would make any insinuations about his being the servant of a privileged few. The job of Secretary of the Treasury as it is being performed by Mr. Humphrey is one that every citizen of America, whether he be Republican, Democrat, or Mugwump, can be proud of. He is attending to his job; he is on the job day and night, serving this country to the best of his ability.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, it was my privilege last February 2 to hear Treasury Secretary Humphrey in his report to our committee. On that occasion, he said:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your committee this morning to discuss the 1954 Economic Report of the President which was submitted to the Congress last week.

I subscribe to the conclusion of the report to the effect that this Nation can make the transition to a period of less costly military preparedness without serious interruption in our economic growth. As the President says in the letter of transmittal, there is much that justifies confidence in the future.

Changes which this administration has put into effect, as well as others which have been recommended, in the tax structure, contribute greatly to our confidence in the future.

As you gentlemen well know, this administration in the past 12 months has cut more than $12 billion in anticipated Government spending. This reduction in proposed spending made possible the tax cuts on January 1. These cuts now are leaving with the taxpayers over $5 billion a year which formerly was spent by the Government. We are cutting taxes, even though we have not arrived at a budget balance. There is a very good reason for this. We must always anticipate the reduction of Government expenditures and begin to transfer billions of dollars which the Government will not be spending back to the taxpayers so that there will not be any sudden dislocation resulting from the lack of those dollars being available to be put into the Nation's spending stream. In that way we help to maintain stability.

It is important to notice that we expect to almost reach a cash balance this year—and a small cash surplus in fiscal 1955. We are thus eliminating the necessity for cash deficit financing from the public which is inflationary particularly in times of high levels of activity. At the same time we are moving closer each year to an administrative budget balance, which is a goal we are determined to reach.

In addition to the $5 billion tax cuts of January 1, we are recommending a general revision of the tax system. It will do two principal things:

1. It will make the tax burden fairer for millions of individuals by removing the more serious tax inequities and complications.

2. It will stimulate production and create bigger payrolls and more and better jobs by reducing restraints and by encouraging initiative and investment.

Millions of Americans will benefit from better tax treatment for working children, child care expenses, for doctors' bills, for annuities, and from easier procedures in filing returns.

And these same millions will benefit even more from such revisions as liberalization of the tax treatment of depreciation and partial relief from double taxation of dividends. Everyone will benefit because the economy will benefit with the resulting creation of more jobs with better tools and machinery to produce higher payrolls and cheaper better things for public consumption.

The tax revision program, by helping the economy to grow and expand, will benefit every citizen, with steadier employment and higher standards of living.

In this connection the proposal for some relief from the double taxation of dividends may not be well understood. Under present law, earnings of a corporation are taxed twice—once as corporation income and again as individual income when they are paid out in dividends to the millions of shareholders in American industry. This has restricted the market for shares of stock in companies which want to expand and has forced them to borrow money instead of selling shares in their future. In the past 10 years better than 75 percent of private-industry financing has been done by going in debt instead of selling shares. What does this mean? It means simply that we have enterprise heavily in debt so that it doesn't develop as well or as quickly as it would without heavy debts hanging over it. Should business turn down, a company in heavy debt is, of course, easily drawn into trouble.

Better prospects for enabling companies to get shareholder financing—instead of going into debt—thus means better prospects for all Americans who work, for increasingly better jobs come more surely out of companies that are moving forward and expanding.

There has also been some misunderstanding about what we are proposing in depreciation. Depreciation is really the wrong word. Buildings and machinery not only wear out but they become old fashioned and neither the workman using them nor the business owning them do as well either in earning wages or in decreasing costs as more modern, up-to-date equipment would make possible. Depreciation is simply the method by which the original cost of a building or piece of machinery is recovered over the years during which it is being used up and worn out. At the moment these deductions must usually be spread out evenly over the years for tax purposes. But if the cost of a piece of machinery has not been written off by the time it should be replaced with the better machinery, there is less inclination to buy a new piece of machinery that will do the job better and cheaper than keeping the old machinery still in use. Our proposal to let more depreciation be taken in early years does not increase the total that may be taken as tax deduction by one cent. It simply recognizes the facts and allows more of the deduction in earlier years. Doing so helps our economy to stay modern and up to date, and so to grow and expand faster. And again repeating the obvious, out of this growing economy come more and better jobs. It also is very helpful to the small and growing concern in arranging its finances for new purchases of additional or more modern equipment and so aids small business to forge ahead.

Nothing can so add to our national strength and preparedness as modernization of the whole industrial plant in America and nothing will make more sure more jobs at which millions of people can earn high wages by producing more and better goods at less cost.

These revisions, as they help our economy expand and reduce the taxes required, will also result in more personal income to be spent by taxpayers for their own account and in their own way and so will provide more money for the purchase of those better goods and services.

Additional tax cuts for all the taxpayers will, of course, benefit them. But until more reductions in Government expenditures are in sight further cuts in taxes will only add to the deficit. However, as rapidly as reduced expenditures can be seen, further tax reductions will promptly be made. In the meanwhile, putting first things first, we must make sure we are doing the things that by restoring initiative will keep our economy expanding. More tax cuts from the paycheck will be of little value if there is no job to make the paycheck in the first place.

As long as Americans know there is adequate chance for gain they will save and invest. They will try new things that will bring forward new business, growing business, more jobs, better jobs, and higher and better standards of living.

In the past decade the growth of American industry was stimulated by debt and war and inflation. With these unwanted pressures fading, we need to again make initiative and enterprise more compelling if our economy is to continue to grow.

That growth stimulated by tax relief and reduction to almost every taxpayer in the Nation is the basic purpose of our tax program.

We believe that this tax program will help to build a firm foundation for the future health of our economy and that we can look to the future with great confidence.

This is the best answer I can think of in addition to that of the distinguished gentleman of Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], to the unfortunate and ill-considered comment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency in 1932, he said he would cut taxes 25 percent. He was elected because the people believed him. He took office with a debt of approximately $21 billion. Today we have a debt of approximately $270 billion, plus $70 billion more in I O U's.

We all want to cut taxes, Mr. Speaker. I recall a statement made by my former colleague from Pennsylvania, Bob Rich, who consistently asked, "Where are you going to get the money?" Now we are raising money to pay for all the bungling and squandering on the part of the previous two administrations. Now we are struggling to reduce taxes. In the Republican-controlled 80th Congress we first balanced the budget, reduced taxes, and lived within our income.

The taxes were reduced by $14 billion last year, and they will be reduced by five or six billion dollars this year. Every Republican wants to remove all taxes possible, but where are you going to get the money to pay these bills? We are removing people from the Federal payroll as rapidly as possible in all departments.

It is easy to demagog about taxes. Every citizen wants tax relief. I wish we could cut all taxes, but we are faced with reality. We have a job to do here; we have a problem to meet that we did not create. We Republicans were not a part of the outfit that dragged us into a couple of wars and then made bum deals at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran. We are not responsible for those things. Why put the blame at the door of the Republican Party or a great servant of the

people, George Humphrey, for trying to bring relief and solve the problems?

Mr. EBERHARTER, my party, including Mr. Humphrey, did not reduce the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. Humphrey and the Republicans did not increase the national debt from $21 billion in 1932 to $275 billion in 1953. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], Mr. Humphrey did not increase the cost of government from $5 billion in 1932 to $78 billion in 1953.

Mr. EBERHARTER, neither my party nor Mr. Humphrey was responsible for the recognition of the Soviet Union. Neither George Humphrey nor the Republicans coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, nor blocked every effort to smoke communism out of the Government. Neither the Republicans nor George Humphrey made the disastrous agreements at Yalta. George Humphrey did not order the police action in Korea. Neither George Humphrey nor the Republicans were responsible for the blundering policy which lost China to the Reds. I am sure it wasn't the Republicans nor George Humphrey that fired General MacArthur. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that neither the Republicans nor George Humphrey brought us a spurious prosperity by war and mortgaged the future through debt. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] cannot blame the Republicans nor George Humphrey for the extravagant fiscal policies which have brought on inflation and then cried for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation. My genial friend from Pennsylvania cannot dispute the fact that in 1947 for the first and only time since 1932, the Republicans did balance the national budget and that Republicans for the first time in 20 years reduced taxes. I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that my party warned us of the dangers of annual deficits and the huge national debt, and he cannot deny that the Republicans fought waste and extravagance in Government and stood for the preservation of the Constitution and upheld the liberty of the individual against encroachments of government itself. Besides, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that the Republicans championed the cause of free enterprise on every front constantly and fought socialism and the welfare state. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that the Republican Party is the one which believes that there is nothing iniquitous in loving one's country above all others nor dishonorable in considering the welfare of the United States their first obligation.

The Ways and Means Committee which reports to us this week does so with a voluminous record of painstaking performance. They recommend a bill that is realistic and sound.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike at this late hour to take so much time—this is my first offense during this 2-year period of Congress. But I just cannot stand this demagogery on the part of some Members who are placing the responsibility for this mess where it does not belong; and it is about time that we called a spade a spade. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] or any other gentleman on that side wants to have it out tomorrow or the next day we are ready for them. I do not like this partisanship on the floor of the House; I have tried to steer away from it.

In November 1952, the people of America voted to stop the war in Korea. We have stopped it.

The people of our country voted to get rid of security risks in our Government. They meant all kinds of risks—the Communists, the drunks, the playboys, the "cookie pushers." We have gotten rid of 2,000 of them, so far.

Our people told us to throw out the Communists, the pinks, the fellow travelers who infested Washington. We have thrown them out.

Sixteen months ago we were told to stop wasting your tax money. We cut the Truman budget by $14 billion, and this year we are cutting another $6 billion.

The people of America told us to change the foreign policy which lost in time of peace, what our Armed Forces had won in time of war. We have changed that foreign policy. Today America is leading the world where the Kremlin was misleading it 2 years ago.

Our people told us in the last election that they were sick of scandals and corruption in the Federal Government. Have they forgotten the mink coats, the deep freezes, the 5 percent boys? I don't think so, but if anyone has, we Republicans are going to remind him of what Washington was like before Ike, and what it is like now, with Ike.

The biggest single responsibility in the world today is the job held by President Eisenhower. No man can do it alone. Our position of world leadership at this crucial moment in history requires the cooperation of Congress and the White House. We are trying to achieve it.

In the opening days of the second session of this Congress, I sense a deep recognition of this truth. We are starting out, on both sides of the political fence, with a real determination to work harmoniously for the public welfare. Let me add in all frankness that this harmony may not last beyond the winter's snows.

There are fundamental disagreements between the 2 parties on both goals and methods. I hope that we can resolve our differences and give our united support to President Eisenhower's basic program.

As I see it, the program on which we must agree will be centered on two principal areas: First and foremost must be a new foreign policy. We have helped our allies in their effort to get off the floor. Now they can be asked to support themselves without weakening the Western World. We have reached the point where American taxpayers will refuse to underwrite nations which do not choose to defend themselves.

We have come to the time when it seems absurd to draft American boys for the defense of nations which are unwilling to draft theirs.

In other words, the moment has arrived for our country to exercise moral and economic leadership without providing troops, ships and planes to protect every critical spot on the globe. If this means talking hard-boiled language to our friends in France, Italy, and Great Britain, let's start talking that way. They understand determination. They despise weakness.

A realistic foreign policy means that Uncle Sam can look a little more carefully at his own home and garden. It can stand a good look. We have been draining taxpayers to the point where the golden goose is growing anemic. Our tax policies have hit hard at the little fellow as well as the big investor. It is time for us to overhaul the Internal Revenue Code.

We have assumed certain obligations to our aged and our dependent men, women, and children. If this is to be something more than a hollow gesture, we must make some realistic adjustments in the benefits they receive.

On the economic home front, I see our job in Congress as one of stimulating private enterprise. There are great new fields to conquer. Atomic energy for peacetime uses; electronics; new lightweight metals; private airplanes for the average worker; chemicals for industry and home use; all these and more are products to stir the American imagination. In Congress, we can furnish the leadership necessary to fire up these industries. Or we can stifle this process.

President Eisenhower has shown that he believes in America. I believe with him that this faith in our future can overcome every obstacle.

If Congress can avoid the temptation to view every proposal as a political issue, we shall go far. I am optimistic because I am convinced that the best politics in our times is American idealism. That is how I intend to look at every problem before us, from atomic energy to the fight on communism.

What is good for America must be good for the world. What is good for America is certainly what Congress must consider. That and nothing else.

PROCUREMENT

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and insert a letter dated March 12, 1954, from Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, on the subject of procurement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have for many months questioned the procurement policies of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the actions of the military services in carrying out such policies, as being contrary to the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and the House and Senate reports accompanying this act.

The reports accompanying the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 referred to the time-tested method of competitive bidding and stated that competitive bidding would be the rule in procurement for the military services and negotiation would be only the permissible exception.

While high Government officials have been telling the people that we have returned to a virtually free economy, with economic controls abolished on all items, there has been an unwillingness to cease negotiating almost nine-tenths of the contracts for military supplies and services under the emergency provisions of procurement legislation. I have previously stated that negotiation should not be used for mere convenience, but should be used only when necessary. The interest of small-business concerns also dictates that there be a return to competitive bidding since in 1953 small-business concerns were awarded 65.9 percent of the advertising competitive-bid contracts in comparison with only 10.1 percent of the negotiated contracts.

It is encouraging to know that there is an arm of the Congress having equal interest with this body in carrying out the intent of the Congress and safeguarding the best interest of the Government. I refer to Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, and those who assist him in carrying out this responsibility. Those of us who have been here for many years remember him as an honest, capable, fearless, and hard-working Member of the Congress, and one who was selected for his present position on the basis of his high qualifications.

Due to the high regard which I have for Lindsay Warren, and his long experience in procurement matters, I recently wrote a letter and requested his views regarding whether existing procurement legislation adequately protects the interest of the Government in negotiated contracts, for his suggestions as to the manner in which any existing deficiencies may be remedied, and for his opinion as to whether the joint determination program for small-business concerns could be effectively continued under advertised bidding if negotiated contracts are further restricted.

I received a reply from the Comptroller General dated March 12, 1954, setting forth his views on the above questions. I recommend this letter for the immediate attention of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the military services with regard to their present interpretations of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and existing orders and regulations.

I further recommend this letter to the attention of all who are concerned with amending existing procurement legislation. On the day that Congress convened I introduced H. R. 6864 for the purpose of amending section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, and the Comptroller General also recommends amending the same section.

I further recommend this letter to the attention of all who are interested in the welfare of small-business concerns, and a return to competitive bidding in the interest of small business.

The above referred to letter dated March 12, 1954, from the Comptroller General of the United States is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1954.

Hon. PAUL BROWN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I have your letter of February 11, 1954, requesting my views as to whether existing legislation, particularly the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, adequately protects the interest of the Government in negotiated contracts.

You mention specifically section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act, which permits negotiation of contracts during the period of a national emergency if determined to be necessary in the public interest, and state it to be your understanding that all negotiated contracts are now awarded under this section of the act. Your letter suggests that an unusually broad interpretation has been placed on what is "necessary in the public interest" under section 2 (c) (1), and you cite the example of a contract for 3 destroyers recently awarded by the Department of the Navy at a price $6,500,000 in excess of the lowest price obtainable.

Apart from the merits of the particular award in the case of the 3 destroyers, it is my opinion that the authority granted by section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act currently is being exercised under circumstances which were not contemplated by the Congress when the act was passed. It was clearly intended that there would be a return to normal advertising-bid purchasing procedures on the part of the armed services, whenever economic conditions permitted. See Senate Report No. 571, 80th Congress. Various deviations from such procedures—some of long standing and others derived from World War II procurement experience—were recognized and made uniform by the act. The exception contained in section 2 (c) (1) of the act is among the latter. Because of the prospect that any future war might start with great suddenness, it was felt by the Congress that standby authority should be available on a permanent basis to permit the shedding of peacetime procurement restrictions simultaneously with the declaration of a national emergency by the President or the Congress. In other words, this section of the act was designed to make it unnecessary to secure temporary authority from the Congress to negotiate contracts upon the outbreak of a sudden emergency when valuable time might be lost in going through the legislative process. However, use of the authority provided under section 2 (c) (1) was intended only to meet abnormal market and procurement conditions. This is borne out by the fact that a state of declared war existed at the time the act was passed, but it was in effect agreed between the Congress and the armed services that that emergency would not be made the basis for the exercise of authority under section 2 (c) (1).

Provision was made for a further determination to be made by the heads of the procuring agencies even after the presidential or congressional declaration of a national emergency before section 2 (c) (1) authority could be used. The determination to be made is that negotiation of contracts is necessary in the public interest. No standards are set forth in the act for the guidance of the agency heads in evaluating the various factors which may affect the public interest. It is clear, however, that the mere existence of a declared national emergency, without more, was not to be made the basis for any blanket exercise of the negotiating authority.

As you know, the President declared a national emergency on December 16, 1950. Immediately thereafter, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force made broad general determinations that it was necessary in the public interest to authorize the negotiation of contracts by their respective departments under section 2 (c) (1) during the period of the national emergency. Similar determinations were soon made by the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. While the use of formal advertising was permitted as an alternative to negotiation, it is significant to note that nearly nine-tenths of the total procurement activities of the Department of Defense since 1950 have been on a negotiated as distinguished from an advertised basis, although the proportion of advertised procurements has increased somewhat in recent months. Also, as provided by implementing procurement regulations issued by the three services, such negotiation has been on the basis of section 2 (c) (1) authority even in cases where negotiation would have been justified under other exceptions contained in section 2 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act.

One result of the exclusive use of section 2 (c) (1) authority has been to render inoperative the limitations of section 7 (b), 7 (c), and 7 (d) of the Armed Services Procurement Act with respect to the delegation of authority by the agency heads and the requirement of reports to the Congress in the case of contracts negotiated under sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16). The award for the three destroyers mentioned in your letter is a good example. It appears from testimony given before the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Armed Services Committee on February 26, 1954, that the award in this case was in reality made on the basis of reasons which would bring it within the purview of section 2 (c) (16) of the act, namely, the desire of the Navy Department to insure the continued operation of the shipyard involved.

The questionable features of the Department of Defense buying practices stem, of course, from the extremely broad authority granted by section 2 (c) (1). Two things only are necessary to render that section operative: First, a declaration of national emergency either by the President or by the Congress; and second, a determination by the agency head that such emergency makes negotiation of contracts necessary in the public interest. This is just one more in a series of instances which I have witnessed during my term as Comptroller General where freedom from checks and controls has given rise to administrative abuse.

As stated above, the act does not establish standards for determining when or to what degree the public interest requires negotiation under section 2 (c) (1). However, the legislative history of the act indicates rather clearly that section 2 (c) (1) authority was intended to be used only when normal peacetime procurement was not practicable. The House report on the bill (H. Rept. No. 109, 80th Cong., p. 6) shows that advertising was expected to be used when definite specifications could be offered to a number of adequately equipped potential suppliers who would compete for the business, and that resort to negotiation would be had only when one or more of these three conditions was missing. I can find no basis for believing that "public interest" under section 2 (c) (1) was ever intended to encompass savings in unemployment compensation, tax losses, idle machines, impact on communities, lost sales, or relief payments, as has been argued by the Office of Defense Mobilization. See the third annual report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, House Report No. 1097, 83d Congress, page 20. It is significant, in this connection, that section 644 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat.

357), prohibits the use of funds made available thereunder for the payment of a price differential on contracts made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Conditions today, fortunately, are far less urgent than those prevailing in December 1950 when the present national emergency was declared. In fact, conditions affecting Government procurement are today relatively stable. Although these changed conditions should permit far more procurement on a normal basis, no change has been made in the broad determinations made by the Secretaries of the Armed Services over 3 years ago. It is believed that the congressional interest in the destroyer contract may have impressed upon the Department of the Navy the desirability of a review of the present necessity for continuance of section 2 (c) (1) authority on the broad basis now in effect, and it was stated at the hearing on February 26, 1954, that such a review was under way.

In response to your request for suggestions which might more adequately protect the interests of the Government in negotiated procurement, I believe periodic administrative review of the necessity for continuation of section 2 (c) (1) authority should be made mandatory perhaps by providing that agency head determinations thereunder should not be made for periods in excess of 6 months at a time. A more drastic limitation would be to permit negotiation under section 2 (c) (1) only during time of actual hostilities and 12 months thereafter and to require express legislative sanction for negotiating authority during any other periods. I do not at present, in view of the limited use of negotiation under the other subsections of section 2 (c), have any suggestions with respect thereto. The authority to negotiate under those subsections is, of course, subject to many limitations and safeguards not applicable to negotiation under subsection 2 (c) (1).

You also request my views as to the effect upon small business of further restrictions on negotiated procurement. My comments will be limited to the effect of modification of section 2 (c) (1), since I have not suggested further restriction on the use of negotiation under section 2 (c) (2) through 2 (c) 17). Section 214 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 238), provides that small-business concerns shall receive any award or contract or any part thereof as to which it is determined by the Small Business Administration and the contracting procurement agency (A) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (B) to be in the interest of war or national defense programs. So long as this statutory authority exists for earmarking a fair share of Government procurement for small business, it would seem to be immaterial whether the contracts are let on a negotiated or an advertised basis. While the conditions may since have changed, it is not inappropriate to point out that the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in a report dated June 21, 1951 (S. Rept. 459, 82d Cong., p. 33), made the following recommendation:

"3. The committee is convinced that small producers fare best under the formal advertised bidding procedure. It therefore strongly urges the use of advertised procurements to the fullest extent practicable. In fact, it is of the firm belief that negotiation should be drastically restricted and employed only for urgent or classified purchases, or when definite benefits to small business may ensue."

In my opinion, therefore, the discontinuance of negotiation under section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act should have no detrimental effect upon the volume of procurement from small business.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

OAK RIDGE, A GOVERNMENT COMPANY TOWN

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Oak Ridge is a community of approximately 35,000 inhabitants. As everyone knows, it is the principal atomic-energy installation. The United States Government owns every single dwelling, with the exception of the recent FHA housing, every business establishment, including the buildings where lawyers have their offices, doctors, and dentists their offices. Even the place where the shoe cobbler fixes your shoes is owned by our Government.

Oak Ridge is in the category of the 19th century "company town." This is fundamentally wrong. Ever since I came to Congress a little over 3 years ago, I have urged the Atomic Energy Commission to make these homes available for purchase by the occupants. I have urged them to get out of the housing business. The United States Government should not be the landlord for its citizens.

I have urged AEC time after time to give the citizens of Oak Ridge the same privileges as other American citizens enjoy. Oak Ridge should be and must be a normal American community. All I have gotten so far is promises—no action.

I understand that the disposal plan is either in the hands of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or shortly will be. I urge that open hearings be had at once on a fair disposal plan and that action be had now, not wait until the next session of the Congress.

I believe that this is in line with the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

All persons employed at Oak Ridge should be eligible to purchase their own homes on long-term credit and to purchase the thousands of unneeded and unused building lots in Oak Ridge so that they can build homes thereon.

There should be no 45-mile limit as to eligibility for housing. There should be no limit, except that every person employed at Oak Ridge should have the right to own their own homes, to build their own homes, and to enjoy the rights and privileges of American citizens.

When a citizen of the United States is deprived of the right to buy and own his own home, he is deprived of his freedom and that is not the American way of life.

[From the Oak Ridger, Oak Ridge, Tenn., of March 9, 1954]

"HOUSING DEFINITELY EASING" (FORD)—FORTY-FIVE-MILE LIMIT SEEN ON WAY OUT—MSI LIST IS DOWN 2,000 NAMES—MORE THAN HALF TITLE 8 READY

The long-controversial "reasonable commuting distance" restriction on occupany of local Government housing may end soon, AEC officials said today.

The Oak Ridge housing situation is "definitely easing up," Fred W. Ford, head of the AEC Office of Community Affairs, said at this morning's biweekly press conference.

Vacancies in present Government units are increasing by 20 per week. The housing application lists at Management Services, Inc., have been reduced by approximately 2,000 listings since February 1.

More and more title 8 and title 9 housing units are being completed weekly. Over half of the 500 title 8 units in East Village are now finished and ready for occupancy.

All of these factors contribute to the steady loosening in the local housing market that has been noticeable primarily since the beginning of the year.

As a result, Ford foresees a continuing program of relaxing and dispensing with local housing restrictions and he believes the commuting-distance provision will be one of the first to go.

Already, he explained, MSI housing officials are studying the practicability of ending this rule which provides that anyone presently housed within 45 miles of Oak Ridge is not eligible for housing here. The 45-mile limit has been written into local housing policy as the reasonable commuting distance.

If this provision were to end, scores of local workers now living in surrounding communities would become eligible for all local housing. They have been eligible for title 8 and title 9 units for the past several months. However, many have been on lists for other local homes.

In addition to the 45-mile limit Ford said that other restrictions are also being examined periodically with an eye to relaxing or ending them. He did not elaborate but presumably he meant the family size and job importance factors which determine the assignment of many local units.

Ford had said early this year, as MSI's change in procedure in assigning housing went into effect on February 1, that it was hoped that this would be a decisive step toward a "free and open" housing market in Oak Ridge which might come about by the end of this year.

The MSI housing application lists that have decreased so substantially are those which were turned over to MSI on February 1 by all local employers, listing all of the local employees who sought housing here, and the type of unit sought.

These lists, at first, showed 5,300 listings, MSI reported. Now they show only 3,300, Ford said today. Still on the lists are many duplications of applications. Ford explained, with many residents having applied for several types of local units. Some are on as many as 4 or 5 lists while the average number of listings per applicant is 2 or 3.

Ford said that most of the present vacancies are in the city's apartment units. As of today, 42 of the 453 Garden Apartment units are empty.

Ford explained also that as quickly as possible various segments of local housing will be placed on "nonquota" lists. That is, these units may be rented without regard to restrictions as long as the applicant is employed in Oak Ridge. Officials have said in the past that E-apartments were on the verge of being placed on "nonquota" status.

Title Eight rental officials reported that approximately 29 units were unassigned as of today. A total of 260 of the East Village units are now completed with 231 occupied or with tenants assigned. The vacant units are available to any Oak Ridge employee. All one need to do to be assigned 1 of these 3-bedroom units which rent for $85 is to get certification from MSI as to job and then negotiate with Fretz, Hayes, and Ballard, the Title Eight rental agents, with offices in Town Hall.

The Title Eight units now completed extend up East Drive Hill to some units on Alhambra Circle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin).

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in 2 instances, and to include in 1 a statement she made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and in the other a letter she wrote to the President of the United States and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington).

Mr. PILLION and to include a statement concerning Hungarian Independence Day.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri).

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and include a newsletter released a few days ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL).

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include certain letters.

Mr. BETTS and Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin to insert certain printed matter in remarks made by him in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. UTT and to include an editorial.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; and

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point 2 citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis 2 citizens and subject of the Kingdom of Belgium.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 12, 1954 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5509. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 16, 1954, 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:

1356. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual Statistical Supplement to the Stockpile Report, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress, and in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953, covering the period July 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1357. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1954 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Treasury (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1358. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1359. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1360. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7061. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7062. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8377. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 8378. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 8379. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the refusal of a political subdivision of a State to take part in the administration or operation of a State plan for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, shall not disqualify the State for Federal payments if certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 8380. A bill to provide that certain individuals who are or may become entitled to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act shall be issued a participation certificate setting forth their benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8381. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that in certain cases leaf tobacco shall not be considered an agricultural commodity for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers under clause (6) of such subsection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8382. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8383. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8385. A bill to amend section 2382 of the Revised Statutes, in order to make the size of townlots conform in size to local standards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 8386. A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 8387. A bill to provide that a greater percentage of loans made by veterans for the purpose of refinancing certain types of indebtedness on their homes will be guaranteed by the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8388. A bill to continue temporarily existing 90 percent of parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 8389. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service Academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8390. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8391. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8392. A bill to provide for the extension of social security coverage to the employees of the city of Lake Worth, Fla., effective as of January 1, 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8393. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8394. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 8395. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 8396. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8397. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8398. A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8399. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans made, guaranteed, or insured under that act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 8400. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of postmasters for fixtures and equipment in use at the time of discontinuance of such post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution providing for the proper protection of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H. J. Res. 468. Joint resolution providing that the Bureau of the Census shall annually conduct a nationwide advisory opinion poll; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Planning Committee for the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce relative to health problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging congressional action against injurious foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 8401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte Meschke Rossiter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 8402. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Co. of Ohio, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Summers (nee Gebauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 8404. A bill for the relief of B Amusement Co. (Robert H., J. C., Kenneth, and Mrs. J. R. Bowers) and others; to the Committee to the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8405. A bill for the relief of Fusa Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 8406. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Aranda Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8407. A bill for the relief of the Portsmouth Sand & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8408. A bill for the relief of Ragland Joseph Biggs (also known as Vincent Doig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 8409. A bill for the relief of Francisco Velasco-Armas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8410. A bill for the relief of Manuel Garcia Marcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 8411. A bill for the relief of the Portsmouth Sand & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 8412. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Del Gatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 8413. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Brinkhoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 8414. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jack E. Hunt; 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:

557. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Harry Thomas, Jr., pastor, and 26 members of the Church of Christ of New Brighton, Pa., calling attention to the treatment accorded the missionaries of that church in Rome, Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

558. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Racine chapter of the WCTU urging that the Bryson bill to have the advertising of liquor stopped on radio, television, interstate commerce, and also that liquor be taken out of the Armed Forces, be given hearing by the committee just as soon as possible; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

559. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Parkway Council No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting enactment of House Joint Resolution 243 and Senate Joint Resolution 126 with regard to amending the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

560. Also, petition of the secretary, Florida State Townsend Club Council, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate action in the consideration and enactment of the pay-as-you-go Federal social security for all, H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H. R. 6923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS OF MASSACHUSETTS BEFORE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1954

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to speak in behalf of my bill, H. R. 6923. The purpose of this proposal is to extend to the members of the Armed Forces of the United States captured or held as prisoners in the course of the Korean campaign benefits equivalent to those provided prisoners of war and certain civilian internees of World War II.

Last fall, at a hearing conducted before one of the Senate committees, I sat next to one of the boys who had been a prisoner of war and who came from my home community of Lowell, Mass. I was shocked that up to that time no provision had been made for the payment of comparable benefits for the prisoners

of war of the Korean conflict. In order to correct that situation, I introduced H. R. 6923, which is very similar to other bills pending before this committee, as well as legislation pending in the other body.

The World War II act provided compensation at the rate of $1 a day for each day the prisoner did not receive the quality of food required to be furnished him under the Geneva Convention. In addition, $1.50 a day was provided where inhuman treatment was meted out by the enemy government or its agents. When the legislative counsel looked into this matter, at my reqeust, it seemed appropriate that the two sums should be lumped together and make the flat figure of $2.50 since it has been pretty well established that there was inhuman treatment meted out to nearly all if not all of our prisoners, and certainly the quality of food did not reach the required standard for any day. Therefore, my bill provides for the flat sum of $2.50 for each day. Surely this is a small amount and one which the Government can well afford to pay to these men who have suffered so much for America.

As in the case of the World War II act, in the event of the death of an eligible claimant claims under the bill would be payable first to his widow, if there is no child or children surviving, then to his widow and child or children, one-half to the widow, one-half to the child or children. In the absence of a surviving widow, payments would be made to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares, and if no widow or children survive then to the deceased's parents in equal shares.

Of course, I realize that under the World War II act payments were made out of the proceeds of any enemy property which had been seized. The money for the Korean act would have to be appropriated from the Treasury. In any event, the sum would be small in comparison with the suffering which these men have sustained.

I hope, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the committee will speedily act favorably upon this measure and that we may see it enacted into law before much more time has elapsed.

Again I wish to express my appreciation for your courtesy in hearing me.

O'Konski Urges Plan To Bring Farmers Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge that this Congress act soon on the pending social security bills before this body. In this respect, I strongly urge that farmers be included in this program. I also urge that we provide increased benefits for all those under the present law and that these increased benefits be also extended to farmers.

Here are answers to questions which farmers have asked about the benefits they will get if Congress passes the bill.

How long must I work after the bill is passed before I can get a benefit?

Under this plan, you would have to work at least half the time between December 31, 1950, and the time you are 65. You would only have to work 2 years if you will be 65 by the end of 1954.

But to get the larger benefits under the new plan, you will have to work at least 2 years after December 31, 1954. This assumes that the bill is passed and goes into effect on that date.

Say you are now 35. You would need to have at least 17 years—half the time from December 31, 1950, and the time you will be 65—before you could be eligible for a benefit at 65.

If you are now 65 and continue to farm, you would be eligible for a social security benefit after 6 calendar quarters under the new social security program.

How much will the proposed social-security program cost?

You will pay 3 percent of your net income into the social security fund. The payment will be made at the time you submit your Federal income tax return. Every person who benefits from the program helps pay the costs.

Is any Government tax money used to pay part of the cost of the social security program?

No. The social security administration has a reserve fund of $18.7 billion. This is being increased by about $1.3 billion annually.

How will the social security benefit my family in case something happens to me?

Your wife will get a lump-sum death payment of three times what your monthly benefit would be. She would also get a monthly check amounting to three-fourths of what your benefit would be. Plus another three-fourths for the first child.

If your widow had two or more children she could get up to $190 per month. Your widow and children would start getting the checks soon after your death if you had been under the program long enough to qualify.

The widow's benefits would continue until the youngest child is 18, then start again after she is 65.

How much will my monthly benefit be if farmers are brought under the social security program?

Your monthly benefit would be based on your average net income. The table below shows the proposed schedule of benefits:

Proposed new retirement benefits (for persons retiring in future years)

Average pay per month	Monthly benefits of—	
	Retired worker 65 or over	Retired worker and wife, both 65 or over
Under $35	$30.00	$45.00
$70	43.50	61.00
$100	60.00	85.00
$140	66.50	99.80
$180	74.50	111.80
$220	82.50	123.80
$260	90.50	135.80
$300	98.50	147.80
$350 or more	108.50	162.80

Benefits for Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the portion of a statement I made this morning before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in behalf of my bill H. R. 6923, a bill to extend to our veterans of Korea the same benefits granted prisoners of war in World War II. I am happy to know that the members of this committee, and I believe the entire Congress, are most sympathetic toward proposals of this type.

The excerpts follows:

EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF H. R. 6923

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to extend to members of the Armed Forces of the United States captured and interned or held as prisoners of war in the course of the Korean campaign, benefits equivalent to those provided to prisoners of war and certain civilian internees of World War II, under the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended. In this respect the bill, H. R. 6923, is identical with H. R. 8076 except for the per diem payments provided for, and is similar to S. 2605, and to portions of S. 2224, all in the 83d Congress. Compensation is authorized to any prisoner of war as defined in the bill, at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which he alleges and proves, in a manner acceptable to the War Claims Commission, that he suffered any inhumane treatment, as defined in the bill, or was not furnished with the quality or quantity of food to which he was entitled as a war prisoner under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

In the event of the death of an eligible claimant, claims under the proposed legislation would be payable first to his widow, if there is no child or children surviving, then to his widow and child or children, one-half to the widow and one-half to the child or children. In the absence of a surviving widow, payments would be made to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares, and if no widow or children survive, then to the deceased's parents in equal shares. Persons thus eligible for survivors' benefits who may be under any legal disability, would receive such benefits through their legal representatives as provided for in section 5 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended. In addition, benefits at the rate of $2.50 would also be paid for inhumane treatment in the form of compulsory, forced labor during captivity.

It is provided in the bill that the term "inhumane treatment" as used in the bill, shall be any act, by the de facto government of the hostile force or foreign country by which the claimant was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of such government of the hostile force or foreign country by which the claimant was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of such government's obligations under title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention, relating to labor, or in violation of the provisions of articles 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 54, 56, or 57 of that convention.

Finally, the bill authorizes appropriations to the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as

amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out its provisions.

Under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, by Public Law 303, 82d Congress, the same types of benefits have been payable to all prisoners of war in World War II. The daily rate of benefit payments, however, were lower. Claims filed with the War Claims Commission for so-called food benefits were paid at the rate of $1. Claims based upon other types of inhumane treatment were paid at the rate of $1.50 per diem for each day the claimant alleged and proved such treatment. Similar benefits at these rates were paid under claims filed by civilian internees in the Philippines, Guam, Midway, and Wake Island.

THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Legislative history

During the 80th Congress various measures pertaining to the recognition and settlement of claims arising out of World War II were introduced. Four of these bills (H. R. 873, H. R. 1000, H. R. 1823, and H. R. 2823) which were introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce formed the basis for the bill which was finally enacted into law as Public Law 896, 80th Congress.

The bills referred to provided for the recognition and satisfaction of numerous types of war claims and proposed a variety of administrative methods for processing them. After extensive hearings on such bills, a new bill, H. R. 4044, was reported to the Whole House on July 17, 1947, by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (H. Rept. No. 976, 80th Cong.). This bill embodies certain of the basic principles expressed in the earlier bills but was more detailed and specific as to types of recognized claims. It was drafted in the form of an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), and provided that seized property of Germany, Japan, and their nationals should be retained by the United States. In its original form title II of H. R. 4044 provided for the establishment of a three-member Commission appointed by the President to inquire into the report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress, with respect to war claims arising out of World War I and World War II. Only the claims of a small group of American citizens interned by the Japanese during World War II would have been adjudicated and paid under the bill. The bill passed the House of Representatives on January 26, 1948.

A special subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held extensive hearings on H. R. 4044 both in Washington, D. C., and in New Mexico. As a result of these hearings, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate offered an entirely new bill, in the nature of a substitute. The bill was passed by the Senate and referred to the Committee on Conference, which reported the bill out on June 19, 1948 (House conference Rept. No. 2439, 80th Cong.). The bill was approved by both the Senate and the House of Representatives on the day it was reported out by the Committee of Conference, and on July 3, 1948, with approval by the President, became Public Law 896, 80th Congress.

Funds were not appropriated for the activities of the War Claims Commission during either the second session or the special session of the 80th Congress. The amount of $75,000 was appropriated for the administrative expenses of the Commission for the balance of the fiscal year 1949 by Public Law 71, 81st Congress, approved May 24, 1949. This appropriation lapsed, however, because of the delay in appointing the War Claims Commissioners. Although the War Claims Act of 1948 became law on July 3, 1948, the War Claims Commission was not activated until September 14, 1949.

The War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong. approved July 3, 1948; 62 Stat. 1240; 50 U. S. C. 2001–2013), as amended by Public Law 75, 81st Congress, approved May 25, 1949, consists of 14 sections. Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 provide for the receipt, adjudication, and payment of various types of claims. Of these benefit sections, however, only section 5 (a) to (e), section 6 and section 7 are administered by the War Claims Commission.

The benefit sections of the act administered by the War Claims Commission provide for the payment of claims submitted by (1) prisoners of war, or specified survivors of deceased prisoners of war, for allowances based on violations of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, relating to the obligation of the detaining enemy power to furnish certain rations to prisoners of war; (2) certain civilian American citizens, or specified survivors of such deceased civilian American citizens, who were captured and interned by the Imperial Japanese Government in certain designated places in the Pacific, or while in transit to or from such places, or who went into hiding to avoid capture and internment, for detention benefits; and (3) religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or the personnel of such Philippine organization, for reimbursement for expenditures incurred or for payment of the fair value of certain supplies and services provided for members of the Armed Forces of the United States or civilian American citizens (as defined in sec. 5 of the act) in the Philippine Islands during the dates specified.

AMENDMENTS TO THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

With the appointment of the Commissioners, approved September 13, 1949, Congress completed its responsibilities with the original act. There have, however, been amendments to the act. Those affecting benefit payments are discussed below.

PUBLIC LAW 359, 81ST CONGRESS

The next amendment was Public Law 359 of the 81st Congress which did not affect the functioning of the War Claims Commission. This was an act to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and modified thereby the provisions in section 2 (a) which set the compensation of the members of the Commission.

PUBLIC LAW 696, 81ST CONGRESS

Public Law 696, of the 81st Congress, approved August 16, 1950, was the first amendment to the War Claims Act after the organization of the Commission and was at the request of the Commission. It provided the Commission authority to subpena witnesses and otherwise to conduct the investigations, etc., necessary to the conduct of the business entrusted to it.

PUBLIC LAW 866, 81ST CONGRESS

One further amendment to the War Claims Act was made by the 81st Congress. This was an amendment affecting payments to the final class of survivors under section 6. Mr. Anderson who introduced the bill, S. 3000, to strike the word "dependent" from the last category of supervisors listed, stated before the House Committee that he was in receipt of communications from surviving parents who had not been dependent at the time the deceased prisoner of war had entered the Armed Forces or had gone overseas, but would now be grateful for his assistance if he had lived to return to them, or from those who were too proud to claim dependency, or unable to do so. A special subcommittee to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its report (No. 3093) accepted the argument of Mr. Anderson that the payments should be considered equivalent to an estate left by the deceased prisoner of war, it also mentioned the Commission's contention that the saving in administrative costs would offset the additional expense in paid claims. The bill passed the House September 18, 1950, and became Public Law 866, 81st Congress, on September 30, 1950.

PUBLIC LAW 303, 82D CONGRESS

The only amendment yet made to the War Claims Act of 1948 which is directly concerned with recognition of various types of war claims is Public Law 303 of the 82d Congress, approved April 9, 1952. This provided for the recognition of new categories of claims under paragraphs 6 and 7, dealing with claims of former prisoners of war and certain religious organizations operating in the Philippines. During the 82d Congress there were introduced a considerable number of bills to amend the War Claims Act which received sufficient attention to warrant hearings before the committees concerned. There were included 5 bills (1 in the Senate) which would have amended section 6 to provide for compensation for unpaid, compulsory labor of prisoners of war and for violations of the Geneva Convention, other than section 11, of which they had been the victims. These were S. 1416, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, and referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, April 30, 1951 (action was postponed indefinitely June 9, 1952, in view of action on S. 1416, which will be discussed later), H. R. 3719, introduced by Mr. DEMPSEY and referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 13, 1951, H. R. 4345, introduced by Mr. CROSSER and referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce, June 6, 1951, H. R. 4522, introduced by Mr. HELLER and referred to House Interstate and Foreign Commerce June 20, 1951, and H. R. 6556, introduced by Mr. ELLIOTT and referred to House Interstate and Foreign Commerce February 16, 1952. Hearings were held on October 18, 19, and 20, 1951, and March 19, May 1, 2, and June 16, 1952, on H. R. 3719, H. R. 4345, and H. R. 4522 and other bills including S. 1415 and H. R. 5385 which would have provided for amendment of section 7 to provide for compensation at the postwar cost of replacement for damage to or loss of certain buildings and installations belonging to those religious organizations already described in the provisions of section 7. S. 1415, which had been introduced by Mr. O'Conor and referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, April 30, 1951, was reported out September 6, 1951, and passed the Senate on October 1, 1951, as amended. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House October 3, 1951, in time to join H. R. 5385, with which it was identical, at the above-mentioned hearings. H. R. 5385 had been introduced by Mr. McCORMACK and referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce September 18, 1951.

Many of the arguments presented at these hearings had of course been discussed before, especially at the hearings preceeding enactment of the War Claims Act of 1948.

The committee reported H. R. 3719 (Rept. No. 1632), and H. R. 4345 (Rept. No. 1633), on March 24, 1952, and also reported H. R. 5385, the section 7 bill (Rept. No. 1631). The provisions of these two kinds of bills were combined and passed as S. 1415, amended, on March 31, 1952. Discussion in the House was very brief and confined to an explanation of the effect of that part of the combination that would provide for further benefits to former military prisoners of war. S. 1415, as amended by substitution of provisions of H. R. 3719 and H. R. 5385, passed the Senate April 1, 1952, and was signed by the President on April 9, 1952, to become Public Law 303, 82d Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 304, 82D CONGRESS

Two bills were introduced in the 82d Congress which developed into a public law providing for modifications of the provisions for making payments to persons under legal disability in both sections 5 and 6. These were H. R. 4477, introduced by Mr. CROSSER and referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on June 15, 1951, and S. 1669, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN and referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary June 13, 1951. S. 1669 was reported out on July 30 (Rept. No. 1630) and passed with committee amendment August 9, 1951. It was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce August 10, and hearings were held March 19, 1952. It was reported out March 24, and passed March 31 without discussion. This was signed by the President on April 9, 1952, also, and became Public Law 304, 82d Congress. The changes made by this law were such as would enable the Commission to make certain payments that had been held in abeyance for lack of authority to pay money to guardians, curators, etc., or to competent minors, and little discussion was necessary in the course of its passage through the Congress. Public Law 303 added the second subsection (d) to section 6 of the War Claims Act (the first had been added the same day by the enactment of Public Law 303). This situation has not as yet been corrected.

The Anniversary of Hungarian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the anniversary of Hungarian freedom, brave men and women in Hungary are again being made to suffer for their devotion to the cause of independence and liberty for which their forefathers fought in 1848. Communist tyrants are imposing their rule by methods which violate every precept of morality. Such acts as the trial and imprisonment of Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty clearly show that the Soviets will not stop at anything in order to secure their hold on Hungary.

Our solemn task is to do everything in our power to protect Hungarians from the terror that is being used against them. We may best do this by giving our full support to the Genocide Convention, a law which states that the Soviet policy of murder, deportation, and persecution of religious and intellecual leaders is an international crime. With the aid of this law, we must work toward organizing world public opinion to such a degree that its pressure will force the Communists to modify their methods.

The independence won by Hungarians under the leadership of Louis Kossuth 106 years ago was short lived. But while the Hapsburgs returned to rule, the Hungarian people remained true to the heritage of freedom. Louis Kossuth went into exile and from there continued fighting for total independence. Today, Hungarian exiles are once again marshaling world support to throw the invaders out of their native land. In paying tribute to the heroes of 1848, we pledge our support in the present battle for Hungary's freedom.

The McCarthy Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to criticize when all about you are engaged in this national pastime, especially when Senator McCARTHY is the target. In all this clamor, let us not be deceived by those who wish to destroy, not only the men, but also any further attempt to stop the Communist thrust. The hard core of Communist leaders, left wing commentators and fellow travelers, have gathered into their ranks, thousands of vocal sympathizers who have now joined the wrecking brigade to make the investigation of any un-American activities so unpopular that men will refuse to take the public abuse that will surely be heaped upon the head of anyone so audacious as to tread upon the sacred precincts of Communists.

Surely in this crusade to defend the liberties of Americans, there will be some casualties inflicted upon innocent people. But tell me, Mr. Speaker, has it ever been argued that because an innocent bystander was shot by the FBI in capturing the most wanted criminal, we should disband the FBI or the police force of every large metropolitan area where similar injuries to innocents have occurred?

I do not say that Senator McCARTHY has never made a mistake. The only one who never made a mistake was crucified 2,000 years ago, but I do say, "Let him who is without sin, cast the first stone."

I know not how the rest of this body feels, but I shall and now do speak in defense of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, in his fight against communism, who is being challenged, mocked, taunted, and misquoted by those who should be his friends, as well as by the enemy within our gates.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the San Diego Union, of March 11, 1954, upon the same subject:

THE McCARTHY ISSUE: A FIGHT FOR POLITICAL LIFE

Like witnesses to a modern drama of the breakup of a man's character or personality, the American people are seeing before their eyes the effort to destroy a man who has enjoyed high public office.

The campaign against Senator McCARTHY has reached staggering proportions.

Misquoted, misinterpreted, hit at every turn, challenged on every statement, taunted and mocked by left-wingers, Senator McCARTHY, in his dedication to his cause, has been driven into excesses that only intensify the attack on his motives and character.

At every press conference, President Eisenhower has been badgered about Senator McCARTHY, apparently in the hope of a personal attack, but each time the President has replied with mild and reasoned criticism.

For this, the President too has experienced the bitter rebukes of those who have magnified the McCarthy issue into a cause that has overwhelmed all other factors of American political, military, and economic life.

What has Senator McCARTHY done? He has exposed Communists and their fellow travelers.

What has Dean Acheson, Democratic former Secretary of State, suffered for his loyal support of Alger Hiss? What has Harry Truman suffered for his administration's promotions of Harry Dexter White?

Where are the stinging criticisms? The bitter denunciations?

The President and other Republican leaders realize that the magnification of the McCarthy issue is enabling political opponents to divide the party, and to divide means to conquer. The breach must be repaired.

Senator McCARTHY now is fighting for his political life, and, fighting alone; he is showing a sense of desperation. The more desperate he becomes, the more sweeping his charges and the more intemperate his answers.

That is where his enemies wanted him: cornered and angry. That is how a man is led into destroying himself.

A less-dedicated man would have avoided some of his excesses and chosen a more diplomatic path. The good he has done is being obscured. And it may be a long time before anyone again tries to pick a hard-fisted political battle against communism at home.

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the occasion of Hungarian Freedom Day:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE OCCASION OF HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY, MARCH 15, 1954

We celebrate today the anniversary of Hungarian independence and of a great democratic victory over the forces of despotism. When Louis Kossuth persuaded the National Assembly in 1849 to declare Hungary independent of Hapsburg rule, a new democratic state came into being. The free Hungary led by Louis Kossuth dedicated itself to the establishment of the rights of the individual by enforcement of such points as equality before the law, freedom of worship, and freedom of assembly. These principles had long been cherished by the Hungarian people. It was this abuse that Col. Michael De Kovats left Hungary to fight in the American Revolutionary War. But it was not until 1848 that Hungarians were able to shake off the rule of foreign oppressors and put democracy into effect in their native land.

The despotic rulers of the countries surrounding Hungary, however, could not permit a democracy to flourish in their midst. In the very same year in which Hungary achieved full independence Russian troops invaded the country. The new democracy was crushed almost the moment it had

bloomed. Kossuth was forced to flee from Hungary. But he did not abandon the fight for Hungarian freedom. Wherever he went, to England, the United States, Italy, he organized support for his cause.

Today, Hungarians are once again fighting to be free. Hungary's Soviet rulers are far more ruthless than their 19th century predecessors. And yet the spirit of Hungary remains unbroken in the face of physical terror. The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty did not diminish the Hungarian people's determination to maintain their heritage nor their adherence to the principles of liberty and justice.

In marking this anniversary, we in the United States of America must pledge to the people of Hungary that we shall not abandon them. We must encourage them to carry on the struggle of Louis Kossuth until independence and democracy are permanently restored to Hungary.

Tenth Anniversary Celebration of Boys' Towns of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House to extend some remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon a subject which is very near my heart. It must necessarily appeal to any American of Italian descent—which I am proud to claim—and I flatter myself as a patriot that it will appeal to every American, whatever his racial origin. I refer to the project known as Boys' Towns of Italy, Inc. Five years ago I had occasion to make some observations on this very noble project; this year, 1954, marks the 10th anniversary of a movement which can surely claim to be one of the most enlightened of this generation.

Conceived by Father Don Rivolta, a Milanese priest, the first of these communities was founded in 1944 at Santa Marinella, north of Rome. Within 5 years it had expanded into 5 towns, combined into a "republic." This experiment has been the model for others, the ultimate goal being, under the patronage of American Relief for Italy, similar communities in each of the 96 provinces of Italy. The ARI not only sets up the communities but supplies them with food, clothing, medicine, and maintenance funds. These Boys' Towns, Americans will be interested to know, are modeled very largely after the famous Nebraska community founded by the late Monsignor Edward Flanagan. The aim of the movement can be stated very simply: to take the boys off the streets, to teach them to run their communities in democratic fashion, and to provide trade training which will enable these boys to make an honest way in life and help in the reconstruction of their country.

It is gratifying indeed to learn that the movement has been a success from the beginning and that it is constantly growing, with ever expanding influence upon the life of the younger generation of Italy.

A stream, Mr. Speaker, cannot rise higher than its source; if the source be polluted, the entire river is noxious. If we in secure, properous America have juvenile delinquency problems, think what the situation must be in poverty-stricken Italy. And by so much, think of the importance of rearing the rising Italian generation in wholesome, moral surroundings. The aid we give to the American Relief of Italy becomes a sound investment indeed. Assistance of this kind constitutes the most deadly foe communism has—and well do the Communists know it.

Some time ago I was happy to receive a letter from my friend, Monsignor John Patrick Carrol-Abbing, who from the first has been a leading light in this movement to rescue the helpless children of Italy from poverty, and worse than poverty. Monsignor Carroll-Abbing described in moving terms the work the ARI, originally set up by President Roosevelt, is trying to do: to give these boys, as he expressed it, "the home and affection for which they have always longed."

The rising generation in Italy may prove a deciding factor in the affairs of a troubled world. America cannot afford to forget the land of Christopher Columbus, and it is with this thought and this hope for continued kindly aid that I venture once most respectfully to remind my colleagues of the Boys' Towns of Italy.

A Limited Federal Reinsurance Bill, H. R. 8356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today H. R. 8356, a bill which carries out President Eisenhower's limited Federal reinsurance program referred to by the President in his health message presented to the Congress on January 18.

The purpose of this bill is to improve the public health by encouraging the more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of health services.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the course of its hearings on health problems has received extensive testimony on the great need which exists for more adequate health insurance protection. According to this testimony, when illness strikes, many present health insurance policies may be canceled by insurance companies, leaving the policyholder without any protection for the future. Other testimony shows that many classes of persons, as for example the aged, will not be accepted by insurance companies.

It is my hope that the measure which I am introducing today will make possible health insurance protection which is more adequate than the very limited and sometimes illusory protection now given under many insurance policies.

This bill is in addition to two other administration bills which I have previously introduced for amending the Public Health Service Act with respect to grants for public health services and to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act provisions of the Public Health Service Act. The latter bill already was passed by the House on March 9, 1954.

The major proposal in the bill which I am introducing today is to establish a limited Federal reinsurance service with a self-sustaining fund derived from reinsurance premiums paid by the sponsors of health service prepayment plans participating in the program.

To provide working capital for the reinsurance fund, an appropriation of $25 million would be authorized from which advances, repayable with interest, could be made to the fund, when and as needed. Another feature of the program would be to make studies and collect information needed as a basis for providing better health service prepayment plans, to publish results of such studies, and on request to give technical advice and information to sponsors of such plans.

This bill will, I believe, be of vital interest to every American. It provides a sensible governmental approach based on private initiative to a serious national-health problem. Heretofore, all attempts by the Federal Government in this field have been predicated on the idea of Federal control and operation. This bill rejects the concept of socialized medicine and permits help within the framework of private enterprises.

The bill was developed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It carries out an important part of President Eisenhower's health program. I am very glad, indeed, that President Eisenhower has charted a clear course of action by which we can begin to cope with the problems of high-medical costs through private operation and Federal leadership.

In the near future, hearings will be scheduled on this bill.

Where Can We Get the Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, where can we get the money to meet the requests—yes, the demands—which come almost every day, at least once a week, from the individuals upon whom we are dependent for reelection? Some, without any hesitancy, tell us that

if we do not comply with their requests we will not be back next year.

Earlier this week, some 2,000 representatives of Federal postal employees came to Washington, and at least three delegations visited my office with a request that I vote for a postal raise of not less than $800 per year. It was my misfortune to be forced to tell them that I could not comply; that I would vote for some increase, but that an $800 raise for more than 500,000 postal employees would add $400 million to the budget.

I called attention to a recent letter, one of many, which came from a member of a group which is almost totally dependent upon Government assistance in order to keep body and soul together.

This widow is past 76, a good, hard-working citizen; is now alone, lives in a house which, because of age and lack of repair, does not give too much protection against the weather. She uses approximately $100 worth of fuel during the winter. She pays insurance on the house and its contents. Her taxes have steadily increased. She writes:

> I don't buy butter, I use oleo. I have stopped buying coffee. I never get the more expensive cuts of meat. I buy hamburger or frankfurters, and sometimes a soup bone. I have a Hudson Seal coat that I got in 1923. I have two house dresses that were given me. I did some canning and put up some pears that were given me. I picked some blackberries and made some jelly. I have tried in every possible way to be sensible in living and buying. I was satisfied with the $55.50 they were giving me, but now they want me to take less, and have put my total requirements at $53.75. I am obliged to wear surgical hose. They did cost $6 a pair, now I pay $12.50.
>
> "Please write me, Mr. HOFFMAN, how I can get along on $35.50 for food, clothing and incidentals; shelter, $4.26; electricity, $5.36; heating fuel, $8.63; total, $53.75.

That is the sum the much badgered and distressed county supervisor tells her that, according to Bureau standards, she is entitled to receive.

The postal employees' representatives acknowledged that others were in need, that they had job security, were not as desperately situated as some others. They suggested that, if we would cut out the billions which we have been sending abroad, the waste in defense production, and perhaps practice a little economy in our own legislative establishments and procedures, it might be possible to give everybody here at home a little better break.

I will go a little bit further than their suggestions and use my best efforts to get a little economy, not only in executive departments but in congressional activities, in our own housekeeping. For one thing is certain, until we do practice rigid economy and prices go down, with many out of employment, with the necessity of trying to provide jobs for the unemployed, apparently we will all have to do a little economizing ourselves.

So, while you are feeling sorry for yourself and I am feeling sorry for myself, it might be well that we should give thanks for the blessings we enjoy and remember there are others who are in greater need than are you or I.

Increase Travel Abroad by Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 11, I introduced H. R. 8352, making a technical correction in H. R. 7773, which I had introduced on February 8. This bill aims to carry out one of several recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, popularly known as the Randall Commission. As the official report of that Commission pointed out, the problem of stimulating foreign trade should be attacked on many fronts, one being the encouragement of foreign travel by residents of this country. "Increased travel abroad by Americans," the Commission declared, "can make a substantial contribution over a period of time to increasing the dollar earnings of foreign countries."

As one means of encouraging this travel, I have proposed in H. R. 8352 that the duty-free allowance of United States tourists returning from foreign countries be increased from $500 to $1,000. At present, United States residents who stay abroad more than 12 days may bring in $500 worth of goods, duty free, once every 6 months. Under my proposal, this allowance would be doubled. As an item of information, an exemption of $100 on foreign purchases was granted in 1897; in 1948 this was increased to $400, with a further increase to $500 in 1949.

In 1952 the dollars spent by American travelers abroad contributed over $1 billion to the purchasing power of foreign countries. This amount represents more dollar earnings than foreign countries received from the sale to the United States of any commodity except coffee. As another point of comparison, the sale of all dutiable finished manufactured goods earned for foreign countries in 1952 about the same amount of dollars as American travelers contributed. It is apparent, therefore, that American travel today contributes substantially to the economy of foreign countries, without affecting adversely our own economy.

Not only are these dollar earnings of great importance now, but they can be increased considerably. If the same proportion of our national income had been spent on travel in 1952 as was spent in 1929, the dollar earnings from travel would have amounted to almost $2,500,000,000. It seems obvious, therefore, that reasonable encouragement should be given to Americans who would like to travel abroad. Unquestionably such encouragement would be effective. The money American tourists spend abroad gives them pleasure and instruction. It helps our friends abroad and wins us many new friends for America. It brings substantial help to our friends abroad with a minimum of hardship and competition for the American people.

Foreign travel can be considered a commodity which Americans purchase freely, and which foreign countries are glad to sell. If we encourage this traffic we can benefit all concerned. If we can increase it, we will provide international trade with a decided "shot in the arm" in the form of new dollars. By the simple expedient of increasing foreign travel, we could narrow the existing dollar gap, which the Randall Commission estimates at two to three billion dollars annually.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that the Randall Commission unanimously recommended that travel abroad should be stimulated. They unanimously recommended also that the duty-free allowance be increased to $1,000, as proposed by H. R. 8352. In view of the fact that many other recommendations aroused vigorous dissents, such unanimity is significant. With this endorsement and with the obvious advantages of this proposal, I am confident that the Ways and Means Committee will give H. R. 8352 early and favorable consideration, and that it will then be approved by this body.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, today being Hungarian Independence Day, it is fitting to remember a people whose ideals are so akin to our own American conceptions and whose great patriot, Louis Kossuth made such a lasting impression while touring the United States a little over a hundred years ago.

President Eisenhower in his message to Americans of Hungarian origin on March 10, 1954, expressed an opinion which I think we all share—that there is today an even greater interest and compassion in the United States toward oppressed peoples than was at the time of Louis Kossuth's visit. Hungary's dynamic orator of 1852 apparently has not warned us in vain that Russian imperialism constitutes one of the gravest dangers threatening Western civilization and the American way of life.

President Eisenhower's message was read yesterday in Hungarian churches and patriotic exercises throughout this land. It was broadcast to the enslaved people of Hungary, rekindling the hopes of millions in a better day to come.

This reminds us that it was an officer of the Hungarian hussars who volunteered to our brilliant envoy in Paris, Benjamin Franklin, 177 years ago, to train General Washington's cavalry. The Hungarian offering his services to us in the darkest hours of this Republic, was one Col. Michael Kováts de Fabricy. He was appointed second in

command of the Pulaski Legion and took part in many a battle between New England and the Carolinas. Sent to bolster the defense of Charleston, he fell mortally wounded leading his men against the attacking enemy.

Americans from Hungary recalled the patriotic deeds of both Kossuth and Colonel Commander Kováts during their numerous events yesterday, their Independence Day, in many cities all over the United States. Right here in Washington, an eminent scholar, Rev. Edmund Vasváry, is putting the finishing touches to a volume which deals with the life story of this brave Hungarian hussar whose motto, "Faithful unto death" became the slogan of the American Hungarian Federation.

Colonel Kováts thus offered not only his talents as a professional soldier, but he came here to make the supreme sacrifice to his new homeland. No immigrant to these shores has given more, not many have manifested such a self-denying purpose. Our independence must therefore be like a dream to the people who gave us a Colonel Kováts, a Louis Kossuth, yet who today are under worse oppression than ever during their thousand-year-old history.

H. R. 8300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker I wish to take this opportunity to make a few observations about the bill for the revision of the internal revenue code, H. R. 8300.

This bill is a tax revision bill and not a tax reduction bill. It is true that there are many provisions that will bring tax relief to the American taxpayers. But this is an incident to the revision of the Internal Revenue Code which this bill represents.

The necessity for a revision of the tax laws of our country is self-evident. It has been many decades since there was a complete revision both as to substance and as to some of the revenue provisions of our code. Fifteen years ago there were only about 4 million individual income taxpayers in the United States. Today there are 54 million. Tax collections have increased 12 or 13 times during that same period. Taxes were added on to taxes and then more taxes have been added again. This mushrooming process in the imposition of taxes upon our people in time of war and other emergencies resulted in a tax code that was illogical, unsound, inaccurate from an accounting and bookkeeping standpoint, and in many instances harsh and unfair. To rewrite this entire law is the task that the Committee on Ways and Means undertook. A good job could not be done without the loss of some revenue because the only way you can relieve an injustice is to relieve it.

Much has been said about the work that has gone into this huge bill of almost a thousand pages. The committee heard 600 witnesses in public session. The Treasury staffs and the congressional staffs have put in a total of 200,000 man-hours of work. More than 200 organizations have been heard in conference and the answers to 17,000 questionnaires have been gone into. This bill without a doubt represents the greatest legislative task ever undertaken in the history of the Congress of the United States.

The real credit for this outstanding service to our Republic belongs to 1 man and 1 man only. I refer to the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, our beloved and distinguished chairman. His keen insight, his determination, his sense of judgment, his vast knowledge and his tireless efforts are unmatched in all the annals of the Government. Without him this bill would have never reached the floor of the House of Representatives. DANIEL REED is more than the man of the year. He stands as one of the pillars of our Republic of all time.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss some of the more complicated and technical provisions of this bill, and they are many. I will mention some of the provisions that mean so much to the rank and file of the people of America.

There is much talk about the cost of medical expenses. Prolonged illness, hospital bills, surgery, and drugs like everything else in this modern day are expensive. Too often we are inclined just to blame some other group for it. This bill does something about it. It liberalizes the medical deduction. At the present time if a man's salary is $3,000 a year and his family has medical expenses say of $500, he can only deduct that portion of the $500 which exceeds 5 percent of his income. That 5 percent has been changed to 3 percent with a minor limitation on the cost of drugs. The maximum amount of medical deduction allowed at this time is $1,250 and that has been doubled.

At the present time if a widowed mother must hire someone to care for her young children while she goes out and earns a living for her household, the amount she pays out for child care is not considered a business expense in connection with her earnings and, therefore, is not deductible from her income for tax purposes. That has been changed. A deduction up to $600 is available for expenses for the care of 1 or more children under age 10. If the child is between the ages of 10 and 16 this deduction is to be available if the child is physically handicapped to such an extent that he is unable to attend school.

The definition of dependents has been liberalized. Millions of people over the country are interested in this. A foster child can be taken as a dependent. At the present time a child taken for adoption is not considered a dependent during the period they are waiting on adoption in the home. That has been changed. The individual who stands in the place of parents and acts as parents is treated like all other taxpayers who support children.

In past years the mad scramble for revenue has been so great that there seemed to be a policy in both the Congress and the Treasury Department to get all the taxes you could regardless of the consequences. If a clergyman is furnished a parsonage he does not have to pay additional taxes by reason of being allowed the use of that parsonage. But if the church had no parsonage and made an allowance to him so that he could rent or provide a place for himself, that allowance was considered income and thus increased his taxes. That, too, has been taken care of.

One of the fine things that was done by the 80th Congress was the provision for income splitting between husbands and wives. This equalized the burden between States. Soon after that law was in effect we found that something more needed to be done. If a man lost his wife by death, he often found that not only his expenses for carrying on a household were increased but also his taxes were increased because he no longer had someone with whom he could split his income. A few years later that was partially corrected by giving such a taxpayer one-half the benefit of income splitting. This complicated the tables and the computation of the tax. In this bill we have gone all the way. We have given the head of the family the full benefits of income-tax splitting. We have also liberalized the definition of head of a family. This is one of the many provisions in this measure along with the others that I have just mentioned and many that I will not mention that bring a real benefit to the American home.

Retired people are the beneficiaries of tax relief by reason of the revisions we have made in this bill. At the present time retirement benefits from the railroad retirement program are by an act of Congress tax exempt. The benefits paid under our social-security law are by Treasury ruling also tax exempt. Yet the retired individual who lived off of his own savings, rentals, or an annuity purchased from the fruits of his own toil received no tax benefits. This has been corrected. This provision is based upon the Mason bill. It gives an income tax free status of all retirement income up to $1,200 a year on the basis of the rate of tax for the first bracket. By that I mean that the retired individual who is in the 20 percent bracket will get just as much benefit from this provision as the retired individual in the 50-percent bracket or in the 90-percent bracket.

At the present time anyone having a gross income of over $600 is required to file an income-tax return. Yet a person who is over 65 does not have to pay any taxes on his first $1,200 of income whether it is from earnings or from whatever source. This means that a lot of fine old people who owe no tax have to file a return and the Government must go to the expense of processing these returns. This has been changed so that an individual over 65 with less than $1,200 taxable income will not have to file a return.

At the present time if a salesman is an employee but incurs certain business expenses incidental to his selling, he cannot deduct these from his income unless he is considered self-employed or unless he is away from home over night. This rule is not just and so in this bill that has been changed so that these expenses can be deducted. In other words this is another situation where tax relief has come about by reason of revising the law so that it accurately measures an individual's taxable income. This is not a windfall for salesmen. This revision is made to the end that he will pay on his actual net income. Other benefits obtained by reason of this legislation are in the same category.

One very important change brought about by this measure has to do with the earnings of a dependent child. Under existing law, if a child earns more than $600 in vacation pay or has a gross income of more than $600 in 4–H Club work, he not only becomes a taxpayer but his parents lose him as a personal exemption. This was most unfair. One case was called to my attention where a boy's earnings were actually $600.89, yet this extra 89 cents cost his parents about $135 in added taxes. But I know of one case where the injustice was even greater. This was the case of a 4–H Club boy whose livestock and products brought him a gross of $800, but his expenses in producing them were $400. He only had a net income of $400, yet his parents had to pay $133 additional tax because of his activity in 4–H Club work. This bill provides that if a dependent child makes more than $600, he shall pay taxes on the excess over $600 but that his parents will not lose him as an exemption.

This bill carries an item in it in which I have been interested for many, many years. A long time ago I introduced a bill on it and I have reintroduced that bill in all the succeeding Congresses. This provision makes expenses paid by a farmer for soil and water conservation a business deduction for the amounts paid but not exceeding 25 percent of his income from farming. This, I believe, will be a great boon to conservation practices. We owe it to oncoming generations to leave this good earth just a little more productive than it was when we found it. The farmer who takes his own money to preserve, and improve, and enrich his soil is serving the general public and he is building a great national asset. These expenses are proper expenses in the business of farming and this bill makes them so.

Earlier in this Congress we extended the principle of accelerated amortization to farmers along the lines that have been enjoyed by industry. I refer to a bill passed earlier that permitted the charging off as expense the cost of grain storage over a period of 5 years. The need for privately owned, adequate and modern grain storage facilities is a national problem. Government-owned storage is not the right answer. This 83d Congress gave the same inducements for a taxpayer to build needed grain storage facilities as has in the past been given to industrialists to build needed war factories. This item, while it was enacted prior to this bill, is somewhat akin to the soil-conservation expense provision and for that reason I mention it here. It has been my constant endeavor to obtain for the farm families of America that same tax treatment that is accorded our industrial economy. This 83d Congress in approving these measures is making those efforts a reality.

Existing law permits an individual who must sell his house and buy another to do so without a present liability for a capital-gains tax. This bill improves that provision in one particular that I will mention. Suppose you have to sell your house under such circumstances but in order to sell you have to clean the place up by painting or papering it. This bill provides that those expenses in connection with getting it ready for sale shall be considered in determining the basis of the value of the property and will mean a tax benefit to individuals in those situations.

With our very high tax rates many Americans say: "What is the use? Why should I think and plan and dream and invent something over a period of many years only to have the sale of that invention devoured in taxes in the year that I realize on it?" This bill permits an inventor to split his income which is actually earned over a long period of time over a period of 5 years.

In spite of the many perplexing problems that face our Republic, I am convinced that there are great days ahead. I am convinced that the possibilities for better living and the possibilities for solution of many of our problems lie in the research laboratory. This bill spells out and liberalizes the tax treatment for research expenditures and permits the taxpayer to either expense those items or capitalize them. This is not only right and just, it is an investment in the future of our American way of life.

So many Americans hope that the day will soon be at hand when our tax dollars will not have to be spent all over the world to prime other nations' economies. This bill extends the Western Hemisphere treatment for corporations doing business abroad to other parts of the world. In other words we are attempting to induce private American capital to create jobs and industries in foreign countries and thus make their economy self-sustaining. To whatever degree this is successful it will relieve the tax burden of the farmers and workers and other producers in America who pay the taxes in the long run. This provision has a safeguard written in it that provides that the corporations benefiting by this section in going abroad cannot benefit under it if their products are sent back into America in competition with ours.

Many loopholes are closed in this bill. Another item that I might mention is that under existing law a refund for taxes amounting to $200,000 or more has to be referred to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This means that the department can make a sizable tax return without having the matter referred to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This $200,000 feature is reduced to $100,000, thus placing more of these tax refunds under the scrutiny of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and their staff.

After much work on the part of the staff, a system has been devised for combining the normal and surtax tables. This has been done in a way that does not prejudice those taxpayers who happen to have certain tax-free bonds.

One of the very important features of this tax revision bill is the new treatment of depreciation. At the present time if a farmer, a company operating a factory or any other taxpayer buys a machine which for instance has a normal period of usefulness of 10 years they can just charge off one-tenth of that cost for each of the 10 years involved. That procedure is not sound. It is not in conformity with business practices or with the facts in most situations. For instance, anyone knows that the actual depreciation between a new car and one that is a year old amounts to a great deal while the depreciation actually that takes place between a car that is 9 years old and 10 years old is very little. In other words, in reality most property actually depreciates most in the early life of that property. We are going to so treat it for the purpose of taxation.

This new rule on depreciation is sometimes referred to as the declining balance system. It will permit the charging off as depreciation two-thirds the value of a property in the first half of its life.

In the long run the same amount is charged off in depreciation for a property as is under present law. So in the long run there is no loss of revenue although there appears to be a loss in revenue in the first years that the taxpayer owns property.

It seems clear that in reality this new rule on depreciation will mean much more revenue for the Treasury. This new rule will add great impetus to the American enterprise system. The fact that taxpayers can fairly and accurately charge to depreciation the cost of new machines, new buildings, and the like will greatly stimulate the American economy. It will mean more payroll taxes, more income taxes, and more excise taxes from the producers of this property that will be brought by reason of this new rule. This will be one of the most important steps in sound taxation that has been made in a long time.

Another important provision in this bill is the step provided for partially removing the double taxation of corporate dividends. If the earnings of a company are taxed at the very high rates which run to 52 percent and then the profits when distributed to the owners are again taxed at very high rates to the individuals, why should people go into business? What is there to encourage a growing, expanding economy to provide more jobs for the young men and women coming out of our schools?

Is it a good thing for the ownership of America's great industries to be spread among as many individuals as possible? If so, we should take cognizance of it. This bill does that.

This bill provides that for the first year a taxpayer may have $50 in dividend income tax free because the taxes on that

earning have already been paid once. The second year he can have $100 dividend income tax free for the same reason. This means that the employee in one of our great companies who is buying stock by having a small amount taken out of his wages each payday will not have to pay taxes on the interest on that stock up to these limits because the company has already paid the tax on those same earnings.

This will be a great incentive for employees and other citizens in all income brackets to invest their money in productive private enterprises. In addition to the $50 and $100 dividend income provision taxpayers are permitted the first year to take a credit against their tax of 5 percent of their dividend income. After the first year it goes to 10 percent.

There are propagandists and leftists who bitterly assail this sound tax reform. They are wrong. We must face up to the real issue here. Do we want the private enterprise system? It cannot be maintained if we go on forever penalizing the person who saves and invests his money. If we are going to create a situation where the only source of capital for new ventures is the Government of the United States then there is no escape from nationalization of our industries and from complete socialism. We in this country turn to the Federal Government to finance things when private capital is not available. The way to make private capital available is to have a tax climate that provides an encouragement for all citizens regardless of from what income bracket they come, to save and to invest their money in productive private enterprises. This provision is a great step in that direction. It will benefit countless millions of people who now are, and millions more who will hereafter become, owners of America's productive industries, but more than that it will mean new ventures, new programs, new factories, new products and more jobs for men and women seeking jobs. It will mean more income and in the long run more revenue to the Treasury of the United States.

This bill also cancels out the April 1 scheduled reduction in corporate tax rates in accordance with the request of President Eisenhower. The added revenue to be received by continuing the 52-percent rate on corporate earnings more than offsets the loss of revenue by reason of these revisions. It is my belief that the good things accomplished by these revisions will, however, give us a growing and expanding economy and more revenue for the Treasury of the United States. To go on without these revisions means to invite great unemployment. We cannot forget that during the Democrat years beginning in 1933 and running until World War II, unemployment is excess of 10 million existed in this country each and every year. Let us enact this bill and not permit that to happen again.

Let me again repeat that this is a revision bill. When the subject of a further reduction of personal taxes comes up, I am sure that it will be the Republicans who will raise the personal exemption just as they did in the 80th Congress. The proposed motion to recommit, to make this a personal income tax reduction bill at this time, would mean a loss in revenue of an additional amount of more than $2 billion. I hope that it can be done soon, but to attach it to this bill means that there will be no bill at all. In other words, a vote for the motion to recommit is a vote against this bill and all the fine provisions that it carries. It will mean there will be no tax bill at all this year. A vote to recommit this bill is in reality a move to destroy and prevent the enactment of all the benefits contained in this legislation which will mean so much to our economy. It will help no one.

Move Surplus Dairy Products and Restore 90 Percent Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture order reducing parity on dairy products to 75 percent of parity is the most disastrous order issued in our generation. If we go into a depression, this order will be responsible.

There has been too little effort by the Department of Agriculture in moving dairy surplus products into consumption channels. With many of our own people forced to exist on near starvation levels—this is a pitiful sight.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act or there will be no action in this respect. I urge the passage of H. R. 8329 introduced by myself and similar bills introduced by 30 other Senators and Congressmen.

The bill provides as follows:

First. Every recipient of old-age assistance, social security, widows' and orphans' benefits, crippled and handicapped aid, or any recipient of public welfare aid shall be given besides the monthly check, a ration card worth $10 each month for butter, milk, or cheese.

Second. The recipients of this $10 ration card each month buy these dairy products from their regular store and merely give a coupon from the ration card in payment.

Third. The regular store each month will mail these coupons in to a bank designated for the purpose in each State and will receive payment at the regular prevailing market price.

Fourth. The designated bank will, in turn, send the coupons to the Federal agency and get payment from the money appropriated for support prices.

If this bill is enacted into law, we will no longer be bothered with surpluses of dairy products—that prove ruinous to the farm prices.

I and 30 other Federal legislators are now working on a bill to provide a quart of milk a day for every student, from kindergarten through the high-school level. These 31 legislators believe that if these two laws are enacted, the dairy farm surplus problem will be solved once and for all so that the dairy farmers can have security in planning. We believe that in cutting red tape and storage costs, the cost of these two programs will be less than the money now being spent for support prices. These two plans place emphasis on consumption, rather than red tape and storage.

Let us pass this bill now and restore 90-percent parity. If we do not, the 1954 depression is on the way. Benson should resign.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 14th day of March is annually celebrated by the Slovak people everywhere in the world as Slovak Independence Day.

This year, as for a number of years past, the residents of Slovakia are unable to participate in this celebration as they are still suffering under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

The strongest characteristic of the peace-loving Slovak people has always been and still is their ardent devotion to the cause of liberty and freedom, and their strong adherence to the same truly democratic principles for which our country stands. Their sons and daughters have given their lives for these principles and many still linger in prisons and concentration camps because of their refusal to submit to Communist domination.

On this, their independence day, I join with millions of Americans in expressing my hopes that the day may soon come when they will again be free and have the God-given right of self-determination of their own national future.

The Seafood Industry in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the commercial fisheries industry in Louisiana does an annual business in excess of $33 million and employs in excess of 31,000 persons. This industry is being developed at a very rapid pace and no one knows what its value to us in the future will be. The Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, commercial industrial services section, commercial seafoods division, has recently published a directory of commercial fish dealers in Louisiana. This pamphlet was published because of the interest of Mr.

L. D. Young, Jr., director of the commission; Mr. Robert L. Eddy, chief of the commercial seafoods division; and Mr. Charles A. Murphy, of the industrial services section, in the development of the commercial seafood industry in Louisiana. It is my understanding that this is the first such undertaking by any State and indicates another step forward in proper development of an industry of boundless potential.

A communication I have received from the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, indicates that this agency has had considerable demands for references of this type and indicated to me that a standard directory for each State would be desirable and that such publications would be of value to the staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I am authorized by the above-named officials of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission to offer their assistance to other States who care to develop such publications in their own behalf.

Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue participation certificates to certain designated classes of persons. In correspondence and by personal contact with my constituents, I find a widespread lack of understanding about the rights of present and future beneficiaries. The purpose of this measure is to put into their hands a formal document setting forth clearly, and by example where possible, the pertinent provisions of the Social Security Act.

Because the Congress has power to alter such provisions, this document should not be called an insurance policy and the term "contract" or similar misleading language should not be used. Instead, the certificate should clearly state in what respects it differs from the usual life insurance contract.

The present Social Security Act uses such terms as "primary insurance benefit," "full insured," "currently insured," etc. While perhaps technically correct, such use of the word "insurance" is misleading to many laymen who mistakenly consider it as synonymous in all respects with commercial insurance. I am informed that the courts have yet to say whether social-security payments are or are not "insurance," but they have held that such payments may become due as a matter of right and as such are not gratuities. The fact remains, though, that there are basic differences in the two concepts of insurance.

I realize that the Social Security Administration has had an educational program in operation for a long time, and various information bulletins have been issued to explain the law. The fact remains, however, that millions still think of it as an inviolate "insurance contract," do not understand that there are conditions of eligibility even though payments have been made for long periods, and few comprehend the method of computing benefits.

To tailor the participation certificate to the present or potential benefits of each individual wage earner, while perhaps desirable, would be a stupendous task. I am, therefore, suggesting only that the name, address, and social-security account number appear on the face of the certificate, followed by a simple explanation of eligibility requirements and benefits computations. A pocket supplement should be provided so that applicable changes in the law could be inserted annually.

A transmittal letter should accompany the document encouraging the retention of the participation certificate with other valuable papers of the recipient.

The Kelley PWA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the newsletter released a few days ago by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Westmoreland County, Pa., with reference to the aims and purpose of his bill, H. R. 8250:

Since introducing my bill last week to create a new Public Works Administration to launch a $6½ billion Federal-local works program, of which $3 billion would come from Washington, I have had many interesting and enthusiastic comments on the proposal, along with one very vigorous dissent.

That came from a newspaper editor in the District who insisted this whole idea was nothing more than boondoggling, wild-eyed spending and so on. It was his position that the PWA program of the late 1930's, as administered by former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, didn't cure the last depression.

This is a rather typical shoot-first-and-look-afterward reaction. Whether or not PWA by itself cured the last depression—and, of course, it didn't and wasn't intended to—the fact remains that PWA was one of the most successful combinations of useful work opportunities and useful construction ever undertaken in this country in a period of economic dislocation.

Many school buildings stand today as a monument to PWA, along with a lot of other necessary and useful facilities erected under the Federal-local cooperative program, under which the Federal Government contributed 45 percent of the cost and the States and local governments the other 55 percent.

While my bill is modeled along the lines of PWA, particularly insofar as this ratio of cost allocation is concerned, it has the added feature of calling for close cooperation between the proposed PWA Administrator and the President's Council of Economic Advisers to make sure the program helps to carry out the objectives of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Thus it should, as that act provides, "materially assist in carrying out the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government" under the Employment Act of 1946 "including the promotion of useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and in promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

My bill is intended to supplement rather than incorporate any present programs of Federal assistance to States or localities for construction. In other words we now have a variety of Federal aid programs not in existence at the time of PWA—the Federal aid highway program has been vastly expanded since then, and also the flood-control program, and we now have Federal aid to airports, hospitals, housing projects, and so on. If those programs are to be expanded, and I think they should be, it can be done under present authorizations merely by increasing appropriations for these purposes. My purpose is to open the way for States and localities to improve facilities not presently eligible for Federal assistance, particularly schools, but also including such things as sewage systems, filtration plants, city halls, courthouses, recreation centers, firehouses, police stations, local flood-control projects not eligible for Federal flood-control funds, and similar construction activities.

It is silly to have construction workers walking the streets looking for jobs while our schools burst at the seams and the physical plants of our municipalities rapidly deteriorate into firetraps or junk or public slums. The work is needed and the jobs are needed, and I hope the Congress will get behind this effort and thus force the administration not only to recognize but to do something about the current depressed state of our economy.

With unemployment over the 3-million mark, the time to argue over whether it's a recession or adjustment is past. There's no sense in waiting until the April reports on February unemployment. The time to act is now.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Independence of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, March 14 was the 15th anniversary of the independence of Slovakia, which occasion found the people of Slovakia engaged in a continuing battle of resistance against Communist tyranny to retrieve their freedom and national independence.

I know I speak for the American people in proclaiming our belief that the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence of the rights of all peoples to self-determination and the opportunity to pursue their own national destiny under the government of their choice are the rights of all civilized peoples everywhere. By its brutal aggression against the Slovak nation, the Soviet Union placed itself squarely in opposition to the ideals held by the whole of

the free world. In their resistance to the bolshevization of their country and in their suffering under a foreign tyranny which has attempted to undermine the most enduring basis of human society, the dignity and rights of the individual together with these national rights, the people of Slovakia have the moral backing and the sincere sympathy of the free world.

Increased Appropriation for Agriculture Research and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President's budget proposal for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1955 contains an increased appropriation for agricultural research and education—namely, the total proposed sum of $112,376,000 as against the amount of $94,194,000 appropriated for fiscal 1953–54—I should like to extend my remarks in the RECORD to emphasize as strongly as possible the desirability of making this increased appropriation. The sum of $112,376,000 is presented in two parts in the budget, of which $68,776,000 is for research and $43,600,000 is for agricultural extension work.

I am sure that all the Members of this House are aware of the splendid work which is going on in our agricultural extension services and our agricultural experiment stations in land-grant colleges throughout the Nation. I have recently received detailed information from Dr. D. W. Colvard, dean of the School of Agriculture of the North Carolina State College in Raleigh, N. C., which shows conclusively the inestimable benefits which accrue from Federal appropriations for agricultural research and education.

Dean Colvard points out that each million-dollar increase in Federal funds for extension will provide approximately $50,000 for use in the great State of North Carolina and that each million-dollar increase in Federal funds for research to be allocated to the States will provide an increase of approximately $38,000 for North Carolina. The fact that the State of North Carolina has increased its support for these programs in higher ratio than has the Federal Government indicates that our people greatly appreciate and value the work being done in agricultural research and education. Our North Carolina local county governments have actually increased their appropriations for extension purposes more than three times as fast as has the Federal Government since 1940.

It is Dean Colvard's opinion, in which I concur, that the underlying purpose and result of the additional appropriation would be to strengthen the economic programs in the various States through research and educational processes. For example, in my own State of North Carolina cash farm income, according to Dean Colvard, has increased by $740 million, since 1940 and through 1952, while total appropriations from all sources for research and extension have increased by a little more than $6 million. When you translate these increases into purchasing power of the farmer, which is the primary factor that sparks the rise in level of national income, Dean Colvard estimates that the purchasing power of Federal appropriations for agricultural extension is actually less than in 1940 whereas the purchasing power of cash receipts from sale of farm products is approximately 250 percent greater than that of 1940.

From the painstaking and revealing studies supplied me by Dean Colvard I am convinced that the increased Federal appropriation for agricultural research and education will have far-reaching effects not only on our farm economy but on the whole general economic structure of our country, and I, therefore, wish to express the earnest hope that when the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture is brought to the House this proposed increase by the President will have the full endorsement of my colleagues on both sides of this Chamber.

More Businessmen Support Fair Program for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I note an increasing number of ninth district businessmen's groups are writing me, urging 90 percent of parity price supports, and supporting me in my long fight for a minimum of 90 percent of parity for farm produce. They know that their prosperity and the prosperity of everyone in America depends upon the solvency of the farmer. If the farmer is forced into a depression, we will all suffer a depression.

I am glad to know that the businessmen of many communities in my State of Minnesota are working together on this important issue, as exemplified in a statement I received from the businessmen of Waubun, Minn.

This statement contains the following pertinent points:

Since no man can live without the products of the soil, the tillers of that soil, our farmers, must be treated fairly in order that our Nation may grow stronger and by its strength, ultimately bring peace to the world.

We feel that the farmers are not asking too much when they ask for fair treatment. Everyone knows that there are many, many minor industries that are absolutely unable to stand on their own feet, but, because of the extremely valuable nature of their services, cannot be allowed to fold, and so are supported by Government subsidies, direct or indirect.

Then, why, when the basic industry, farming is, so to speak, weak in the knees, should the supports be removed or drastically reduced? Is it to hasten the collapse of the small farm, and the small-business man—the very backbones of the Nation? Perhaps that is not the intention. But that will be the result.

The statement concludes with an expression of strong opposition to the new farm program of flexible supports.

Surplus Foods Should Be Immediately Distributed to Deserving Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent extends about 150 miles along the Ohio River and northward about an equal distance. It comprises the counties of Athens, Fairfield, Gallia, Hocking, Jackson, Lawrence, Meigs, and Vinton. In certain sections of each of these counties there are located some very needy families. We have reports constantly to the effect that the Government has a large surplus of food. I have looked into this matter rather closely and find that the Government, through the Agricultural Marketing Service, is undertaking to distribute this surplus food in such a way as to bring a substantial relief to these needy families.

The Agricultural Marketing Service operates through the State authorities. In Ohio this distribution is made through the State supervisor of community distribution.

I have investigated this situation rather thoroughly with the people and officials in our district and I am glad to know that the city of Jackson has been designated to be the distributive center for these surplus commodities. Jackson is very advantageously located from the standpoint of being accessible to all parts of our district.

I am sure that the county commissioners in each of these counties will respond enthusiastically to the performance of this task and I am also sure that the various relief organizations in the counties will respond enthusiastically to carry out this very important and worthy program. It shall be my purpose to cooperate fully with these various organizations so that we can do successfully what the Government wants done and also we can bring relief to many worthy people who are anxious to have it and are entitled to it under the circumstances.

Several bills have been introduced in the Senate and also in the House. The purpose of these bills is to provide full and complete authority for the Government agencies to distribute the great quantities of surplus food that are piling up in the various sections of the country.

The figures now show that the Government has in stock and available for distribution, more than 300 million pounds of butter and likewise more than 300 million pounds of cheese and milk. Also the Government has great quantities of other food that could be prepared for distribution and should be distributed where needed.

It shall be my purpose to support and aid in the passage of any legislation that may be needed to bring about early distribution of these great quantities of foods that are available. There is no doubt that the local agencies, if given proper encouragement, can provide for the fair and adequate distribution of these surplus foods.

The Jenkins Bill Encourages the Self-Employed To Build Their Own Retirement Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that the American people in the past few years have become security conscious. I was a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means when that great committee wrote the first social-security law.

The first law provided protection for the needy aged. That was about the extent of the first bill as reported to the House for its consideration. While we were considering this bill in committee, I offered an amendment to include provisions for the needy blind. My amendment was rejected by the Democratic controlled Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Roosevelt was then President. He expressed opposition to the inclusion of the blind and offered as his reason the fact that most of the States had institutions which took care of the blind. This was not quite true generally speaking. These State schools, where they existed, took care of some of the blind children. To be eligible for existing State help it was frequently necessary for the children to leave their homes and families to be institutionalized. It was at best an inadequate and unsatisfactory arrangement.

I offered an amendment on the floor of the House which would include the needy blind of our country. This amendment was included in the first social security law. I have always felt proud of my efforts in having the blind included under the protection of the social security law.

After the passing of the first law in 1935 which only included the needy aged, needy dependent children, and the needy blind, the sentiment for expanding social security has increased greatly. Title II of the social security law, known as old-age and survivors insurance law, was enacted in the original legislation providing for a contributory system of tax payments with the employee and the employer both paying a certain small percentage of the wages earned. These payments are paid into the OASI trust fund to be used exclusively for the purpose of paying benefits to retired workers under the provisions of the social security law. The coverage and benefits provisions of the OASI program have been made more adequate by subsequent amendments.

The OASI program as originally enacted did not include the self-employed. Even under our present Social Security Act, as amended, there are many categories of employed and self-employed persons who are denied OASI coverage. Many of the large corporations and employers of labor provided their own retirement programs whereby many employees were given security coverage.

In spite of this very general trend toward security coverage there remain many thousands of our people who are not included under our social-security protection and who are not given the opportunity of providing for their own retirement through plans approved under the Internal Revenue Code. These persons have come to the conclusion that their best relief will come if they entered into a plan of self-insurance. Already many persons who do not qualify under any plan, presently in force, have come to the conclusion that they owe it to themselves and to their families to guard against the vicissitudes and uncertainty of life. It is to meet this demand that the Jenkins bill, known as H. R. 10, was introduced in the present Congress.

The Jenkins bill, H. R. 10, will give to self-employed persons and others not eligible under existing law to be covered by an approved retirement program, the opportunity to establish their own individual retirement plans. H. R. 10 would give to these taxpayers benefits comparable to those available to corporations and their employees under section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section of our tax laws provides that employees participating in plans approved under the statute do not have to include the employer's contribution to a retirement program in their gross income for tax purposes until pensions are actually received. Company contributions are deductible by the company in the year in which made.

H. R. 10 would allow eligible persons to exclude from their gross income limited amounts paid into a restricted retirement plan or toward the purchase of a restricted retirement annuity contract. Annuity payments received under this program would be fully taxable. A qualified individual under my bill is defined as one "not eligible to participate in a pension or profit-sharing plan qualified under section 165 or established by a governmental or charitable employer." It thus covers employees of corporations or partnerships which have no qualified plan. It would also cover owners of small businesses, professional people, and farmers. The amount deductible in any 1 year cannot exceed 10 percent of earned income or $7,500, whichever is less, and there is a lifetime limitation of $150,000. I stress the fact that my bill would merely give to millions of our taxpayers benefits that are comparable to those already received by other millions of American taxpayers.

I shall not go into a further discussion of the bill. Much has been written about it. One of the most lucid and convincing articles that I have seen is an editorial that appeared in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post published under date of April 24. This is not simply a news article but is instead a considered opinion based on careful analyses of the issues and equity involved. It is an editorial that has been written by a man who recognizes that there is one more important step that must be taken before the security of a great and responsible group of our people has been provided. This editor puts himself and his very popular and widely circulated magazine on record as supporting the lawyers, doctors, dentists, farmers, and many thousands of our best citizens in their desire to establish security for themselves and their families.

This editorial is as follows:

WHY NOT ENCOURAGE THE SELF-EMPLOYED TO BUILD THEIR OWN RETIREMENT FUNDS?

Employed persons in the United States are at least partially protected for their old age by social security. In addition, many of them are the beneficiaries of company pension funds. Payments into such funds by employers, as well as the employers' share of the social security tax, are deductible from taxable income. Up to now, however, there is no similar provision for a large group of self-employed people, such as physicians, lawyers or farmers. Their efforts to provide for retirement are hampered by exorbitant taxation.

In the Philadelphia area recently, a physician enjoying a large and presumably profitable private practice retired and took a job in a Government hospital. He gave as his reason for doing so the fact that he had been unable to educate his children and at the same time save enough to provide for eventual retirement. He felt himself compelled to become an employed person in order to receive the benefits of a pension fund. A young doctor or lawyer, after a long and expensive education and apprenticeship, is likely to find adequate saving almost impossible under present conditions.

Congress is now considering a measure which is designed to fill some of these gaps. The Jenkins-Keogh bill, which was introduced last year, is an outgrowth of several efforts to solve the problem. In general, it provides that any individual who is not eligible to participate in a pension or profit-sharing plan may set aside each year an amount not to exceed 10 percent of his earned income, and in no case more than $7,500, to be paid into a restricted retirement trust or insurance annuity. The amount thus set aside could be deducted from his taxable income. The proposed law places certain restrictions on the means by which these savings can be accumulated and provides that the taxpayer may not tap the fund until he is 65 years old, "except in the case of total disability." This would place him roughly on the same footing with

employed individuals who are the beneficiaries of private pension funds.

Undoubtedly the proposed measure does give the self-employed certain other advantages over their opposite numbers in the ranks of the employed. For example, the beneficiary of some company pension funds may not accept a job in another company without forfeiting his equity in a pension from his first employer. The self-employed doctor who builds up his own retirement fund may leave his community and set up shop somewhere else and still hang on to his retirement allowance. There are undoubtedly other discrepancies, but if an individual can do better on his own account than through a company pension fund, this might be an important step away from the welfare state. Private saving should be made at least as attractive as reliance on contributions by employers or the Government.

Few reliable estimates have been made of the possible loss of revenue to the Government if such a law were passed. However, as a writer in the Harvard Law Review has observed, "even the possibility that the revenue loss would be so considerable as to necessitate higher tax rates is not a valid objection; it seems more equitable to distribute the tax burden among all taxpayers than to continue discrimination against one group."

Congressman Doyle Urges Colleagues To Encourage Citizens To Exercise Voting Privilege and Responsibility in Coming Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I make these few extemporaneous remarks about the privilege and duty of participation in American voting processes, and the danger to our beloved Nation if the majority of American citizens do not perform that duty. We as Congressmen can render a fine service in this regard.

Just so long as the majority of the American adulthood become informed and stay well informed about the affairs of our Nation and in their respective local communities "from the grassroots up," just that long will our great Nation be strengthening its sinews from day to day. Mr. Speaker, only so long as an increasing majority of the American people participate in shaping their own destiny and the destiny of this Nation by exercising their choice of men and measures at the ballot box, only that long will our constitutional form of government endure. For, it appears as clear as crystal to me that the secret of strength to our American way of life and living is that the clear thinking, patriotic, humble folks of our beloved Nation shall participate individually in making our democracy work at the grassroots of American citizenship.

It is self-evident, therefore, that the voting habits of Americans must be conscientiously shaped by Americans so as to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship. And this very American citizenship assumes the obligation to register for voting and then to actually vote in local, State, and National elections. We Americans must stop being careless in this regard. We must stop being slothful about this voting business. We must systematically work to destroy the citizen apathy toward our election processes which apathy, if extended very much more, will permanently weaken the very foundations of our American constitutional way of life. Truly a minority of the American people must never be charged with the responsibility of determining the destiny of America.

So, I vigorously urge that you and I as United States Congressmen, do our dead-level best to systematically and very determinedly urge every possible qualified person to register to vote—and then to vote at primary elections in their respective States and then later at the November general election.

Looking back at the 1952 elections the record indicates that only 1 out of 2 persons of voting age took time to cast a ballot for President of the United States, while in 1940 nearly 2 voters out of every 3 voted in said election.

I do not now have the time to give statistics. In fact, that is not the purpose of these informal comments. If there is a higher privilege in our American citizenship than the right to vote in a free election, what is it? And, where is there a higher obligation of American citizenship than to vote in our free elections? Is it not a fact that upon our American right to vote at free elections the very foundation of our system of self-government exists?

Mr. Speaker, in these few words I again urge every Member of this great legislative body to be more diligent than ever, in encouraging and informing our electorate, regardless of political party, of the privilege and duty of the American free vote.

In closing, I incorporate a letter, dated March 26, 1954, from the Library of Congress on this subect. Some day later I hope to make further comment, including the matter of making sure that Americans abroad in the military or civilian service also vote. All States should make it so they can do so. There is need of fundamental correction of some of our State election laws in this connection.

The letter follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1954.

To Hon. CLYDE DOYLE.

From James A. Mitcham, Government Division.

Subject: Selected data relating to voting participation.

The basic data on voting participation in the presidential and congressional elections are contained in table 1. Herein is shown by State the percentage of the potential voters that participated in the elections of 1940 through 1952. We were unable to include the data for the 1938 congressional elections, since there has been no reliable estimate published of the voting potential in 1938. The Bureau of the Census voting population estimates for the intercensal years are not available prior to 1940.

Table 2, based upon the data in table 1, shows the percentage increase or decrease in voting participation in the congressional elections and the presidential elections. As a general conclusion, it can be readily seen that voting participation in congressional elections falls considerably below that of the presidential elections not only for the United States but also in every State.

The 1952 voting percentage, although the highest of those for the years shown, only exceeds the 1944 average by 2.8 percent. However, the improvement from 1948 low of 52.1 percent was more than 10 percent.

That the increase-decrease span in voting participation shows little relationship to regions is apparent from the data presented in table 2. Changes in voting percentages for the years 1940–1944 ranged from a +15.2 percent increase in Maine to a decrease of −5.7 in Oregon. While the overall decrease in voting from 1944 to 1948 presidential election was a −7.6 percent, the State of Nebraska showed a decrease of −17 percent. North Carolina, one of 8 States to show increased voting for 1948, had a +4.9 percent average. In 1952 every State showed an increased vote over that of 1948. Oregon, which had the greatest decrease in 1944, also had the greatest increase (+20.2 percent) in 1952. Colorado with +0.2 percent had the smallest increase in 1952 over 1948. Of the many important reasons for the 1952 upsurge in voting are the population increases and the concerted drives by numerous organizations to "get out the vote."

Congressional election voting changes show that Kentucky had the highest increase from 1942 to 1946, or +15.2 percent, and fell to the bottom with a −9.2 percent in the period 1946 to 1950. North Dakota was lowest in the period 1942–46 with −7.9 percent and Oregon was highest in the period 1946–50 with +16.5 percent.

In all the elections, it is interesting to note that the States of the South—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—have shown steady increases in voter participation despite the fact that none of these States have had more than 50 percent voter participation since 1940.

Table 3 shows the extent of participation in the 1950 to 1954 national elections in 25 foreign countries. It is significant that in comparison with these countries, the United States ranks 21st in percent of the electorate that voted. One observation should be made that the election laws in all these countries are not uniform. As a consequence the comparability of voting averages in some countries with the United States might be open to question. Furthermore, it would not be valid to compare the voting percentage of any country with that of a single State of the United States.

The publication we have attached entitled, "You Can Vote," summarizes the election laws in the States. The table taken from the NEA Journal presents this same information in a more concise form. Insofar as we know, there are now no Federal laws relating to special privileges for voting by members of the Armed Forces at home or abroad. Such legislation was passed in 1944, as an emergency measure during World War II.

Population figures for the age group 18 to 20 years are not available for any years except the decennial census. Therefore, we have not included this very limited data in our analysis.

For general information on the subject of the importance of voting we have attached a selection of articles. Your attention is called to a survey made by Representative JACOB K. JAVITS which shows the analysis of response to the question, "Why don't you always vote?" put to a selected group of persons in 1950.