Department of Agriculture already is playing the cottonseed boys off against the soybean producers."

The junior Senator from Minnesota is wise to that policy, too. I have sent out some material on that subject, including graphs and charts, to my colleagues in the Senate.

The word is now out: "We will reduce dairy price supports. Then we will get the grain prices down. Once we have oats, rye, barley, and sorghum down we can reduce the price of corn, because one can be substituted for another."

After all, if the price of oats, barley, and rye can be reduced to 80 or 85 percent of parity, why should farmers feed 90 percent of parity corn to their livestock? So one commodity will be used against another. It will be the old game of divide and conquer.

I wish tonight to warn every Member of the Senate who represents a producing State of the Union—and every State produces something, because agriculture is a rather universal pursuit throughout the Nation—there is a very devious, curious, and rather unsavory game going on, of playing one commodity off against another.

Never did I feel I was more right than I feel at this hour. Never did I feel that the evidence was more clear that there is a determined, premeditated operation in the Government, particularly in the Department of Agriculture, to have a general lowering of the level of agricultural prices and agricultural income. This administration does not seem to show too much concern about the continuing rise in the cost of living. It does not seem to show too much concern about the fact that the wholesale food indexes are at an all-time high. It does not seem to show too much concern about the fact that interest rates have gone up. Interest rates are a kind of price-support proposition for the financial institutions.

The administration does not seem to show too much concern about the fact that there are 4 million unemployed. It does not seem to show too much concern about equity in taxation for the great rank and file of our people.

So I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to go before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to besiege that committee, and to ask that it promptly report the necessary bills or measures. We can do this next week; we can do it tomorrow. It will not take long.

I remember when the Mexican labor bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without a hearing. It did not take long to bring it before the Senate. It was vaulted from the House of Representatives to the Senate with hardly a stop. There were not even printed hearings, because no hearings were held. It was quick, positive, definite action. The bill passed the Senate, too.

But in this area of Agriculture? No.

Mr. President, I think I have done my duty. From here on, I shall act beyond the call of duty.

I desire to have the acting majority leader convey to his leadership the message that the junior Senator from Minnesota will be on the floor of the Senate day after day until something constructive is done. I shall pursue the matter, I shall persist in it, and I shall do so in the name of fair play and equity. We are not asking for the millennium; we are not asking for special privileges. We are asking for fair treatment and equality of treatment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it will not be necessary for the acting majority leader to inform the majority leadership that the junior Senator from Minnesota will be speaking on this subject, because, as best I can recall, the Senator from Minnesota already has warned a half-dozen times that he intends to continue to speak on the subject. So I think all that is necessary is to remember what the Senator from Minnesota already has said.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God of grace and goodness, grant that our whole life during this day may be lifted into an atmosphere of spiritual refinement.

Give us moral courage as we contend with those great and vested wrongs which are continually storming the citadel of our souls.

Help us to hold in stern discipline every evil desire which seeks to undermine our character and tempts us to break faith with our better self.

May all the ambitions and aspirations which Thou hast planted within our minds and hearts grow into fuller strength and beauty.

Inspire us with an eager longing to enrich the well-being of mankind everywhere. May the spirit of good will and helpfulness have an ever-widening dominion.

Hear our prayer in Christ's name. Amen.

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

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM submitted a conference report and statement on House Joint Resolution 238, granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

FARMERS' SHARE OF CONSUMERS' DOLLAR IS LESS THAN MOST PEOPLE REALIZE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a growing belief among urban people that farmers are "living high on the shank" at the expense of city consumers. I suspect that some of my colleagues from urban districts entertain the same notion. My reason for making this observation is that as recent as last week one of my distinguished colleagues from New York declared on the House floor that the Secretary of Agriculture should be congratulated for lowering dairy price supports. The implication was given in his remarks that we now have a Secretary of Agriculture who is thinking of consumers.

As I have stated here on the floor several times, I am also concerned with the economic problems of consumers; but I do not think that the remedy lies in beating down farm prices. When the gentleman from New York uttered his words in praise of the Secertary of Agriculture, he must have done so with the thought in mind that farmers are being paid too much for their milk.

What are the facts on the dairy farmers' share of the consumers' milk dollar? Are dairy farmers gouging consumers? Well, I decided to do a little research work of my own on eight milksheds east of the Mississippi River. The milksheds that I secured information on are all very large metropolitan cities, and over 18½ million people live in these cities.

The figures which I obtained are the most recent, and they cover milk prices for a period of from a month to 6 weeks ago at the latest.

Dairy farmers in the New York milkshed area, I was informed, received $4.25 per hundredweight for their milk. Consumers in New York City were paying on the average of 25 cents a quart for home-delivered milk.

According to my calculations, the dairy received 9.2 cents on a quart of milk. If the New York milkshed dairy farmers gave their milk away for nothing—and it appears that some people would like to see it this way—New York City consumers would still have to pay 15.8 cents for a quart of milk.

Do these figures support the contention that dairy farmers are gouging the consumers? I fail to see it, for there is a 15.8 cents spread between the farmers' share and the consumers' price. The gentleman from New York said nothing about this when he declared the other day on the House floor that there was a "rash of speeches" on the dairy problem.

However, let us hurry along and examine the farmers' share of milk prices in seven other major industrial centers. Here are the facts:

In Washington, D. C., the price of home-delivered milk is 24.5 cents a quart, and the farmers' share is about 10.8 cents. For the city of Boston home-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

delivered milk averages from 23 to 23.5 cents a quart with the farmers' share running 11.9 cents. Philadelphia consumers paid 23 cents a quart and farmers received 10.3 cents.

Moving westward, we find that home-delivered milk in Cleveland costs 20 cents. The dairy farmers' loot is 9 cents. Home-delivered milk is sold to Detroit consumers for 21.5 cents a quart. The farmers in this area received 8.2 cents. Still farther west we find Chicago consumers paying 25.5 cents a quart, and the dairy farmers are robbing consumers to the tune of 7.9 cents a quart. In Milwaukee the consumer pays 20 cents, and the farmers are getting "hog rich" on 7.2 cents a quart.

No, my friends; farmers have not been gouging the consumer on milk or any other farm commodities. I read some figures recently to the effect that the cotton farmer receives 31 cents on a $3.50 shirt. A beef farmer receives 24 cents of the consumers' dollar. The wheat farmer receives 3.2 cents out of a 17-cent loaf of bread. A 23-cent can of corn enriches the farmer by 3.6 cents. Tobacco farmers are getting rich on their 3.3 cents that they get on a 23-cent package of cigarettes.

Despite this evidence, the gentleman from New York believes that we should congratulate the Secretary of Agriculture for thinking about consumers. Well, just for the record, I wish to say that farmers are also consumers. In my remarks yesterday, I neglected to mention some pertinent facts about the farmer as a consumer.

The American farmer requires each year 7 million tons of steel. This is more steel than is used in a year's output of passenger cars. Farmers, by the way, also buy passenger cars when they have the money. Incidentally, it requires 350 million pounds of raw rubber to supply the rubberized equipment on America's farms. This is enough rubber to put tires on 6 million passenger cars. Each year American farmers use 16.5 billion gallons of crude petroleum—this is more petroleum than is used by any other single industry. Farmers use 50 million tons of chemicals each year.

And yet there are people who think that our industrial economy is not tied up with the welfare of agriculture. I am not certain that some of my colleagues and the critics of farm programs appreciate the fact that almost 40 percent of the Nation's working population is involved with the economics of agriculture and industries related to agriculture.

Or to put it in other words, out of 61 million people employed in the United States, 10 million are working on farms; 6 million are producing for and servicing farmers; and 9 million people are processing and distributing farm products. On the basis of these statistics, I believe that agriculture is very important to the Nation's business, industrial, financial, and political economy.

Instead of taking potshots at farmers, as some people delight in doing, we should be concerned with what is happening in agriculture. I am sure that the newspaper editors and magazine editors—who also receive subsidies—are not going to buy the tractors, farm trucks, fertilizer, and other farm supplies that farmers will not be able to buy in sufficient amounts if agricultural income continues to decline.

According to The Farm Income Situation bulletin, published by the United States Department of Agriculture, net farm income in relation to national income was the lowest percentagewise in 1953 that it has been since 1910. It was 6 percent of total national income last year. This is 1.3 percent lower than it was in the depths of the depression in 1932.

I also wish to point out that for 1953 the farmers' percentage of net income in relation to gross farm income was the second lowest since 1910. It was down to 36.6 percent.

While farm income has been declining, there is no evidence to indicate that farm costs of operation are dropping. In fact, farm costs continue to stay at the same level, or at best drop slightly in certain phases.

Let me sum up farm costs by citing this example. Today the cost of a two-plow tractor would have financed the production expenses of an average farm in 1910 for 3½ years. I did not hear the gentleman from New York suggest that farm implement manufacturers, steel companies, rubber companies, chemical companies, and others that supply farmers should cut their prices to 75 percent of parity. Nor has the Secretary of Agriculture expressed much concern about farmers as consumers.

Farmers have been going steadily into debt. Farm mortgage debt today stands at $7.8 billion; and farmers' short-term debt was around $7.2 billion at the end of 1953.

A few more figures on farmers' increasing costs should be of interest to my colleagues. The statistics I cite are from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1953, just published. On page 8 we find these figures:

In 1947, 800 bushels of corn would buy a tractor. At the end of 1952 it took about 1,300 bushels—or two-thirds more.

In 1947, 930 bushels of wheat would buy a 12-foot combine. At the end of 1952 it took more than 1,600—or three-fourths more.

In 1947, 9 bales of cotton would buy a pickup truck. At the end of 1952 it took 12 bales—one-third more.

In closing, I wish to say that today I included other types of agriculture because what has happened and is going to happen to dairy farmers will also face other segments of American agriculture.

Tomorrow Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson plans to play a little April Fool's joke on dairy farmers—he is going to lower dairy support prices to 75 percent of parity. I note that the press carried stories to the effect that the order would not be carried out for at least another month.

On March 15 I introduced a bill, H. R. 8388, to extend the present 90-percent support prices on milk and butterfat for another 120 days. I introduced it for the purpose of maintaining present supports so that Congress could give more thought to a dairy program as part of the general farm bill.

I have twice written the members of the Agriculture Committee to hold a hearing on my bill—or a similar bill—and report it out before April 1. Up to this moment the Agriculture Committee has not held a hearing. I do hope that they will find it expedient to hold a hearing and report the bill out before the dairy industry is confronted with even more pressing economic problems.

This is a serious problem and it must be solved—but it will not be solved by beating down farm prices. Seventeen-cent-a-pound butterfat didn't help city consumers in 1932—and it will not do it in 1954.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

A FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, despite the continued rise in unemployment and the administration's promise to take action if there is no improvement in the jobless situation in March, we are now being told that May is really the month in which to look for economic improvement. Efforts are now under way to minimize the importance of the March figures on which the President laid so much hope. Here it is the end of March. There is no improvement in sight. Nor is there in sight any attempt by the administration to take action.

Labor Secretary Mitchell admitted recently that unemployment would continue to rise in March and April, but that an upswing in employment would not come before next fall. How high unemployment would go is a matter which only the future can tell. Dr. Ross M. Robertson, an economist with the Federal Reserve bank in St. Louis, estimated it would reach 4 million by the end of March and would continue rising until it reaches 5 million. He added that there would be no reversal to this trend at least for the next 6 or 8 months.

Here are the month-by-month figures on unemployment since last October as reported by the Commerce Department's Bureau of Census:

Month	Total unemployment	Monthly increase	Total civilian employment
October 1953	1,162,000		62,200,000
November 1953	1,428,000	266,000	61,925,000
December 1953	1,850,000	422,000	60,764,000
January 1954:			
Old	2,360,000		
New	3,087,000	510,000	59,753,000
February 1954:			
Old	3,385,000		
New	3,671,000	584,000	60,051,000

Mr. Speaker, the two sets of figures given for the months of January and February are based on separate sam-

plings by the Bureau of the Census, the old survey being limited to 68 areas and the new survey encompassing 230 areas throughout the country. A careful perusal of these figures shows the following:

First. That unemployment in February had reached the highest total in the last 4 years.

Second. That unemployment in the 5-month period between October 1953 and February 1954 increased at a faster rate than at any time in our history, including the depression period of the early 1930's.

Third. That despite repeated administration assurances that the situation is leveling off, the increase in unemployment is growing each month.

Fourth. That unemployment is now being felt in almost all major industrial areas in the country, as evidenced by the fact that the new Census Bureau survey covers 230 such areas.

The most disquieting phase of this situation, however, is the fact that the Census Bureau's figures on unemployment do not include persons who were laid off for 30 days or less, or those who worked as little as 1 hour per week. Actually, then, the number of people out of work is much larger than the estimated figures of the Census Bureau.

If the picture is not obscure enough, the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security reported on March 19 that virtually all of the 149 major job areas which it surveyed reflected adversely affected employment conditions between mid-January and mid-March of this year, and at least 40 of these labor market areas are now classified as showing greater surpluses of workers. This Bureau said it found that unemployment had spread by mid-March to a "wide range of industries," including auto, farm machinery, aircraft, household appliances, basic steel, textiles, shipbuilding, electronics, electrical equipment, and others.

Mr. Speaker, the one glaring weakness about the unemployment statistics published periodically by the various Government bureaus is that they are estimates, based on surveys, and not exact figures. We have no true picture of the unemployment situation. There is no correlation and no coordination of employment data as gathered by our various bureaus and agencies. Commerce Department has one set of figures, the Labor Department has another, and the Agriculture Department yet another. While it is true that they cover different aspects of the employment situation, they fail to provide us with a total picture and only add to the confusion.

The result is that today few objective observers have any confidence in the accuracy of the administration's official figures on unemployment. Its surveys are not carefully tested, different sets of figures are issued, the statistics are inconsistent, corrections have had to be made after official figures were released, there is apparently no agreement on the base which is to be used in measuring the rate of joblessness, with the result that many people question the veracity of these statistics. At a time when accurate statistics are of crucial importance, we do not have them or we question those we have. In fact, we do not even have an accurate or acceptable definition of the term "unemployment." If a person has been laid off for less than 30 days, is he to be considered as unemployed?

We cannot proceed on this casual basis. If we continue to do so, it will in time become dangerously misleading. We must know accurately how deep unemployment is reaching, how fast it has been rising, how far it may be going before the trend is stopped and reversed. We must have accurate figures that are not questioned or disputed.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way whereby we can obtain a true picture of the situation and that is by having a congressional committee look into the matter, study our present system of compiling data on the number of unemployed, clearly define unemployment in acceptable terms, and recommend ways to coordinate all such statistics into one report to be issued from one official source.

I am, therefore, introducing a joint resolution to establish a committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Unemployment which shall conduct a full investigation of the unemployment situation in the country, with particular reference to certain localities and industries, and that this committee shall make a report of its study and its recommendations to Congress by June 30, 1954. This is to be primarily a fact-finding committee and it shall have the authority to call on the various departments and agencies to furnish the necessary information in pursuance of its functions. The committee is to consist of 16 members, 8 from the Senate and 8 from the House, to be divided evenly among the 2 political parties. The committee is to select its own chairman and vice chairman.

The main idea is that this must be a quick and intensive study. We must have a true picture of the unemployment situation at the present time and we must also have the machinery to supply the Government and the people with accurate statistics for future guidance and planning. We cannot and dare not drift along blindly and casually. The welfare of our people and the future of our Nation require that we have clear direction ahead.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Joint Resolution 487

Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Unemployment

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Unemployment (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of 8 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and 8 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker. In each instance not more than 4 members shall be members of the same political party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to perform the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(b) The members of the joint committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the functions vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the unemployment situation in the United States, with particular reference to the extent of unemployment in particular localities and industries.

(b) The joint committee shall make a report of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the Senate and House of Representatives on or before June 30, 1954.

(c) The functions vested in the joint committee by this joint resolution are supplemental to the functions vested in other committees (including joint committees) of Congress; and nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed so as to curtail or take away any function of any such committee.

SEC. 5. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable.

(b) (1) The joint committee is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, board, bureau, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, data, estimates, and statistics which will be of assistance to the joint committee in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution.

(2) The executive departments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government are authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, data, estimates, and statistics directly to the joint committee upon request made pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection.

DAIRY PRICES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the 81st Congress, I have had the honor of representing the people of the southern half of Milwaukee County in this great body. My district is primarily industrial and the great majority of our people are wage earners. They are consumers who are most vitally affected by fluctuations in the cost of

living. An increase in the price of basic commodities makes it frequently difficult for them to make ends meet and it makes inroads on their savings.

For these reasons, all increases in the cost of living have been deeply disturbing. Further, the growing spread between the low prices received by farmers for their produce and the high prices charged for the very same products to our metropolitan consumers was of great concern to me. Therefore, I have repeatedly urged Congress to investigate this situation to determine who has been getting the gravy.

Last year, with a number of my colleagues, I sponsored a resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests. When the Republican-controlled House last year denied the Federal Trade Commission the funds necessary to undertake a study of the makeup of the consumer dollar—a study that could have helped to clear up this mystery of the rising cost of living and the simultaneously dropping farm incomes—we pressed for early action on our resolution. We will continue to press for congressional action on this proposal because the people of my district and all the consumers in our country are entitled to know the facts about this situation.

In the meantime, however, another subject which is very closely connected with the interests of the consumers of my district, needs to be mentioned: namely, the critical situation which is reportedly facing the dairy farmers of our great State of Wisconsin. We must remember that our dairy industry accounts for a big portion of our State's economy. Because of the growing spread between farm and consumer prices, and the recently announced decision of the Secretary of Agriculture to cut dairy supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity, our Wisconsin dairy industry may be facing some very difficult times.

Now the people of my district have seriously questioned the wisdom of maintaining a permanent and rigid support program for any segment of our national economy. Further, they have been hard hit by the high level of prices of agricultural products. They welcome relief from those high prices.

At the same time, however, our people realize that the farmer has not been getting the gravy because his income has been dropping while prices have been going up. They also appreciate the fact that if our dairy industry goes into a slump, our dairy farmers will not have the money with which to buy the products manufactured by the people of Milwaukee.

This is not a simple matter, nor one that can be solved overnight. Yet the Agriculture Committee of this House has delayed giving serious and comprehensive study to this problem in face of the threatened crisis. The issue is grave, and it requires earnest attention and close cooperation between the Government and the representatives of the dairy industry.

Together with other Members of Congress. I wish to commend my colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, for his efforts to bring about immediate consideration by the Agriculture Committee of his proposals contained in H. R. 8388. As I have already stated, the threatened crisis which is reportedly facing our dairy farmers—and thereby a large segment of the economy of our State—merits earnest and careful consideration.

In closing, it is my desire to again emphasize that, together with those of my colleagues who are also concerned about the interests of the consumers, I will continue to press for early action on the proposal for the establishment of a joint committee on consumers' interests. The consumers are in need of help and it is up to this body to ascertain why our people are paying high prices for goods which continue to bring decreasing incomes to agricultural producers.

UNEMPLOYMENT AT MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in Martinsburg, W. Va., there are two projects that I desire to call to your attention. This city is one of the many in my district that is classified as a distressed unemployment area and it surely needs a building program.

Several years ago a new Federal building and post office was authorized and plans progressed to the point of purchasing the grounds, but the war stopped all construction as we know, and in 1945 the already-appropriated moneys were turned back to the Treasury. Now that this program is already set up and there is a lot of unemployment in this area as well as a great need for a new post office and Federal building, why should not this be an appropriate time to start this construction? I have done everything I know how to do and it is now time for Congress to take a hand in this project.

I am told the Government is not doing any building in the United States now. However, we are going to have to start a building program in the near future, so why not now? It will certainly help to alleviate a critical unemployment situation in this area.

Another item I desire to call to your attention, one of the finest airports to be found anywhere is also located near Martinsburg. This is a comparatively new airport, constructed in 1944 at a cost to the Federal Government of more than a million dollars. I have suggested to the Air Force it would make an ideal site and location for the proposed new Air Force Academy. It is just 15 air minutes from Washington. I have tried and tried to get the defense agencies, the Air Force, the Civil Aeronautics, or private industry to make use of it, but I am told this airport is not needed. Yet the Air Force goes ahead and builds new airports when this fine facility is close by that could be utilized.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. 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. 42]

Battle	Hale	Powell
Bender	Jensen	Richards
Bentley	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Boykin	Kee	Roberts
Bramblett	Kelley, Pa.	Seely-Brown
Carlyle	Lucas	Sieminski
Celler	Lyle	Teague
Chelf	McGregor	Tuck
Chiperfield	McIntire	Velde
Cotton	Merrill	Weichel
Curtis, Nebr.	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Nelson	Yorty
Dawson, Ill.	Patten	
Dingell	Pillion	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have had the recent privilege of reviewing a new bill proposed by the Department of Defense to provide medical care for dependents of service personnel.

You might well ask: "What is so unusual about that? Do not we provide medical care for service families now?"

As a matter of fact, we do provide some medical care for some service dependents, but it is offered to them sometimes begrudgingly, on a basis of privilege rather than of right. The proposed bill, on the other hand, could well be termed a dependents' bill of rights for medical treatment. It would establish a definite obligation of the services to provide medical treatment to servicemen's families, an obligation that many of us in Congress may have assumed was being fully discharged.

In these days of deep concern over the strength of the defenses of our Nation, we must not overlook the importance of maintaining high morale and fighting efficiency of our defenders, those in the military service today in whose hands we are trustfully placing our future existence.

Surveys and personal interviews have convinced many of us that the No. 1 concern of the fighting man today is the safety and well-being of his family. The airman on duty in the frozen Arctic reaches, the sailor on an extended cruise away from his home, the marine and infantryman on a foreign shore

is most concerned that his family is being cared for while he is away.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed bill guarantees to our fighting forces that this usually recognized privilege of medical care for dependents is, in fact, an entitlement that he can count on. With that assurance, the fighting man on our global defense line can turn to his job at hand with renewed confidence and higher efficiency.

The preamble to the proposed bill carried a statement of intent that bears out the importance of medical care. It states, in part:

> The Congress believes that programs of medical care have been, and will be, important factors in the creation and maintenance of great courage in face of combat and other service conditions throughout the Armed Forces, because it assures members of the Armed Forces at home and overseas that the medical care of dependents will not be denied by reason of member's service or member's absence on extended active duty.

This forward-looking legislation, as proposed, will cover dependents of servicemen and women, active and retired, and the widows and dependent children of deceased service personnel. It includes all branches of the military, including the Coast Guard, when on active duty with the Navy.

One of the most important provisions is that it makes full use of existing military medical facilities and staff. The bill provides specifically that military medical facilities would be used to the fullest extent possible.

In cases where such military facilities were not capable of providing the authorized treatment, or in cases of emergency, medical care would be provided at Government expense from duly licensed civilian physicians and surgeons, and at duly accredited civilian hospitals and treatment facilities. Use of military medical facilities would be specifically directed in cases where the care could not be furnished more economically by civilian means.

In order to prevent possible overuse of the new program, the Secretary of Defense would be allowed to assess a nominal contribution from each patient for the medical care rendered. Current thinking in the Department of Defense is for a charge to the patient of about 10 percent of the cost. In the case of hospitalization, this would about equal the nominal subsistence charge now made to dependents who have been treated at service hospitals. Outpatient medical care at a military dispensary, or clinic, would not be charged to the patient under the proposed regulations.

Medical care would include such treatment as diagnosis, acute medical and surgical treatment, immunization, and maternity and infant care. It would include hospitalization, where needed, except for domiciliary care of chronic diseases, chronic nervous or mental disorders, and certain contagious diseases. In acute emergencies, it would include ambulance service, and in special cases would also include house calls by the physician.

This bill, when passed, will have an immediate and far-reaching effect on the Armed Services, where morale is at an all-time low, and reenlistment rates are the lowest in history.

It will mean that this Congress and the Eisenhower administration have reversed the ominous trend that has progressively whittled away servicemen's benefits over the past 10 years. It will signal an end to the creeping cutbacks that have seriously damaged military morale at a time we can least afford it.

I understand that this legislation has the approval of the various branches of the military, of the Defense Department itself, and of President Eisenhower. I understand it has been thoroughly discussed at the Budget Bureau and is soon to emerge from there for action by the Congress. It is my earnest hope that we may act quickly, forthrightly, and sensibly when this long-needed legislation comes before us for consideration and action. Action on this matter is long past due.

SUPPORT PRICES ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson will lower the support level on dairy products, including butter, to 75 percent of parity. This courageous action is being taken by the Secretary in an atmosphere clouded by false statements and malicious rumors. I think it would be well at this time to examine the facts.

First, what is the law under which the Secretary is taking this action? Let me read it. Subsection 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act provides:

> The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

Let me emphasize the key words. Supports shall be set at a level necessary to assure an adequate supply. That is the law.

A review of the production of dairy products during the last year when the price was supported at 90 percent of parity is in order. You all will recall that Secretary Benson agreed 1 year ago to continue supports at 90 percent. He was frank in admitting that he came to this conclusion reluctantly. He said at that time that the dairy industry itself should find a solution to the program that was keeping milk and butter and cheese priced out of the low-income market. He warned that the consumer who could not afford to buy these necessary foods for his children resented the use of his tax money by the Government to buy these foods for storage. Nevertheless, in order to give the industry time to work out its own solution, the Secretary kept high supports.

What has happened to the supply of dairy products? Has consumption increased? Has the industry come up with a program that would put these needed products in stomachs rather than storage? Let us look at the facts for the answers.

The Commodity Credit Corporation inventory as of February 20, 1953, was 60.5 million pounds of butter, 22.7 million pounds of cheese, and 97.5 million pound of nonfat dry milk solids. This was the equivalent of approximately 1.2 percent of the milk production of the previous year.

What is the picture today? Here it is as of February 17, 1954.

Instead of 60.5 million pounds of butter, the Government now holds 275 million pounds. Instead of 22.7 million pounds of cheese, the Government now has 290 million pounds. Instead of 97.5 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids, we now have 482 million pounds.

Our supply on hand of butter and cheese—stored at appalling expense to the taxpayer—is sufficient to give every man, woman, and child in the United States 3 pounds each. The operation of the 90 percent price-support program during the past year has required the Government to use tax funds to take approximately 1 quart out of every 10 produced and put it into storage.

I do not think anyone can safely say that the 90-percent support program is necessary to insure an adequate supply of butter. Those who would maintain this, would describe the Johnstown flood as the result of an adequate supply of water.

Instead of attempting on its own to bring consumption up and production in line, the dairy industry bolstered by the high support program has increased production during the past year to such an extent that we are paying over $500,000 per day in storage charges. How can anyone defend or propose a continuation of this policy?

Can any friend of the farmer maintain that a continuation of this surplus buildup will result in anything but a revolt from the consumers—a revolt that may in its extreme wreck any program to aid the farmer?

I submit that Secretary Benson has taken the only action he can take and obey the law. I believe that this action—despite the outcries from narrow interests—is the only one that will save the farm program.

Is there any constructive alternative to this program which will permit a general decrease in retail prices of milk and its products and so encourage increased consumption for the benefit of all?

I cannot see how anyone who is conscientious could do otherwise than what Secretary Benson has done in this case. His honesty, integrity, and concern for the general welfare—in the face of political pressures generated by narrow interests—is admirable. In Secretary Benson, the American people have the type of courageous public servant they are entitled to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8583) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8583, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 42, line 25, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$103,582,000" and insert "$188,358,000."

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the appropriation recommended by the committee from approximately $103 million by $85 million. Several other amendments will be offered today, and they will bear upon other sections of the bill. I expect to have something to say about those amendments when they are offered, but I will undertake to confine my remarks during these 5 minutes to this particular amendment. The $103 million of funds authorized in the bill, will permit TVA to complete the construction of every installation now in process of construction. The purpose of the amendment is to give TVA additional money to build entirely new steam plants or new units in existing steam plants. The question, therefore, arises whether or not TVA will need $85 million to build new steam plants. I will cite just two reasons why this amendment should be defeated. There are others that I could mention, but I think these two ought to be determinative of this issue. First, keep this in mind. We are not dealing with $85 million. That is only the first installment. These steam plants undertaken to be authorized by this amendment will require 3 years to construct, and the $85 million undertaken to be added to the bill today will only pay the first year's cost. So, we ought to understand at the outset that what is proposed here is to obligate the Treasury of the United States to spend $227 million in addition to the $1,750,000,000 already invested in TVA. The other reason I think the amendment should be defeated is that it does not have budget authorization. There was no justification before our committee for the construction of additional steam plants. Not a word appears in the printed justifications filed before the committee asking for money to construct plants other than those now in process of construction. I do not think this committee, without any hearings and without any consideration at the hands of the Budget Bureau ought to summarily so to speak add $225 million to the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. I do wish to make it clear that there is no shortage of power in the Tennessee Valley area. Statements have been made on the floor this week, as well as last year, indicating a shortage. It is not a question of shortage of power; it is a question simply as to whether TVA will get the additional power it needs from private power sources that is now available, or whether the taxpayers of the United States will put up additional money to build new steam plants. TVA expects to sell during the fiscal year 1955, 50 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. Where is that electricity going to go? About 50 percent of it will go to Federal agencies.

Sixteen and one-half billion of those kilowatt-hours will go to industrial and commercial uses. Five billion, one hundred million kilowatt-hours will go to Tennessee Valley to light the homes of the people of the Tennessee Valley; one and a half billion kilowatt-hours will go to the people of Tennessee to heat their homes. I do not believe it is up to the taxpayers of the United States to provide cheap electricity for the good people in the Tennessee Valley to enjoy the luxury of electric heating.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the money we have spent on TVA is the best investment the Government has ever made in its entire fiscal history. The Tennessee Valley Authority has paid bigger dividends than we have ever received from any other enterprise within the memory of man.

Had it not been for TVA we could not have had the atomic bomb which ended the World War, and which saved hundreds of thousands of lives and untold amounts of treasure. Had it not been for the superpower provided by TVA we could not have produced the aluminum for that great fleet of airplanes which blasted Hitler's centers of communication, production, and power and brought the war to an end.

TVA alone made it possible. And the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] went with me down to Oak Ridge, leaving in the night and returning in the night, and with me and the other three members of the subcommittee wrote into the TVA appropriation bills over $2 billion, when no other Member of the House knew that it was being spent much less what it was being spent for. That $2 billion ended the war. How fortunate for the Nation it was that it was in the 79th Congress and not in the 83d Congress.

The flower of the American Army was trying to take Iwo Jima. The desperate resistance of the Japanese forces was compelling us to consume three times the men and munitions and three times the time we had expected to expend. They were entrenched in caves and vast underground galleries and had to be blasted out with subterranean charges and burned out with flamethrowers, step by step, a yard at a time, and our losses were appalling. Just last week you read in the papers of the finding of 3,200 bodies of Japanese soldiers in these underground galleries where they had remained undiscovered during our 10 years of occupation of the island. When we finally took it there was not a square foot on the island that had not been bombed and devastated and pulverized by artillery, rifle fire, grenades, and the heaviest naval guns in the American fleet.

We then turned our attention to the mainland and the indomitable Japanese Army, fighting on its own shores, in defense of its homes, its empire, and its shrines, fighting with its back to the wall, prepared to make an even more desperate resistance. Iwo Jima was merely a foretaste of what was to come.

In that fateful hour, a single airplane, with a single bomb—from TVA—without the loss of a single American life, closed an era in world history.

What a dividend TVA paid. There is not a community in America but sent men to Iwo Jima who never came back. What would it have meant to communities and homes throughout the Nation if we had to take the mainland—the homeland—by assault? As at Iwo Jima, wave after wave after wave of Americans hurled against ramparts defended by Japanese who never surrendered would have been hurled back burned and broken and crushed to bloody pulp. That is what TVA saved us. And yet they tell us here today that TVA should never have been built. That it was a financial mistake. That it is socialistic. That it prevents the private utilities from charging the American people more for electricity.

But that was only half the battle. Over on the English Channel superior German airpower destroyed Rotterdam in 30 minutes, and brought France to her knees in as many days. Every night London was lighted by her own conflagration, and slowly but inexorably Hitler closed in. Neither England nor France nor any allied country could turn back the rain of death from the skies. Only one hope remained. American airpower.

Only a little while before we had fought in the Appropriations Committee and here on the floor the same battle we are fighting today. TVA was appealing urgently for that last dam. The same interests opposed it then that oppose it today. But it was the 78th Congress and not the 83d Congress. And we built the socialistic dam that completed the grid and from the expanded TVA flowed the vast currents of power which produced the aluminum and sent a conquering cloud of airplanes across just in the nick of time to stop the new rockets already in position on the French and Belgian coasts which would have snuffed out all allied resistance in a matter of weeks. No power or agency under heaven could have saved Europe and us—but TVA. But we are told here today that TVA is socialistic and should never have been built and that it should be so loaded down with drains on its income that the yardstick which protects every consumer of electricity in city and country, in every community in the Nation, should be destroyed so that private enterprise can charge more for electricity.

But we are confronted by another and more deadly enemy. Russia not only has the A-bomb and the H-bomb but she has more and better planes than we have. She has more and better sub-

marines than we have. And she has a well-disciplined and well-equipped army 10 times as large as all the allied armies combined.

Russia is building TVA modeled powerplants on her great rivers. And she is not putting them under the restrictions imposed by the committee in the bill pending here today.

The President has warned the Nation of the danger of the situation. Plans have been completed for abandoning our cities and getting our people out into the country as their only defense against air attack. And TVA which saved Europe cannot save itself. In this bill we are taking the first deliberate step toward strangulation.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we do not have to emasculate TVA. If we will just give them time the Russians will do it for us. Our Army long ago worked out a list of targets which they say the Russians will attack when they come over. And TVA is the first target on the list. Russian communism hates and fears TVA more than any other American institution. And when this race between American and Russian armaments draws to its close—as eventually it must—TVA will be the first to go. It is now a question of which will get in its deadly work on TVA first, the Politburo or the Power Trust.

But TVA is as valuable in peace as it is in war. Within the last century we have so plundered and exploited our national resources that we are getting down to the bottom of the barrel. Our vast forests are making their last stand in the Far West, and lumber is reaching a prohibitive price. Our gold and silver mines have been worked out and we must import all precious metals. New oil wells are being discovered but the old wells have been pumped dry. Even our subterranean water level is dropping and reclaimed irrigation districts are being turned back to the desert.

Our agricultural lands have been so worn and depleted that fertilizer is a necessity in every farming region. The first modern fertilizer plant was established at TVA and it is today a pilot plant showing what kind of fertilizer is needed and how to produce it cheapest. And of course the cheaper food can be grown the cheaper it can be sold to the consumer.

But most serious of all, our iron mines are being exhausted and now that even the fabulous Mesabi Range is about worked out, it becomes necessary to find a substitute. Steel is the foundation of industry—the one indispensable factor in our modern economy. Aluminum is the only practical substitute. And it can be produced in practically unlimited quantities as long as we have electricity. But it requires electricity to produce it, and only TVA can deliver power in the quantities required.

We cannot stand still. We cannot adequately implement a steel-age civilization without TVA. We cannot win the next war with the weapons and strategy with which we won the last war. We will need greater weapons—we must have a greater TVA in the next war than we had in the last. Instead of restricting TVA as we do in this bill we must provide additional and expanded facilities.

That is what we are voting on here today. We know how Stalin and Hitler and the Mikado would have voted. They didn't like the demonstration over Hiroshima and Berlin in 1945. We know how Malenkov and Vo Nguyen Giap and Mao Tse Tung would like to see us vote on TVA here this afternoon. And in voting let us remember that a hydrogen bomb dropped on Washington would burn to a crisp everything north to Toronto, south to Miami, and west to Kansas City. In this connection I would like to read an editorial from the Washington Post and Washington Times-Herald, the great American newspaper. Its editorial opinions are not controlled by its advertising columns. Here is what it says:

CRIPPLING THE TVA

The House Appropriations Committee has proposed a program for the Tennessee Valley Authority which would slowly put it out of business as an effective regional enterprise. In the first place, the committee lopped off $38 million of the $141 million appropriation recommended by President Eisenhower. This is a heavy blow in view of the fact that the President already had refused a TVA request for $85 million to build new power facilities. In the second place, the committee wrote into the appropriation bill, which the House now is considering, a series of riders that would do more damage than the denial of funds.

The bill would abrogate the agency's authority to control resale rates on the power it generates. This would permit co-ops and communities buying power from TVA to vie with one another in establishing retail rates, or to pay for various community services by charging high electric rates, or to subsidize certain enterprises with low rates at the expense of the individual consumer. Another rider on the appropriation bill would require TVA to pay interest to the Government on money invested in power facilities. TVA could pay this, as it is ahead of schedule in repaying money advanced by the Treasury. But if it paid interest charges—interest on money to purchase property which the Government owns now and will own after the agency pays back the money—TVA would have less money for new transmission lines and other necessary development. Finally, the bill would require the agency to return to the Treasury money it has on hand to cover depreciation of plant and equipment. This would be an invitation to inefficiency.

TVA is an agency which the people of this country have come to support with pride and enthusiasm. During World War II, it proved its worth many times over. Even today there is a shortage of electric power in many parts of the country, and nearly every electric system is busily engaged in expanding plant capacity. It would be shortsighted in the extreme to cripple TVA at a time when it is an important supplier of power for atomic plants. Congress would not think of making a direct attack on the agency. It should not permit an indirect attack—and by the infamous method of legislation by appropriation—such as that engineered by critics of TVA on the House Appropriations Committee. The House at least ought to eliminate these legislative riders in the appropriation bill.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have had 20 years' experience now with America's first, much-touted, great, Socialist, Communist experiment. We ought to have learned something.

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

Mr. GWINN. No; I do not. I will after a while. I am anxious to yield, but not now.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that those words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. GWINN: "We have had 20 years' experience now with America's first, much-touted, great, Socialist, Communist experiment. We ought to have learned something."

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, 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. 8583) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. GWINN: "We have had 20 years' experience now with America's first, much-touted, great, Socialist, Communist experiment. We ought to have learned something."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, may I read the definition of communism?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair sees nothing in the language used that would reflect upon the membership of the House or otherwise be considered unparliamentary.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8583, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, it might be well to read from Webster's International Dictionary the definition of communism:

A system of social organization——

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not speaking on TVA and he is therefore out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will address himself to the pending amendment.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing just that. I am going to describe this black spot on our map down in Tennessee which they themselves have circulated, and give a definition of what it is, which I propose to talk about:

Communism is a system of social organization in which goods are held in common, the opposite of the system of private property.

Now, we ought to defeat this amendment; in fact we ought to stop all appropriations because a system of public property or commercialized property

works in America like it does in the rest of the world—England, France, Russia. It reduces production, it impoverishes the people, it destroys political and economic freedom without an exception in the world. From that history we would expect just what has happened in Tennessee as the result of this experiment.

The chamber of commerce has just published a most enlightening study on TVA from 1933 to date. It shows that Tennessee among the 10 Southeastern States ranked very high before TVA when they had private power and private salesmen going all over the State selling power. They had no shortage.

Tennessee ranked then among the 10 Southeastern States with regard to retail sales as second in 1929. After TVA in 1948 it dropped down to fifth.

In retail-store payrolls in 1935 it ranked third; in 1948 fifth.

In value added by manufacture, Tennessee ranked third in 1933, fourth in 1947. In gross postal receipts they ranked third in 1933, down to fourth in 1951.

Listen to this: Receipts from farm markets, in 1933 Tennessee ranked fifth, in 1950 eighth.

They put more land under water, 660,000 acres of it under water down there—more acres than there are in the whole State of Rhode Island. Floods are not controlled. The land is permanently flooded. Annual production of $27 million, from the richest bottom land is permanently wiped out, the State permanently crippled by a big, rather useless lake, with 9,000 miles of shoreline. As some one said, "Man made 9,000 miles of shore on a God-made 650-mile river."

The extent of the misrepresentation involved in this project as a flood-control project is shown by the Army engineers report that not more than once in 500 years would there be a serious flood.

In all of the categories examined, Tennessee has fallen behind in productivity. It ranks one point above where it used to rank 20 years ago, only in one particular, and that is the per capita income and the per capita taxes paid. But, the reason for that is not that Tennessee is more productive. Instead of producing and paying taxes, Tennessee herself has been an eater of taxes from the outside. One hundred and eight million dollars have gone down there from the outside to meet payrolls of 22,796 TVA employees, or nearly an average of $5,000 apiece, plus other hundreds of millions in doles for one sort or another. That accounts for the rise in per capita income and per capita taxes paid in Tennessee—by donations from outside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to say this: I am in this peculiar position. We are actually working today on borrowed time. The other committee is waiting to go. We had discussed this matter yesterday and the day before. I have no desire whatever to limit debate of anybody, especially those who have not spoken before. I hope no one will ask for an increase in time. I am constrained to object to any request for additional time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the phrase "borrowed time" in its application to the House. This side cooperates in every way possible.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, the gentleman, I think, should allow a little flexibility, and a situation has arisen where, I think, if anyone wants to answer, he should be given 5 additional minutes. I believe in freedom of speech, and I would like to see the gentleman from New York get 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California insist on his objection?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I may make a further observation, answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, if I accede to his request to permit the gentleman from New York additional time which I think, as he does, is desirable, will he then object if from then on I decline to allow unanimous-consent requests by other Members?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts will not permit himself to have conditions imposed. I have asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have 5 additional minutes, and I am just going to stand on that. We will let the rest take care of itself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then the gentleman from California will not object to this unanimous-consent request, but the gentleman from Massachusetts understands what will happen in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not binding himself beyond the present unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from New York have 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I was interested in the gentleman's reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Communist outfit. Year before last when the gentleman's candidate for President came down to Memphis he endorsed the program of the TVA——

Mr. GWINN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What complaint did the gentleman from New York register then against his candidate's endorsement?

Mr. GWINN. I am not discussing that now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is very relevant.

Mr. GWINN. I yielded for a question. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am asking the gentleman, what complaint did he register at the time his candidate endorsed what the gentleman says is a communistic organization?

Mr. GWINN. What gentleman?

Mr. ABERNETHY. You.

Mr. GWINN. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said, what objection or protest, if any, did the gentleman interpose when his candidate for President in 1952 endorsed this so-called Communist organization?

Mr. GWINN. Why, the part of what the candidate said that I endorsed was that this was one of the best examples of our American creeping socialism.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But that was after he had already caught the rabbit.

Mr. GWINN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. ABERNETHY. While your candidate was chasing the rabbit, what did the gentleman have to say?

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not understand that.

Mr. GWINN. I would like to answer further the gentleman's reference yesterday on the floor to the candidate for the Presidency. When the candidate for the Presidency rode in his campaign, before his train got even to the Tennessee border a committee from Tennessee, economically not free, politically not free, religiously worshiping the State, said to the candidate, "What do you bid for the votes of Tennessee in terms of appropriation for TVA?" And the gentleman said that unblushingly, as if our candidates, from here on, should approach each State border with an answer to the question, "What do you bid at this auction for the vote of this State?"

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

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

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if he agrees with this statement made by President Eisenhower on November 2, 1952, just 2 days before the election, which statement appeared in all the Tennessee newspapers:

> If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. I have a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will be able to continue to do in the future. Under the new administration TVA will continue to serve and promote the prosperity of this great section of the United States.

Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GWINN. I assume, Mr. Chairman, that what the President meant was that since TVA was well advanced, having had spent on it $1,788,000,000, that it would raise its power rates to a point where it could build its own steam plants and pay its own taxes. TVA is not contributing to the salary of the President or to the salaries of the Congress or the delegation from Tennessee. Its customers, 1,600,000 of them, are not saying anything either in their power bills. We ought to raise the rates so that at least the Tennessee Valley, this black spot on the map that they put out, will pay something toward their own national defense.

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

Mr. GWINN. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to remind the gentleman that the financial structure for the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway will be an exact replica of what we have in the Tennessee Valley. Is the gentleman going to take the floor when we take up the St. Lawrence Seaway and brand it as communistic and socialistic?

Mr. GWINN. I shall, if they lose track of the harbors and rivers and begin to deepen the channels as an excuse to use coal.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the chairman of the subcommittee deemed it advisable to object to my request to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, after such a serious charge has been made against 5 million loyal Americans, against the people of Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. Chairman, I might say as an irrefutable fact Tennessee has been known, since 1796, as the volunteer State of the United States of America. In every war America has ever been in, there have been more volunteers from Tennessee, per thousand of population, than from any other State in the United States. Not only in the Spanish-American War, not only in World War I, not only in World War II, but in Korea also, Tennessee is still known as the volunteer State. Any time America is threatened the State of Tennessee comes to the front with her sons and her daughters. We in Tennessee have never been known as believing in communism or any other type of foreignism. We believe in Americanism.

I venture to say to my good friend from New York that he has more Communists in his district than the entire State of Tennessee, and I also venture to say that he has more sympathizers with communism in his district than the State of Tennessee ever will have.

Mr. Chairman, it is a reflection not only on the speaker who is now addressing you to be classified as one who believes in any form of communism but it is a reflection on the nine members of the Tennessee delegation in this House.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction from any Member of this body that there are no more loyal Americans in the United States of America than the nine Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Tennessee. It is not only a reflection on those nine Members from Tennessee but it is a reflection on every Member of the House of Representatives who since 1933 has voted for TVA.

It is a reflection on your present President, who last November said that TVA was all right. In his statement made in Memphis, Tenn., he embraced the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am sure my friend from New York would say that the President of the United States is against communism. If his statement is true that we in the valley are advocating an agency which believes in communism, he is saying that the President of his own party is embracing communism also.

Let me go further, Mr. Chairman, and say this: The gentleman from New York just does not know what TVA is. I think he has been guided by the chamber of commerce or some private power company. If he would come and see what TVA has meant not just to Tennessee but to the national defense of America, he would not come into the well of this House and make statements such as he made previous to my speaking.

What would have happened, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, had we not had TVA and its power in the last war, and in World War II also? What would have happened if we had not had the atomic bomb? If the subcommittee chairman had let me have the additional 5 minutes I requested, I could have gone into the history of the national defense of this country of ours and shown you what a part TVA has played in it.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I have but 5 minutes.

Mr. GWINN. I yielded.

Mr. SUTTON. But not to me.

I may say to my good friends that are opposing this $85 million for TVA that I would like to predict something for you: Within 4 months you will be in here asking this House to give at least $300 million for TVA, even though you are today trying to cut our throats. If you know anything about national defense at all, and if you know what is going on today, if you will stop and think and consider, you will not be fighting this amendment because you know yourselves it takes 3 years to construct these steam plants. We have never had a power shortage like today, when we are building some super bombs for the defense of the people in your district and mine, in Tennessee and New York. Without building these plants and preparing for the future, you are cutting the national defense of America.

I might say this to the gentleman from New York, that we in Tennessee hate communism.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is not always easy to present a subject that has been the subject of as much partisan argument as this one has, to get credit for being completely unbiased in analyzing it and presenting it. The TVA was quite an issue in the Congress and in the country when it was created. In the 20 years of its existence, there have been many strong leaders in the Republican Party who agreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN]. The record of this Congress will clearly show that has been the viewpoint and the attitude of many Republican leaders through the years. In the 1952 presidential campaign, when General Eisenhower, with his great popularity throughout the country, was the candidate and the nominee of the Republican Party, it was a natural thing for the people in the Tennessee Valley area and those who believe it necessary to have the TVA to meet local and national needs to wonder how they would stand with a man elected on the Republican ticket in view of the fact that so many Republican leaders agreed with the attitude of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN]. At that time, they did ask General Eisenhower, Candidate Eisenhower, where he stood on this great activity which is so vital to a great section of the country. At that time, Mr. Eisenhower clearly stated his position. He stated clearly that he would be for the operation of the TVA at its maximum efficiency and he clearly represented to the people of the area that he would not be a party to the dismemberment of TVA. He made that commitment, and as my colleague said, "He caught the rabbit"—he won the Presidency. But, my friends on the left, let me tell you something. People down there realized then that all they had was the President's own assurance. They recognized then, and they recognize now, that there are 2 or 3 ways to kill the TVA. I am saying to you that the course that this subcommittee has started out upon in this bill clearly shows that they are headed in the direction of killing TVA notwithstanding the commitment of their own President. One way you can kill anything is to let it strangle on its own growth. This issue of whether we should ever have had TVA or not is beside the point—we have it. Let us see if this administration, through this committee, is now starting out on a policy to abolish the TVA. First, through the activities of the Government, the Atomic Energy Commission in less than 2 years, that is the Federal Government, will be taking fully 50 percent of all of the power produced in that area. There, through the Federal Government, you are taking more and more of the total production of the entire operation. Then, notwithstanding the foreseeable need for more power for the Government and for the natural growth in the needs of the area, the TVA is not authorized to place orders for the additional power generation which we can clearly see will be needed. Remember territorial expansion is not sought nor involved. Now to further strangle the TVA the subcommittee requires TVA, in addition to returning to the Treasury the full amount of money that we have invested in 40 years, to return to the Treasury each year $20 million more whether the TVA makes such money or not—even if we have a dry year when water might not be available to generate power. Not only that, but the committee says that transformers and all these other things that are so essential to running a real power utility are going to have to be paid for out of the funds that come into the TVA from power sales. The committee does not stop there. The committee says, "Each year out of your income, even when the Government is taking half of the total power production for atomic energy, you are going to have to run the forestry work, the soil-conservation work, and programs of that nature for which, in

the rest of the country, we appropriate money to the Department of Agriculture, from your power income. And then, in addition to that, you say in this bill to TVA, in case that does not make you raise your rates to the retailers to destroy a part of the value of TVA as a yardstick—in case that does not force repeal of the TVA by making it necessary to sell or to strangle on the growing need for power in the area, the committee would take off all control on the retail rates charged by the distributors, municipalities, and cooperatives, giving an open invitation for them to finance municipal programs from power distribution, so they will increase retail rates though such course would not help the Federal Government or the TVA. Remember this action was not requested.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I am under a good deal of pressure. Cannot the gentlemen extend his remarks?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for 1 additional minute to complete my statement.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I will not object to the gentleman proceeding for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GAVIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, I just wanted to say that yesterday when I asked for an additional minute the gentleman from Tennessee objected, but I will not object.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the attitude of my good friend. I did want to say this: What this committee did in its recommendation was to take off the limit as to what any city could charge at the retail level, and apparently dangled before the cities that "Here is a means for you to finance everything in the city." The effect would be to destroy the yardstick value of TVA. Actually it opens up possible dangerous practices, for then cities could provide industrial power for practically nothing, and could bring industries into the area and obtain operating costs for power distribution from the domestic consumers. Behind it all you can see that the fears of the Valley that the Republican administration will destroy the TVA are being well carried out by the proposed action in this bill. Instead of meeting the issue and abolishing the TVA or selling it, they are taking away half of its power production to meet Government needs. Then they are not making available money to finance the building of the additional units needed to meet such increased loads, they withdraw necessary operating capital and destroy the yardstick value by taking off all control of retail charges. If there is any surer way than that to kill the TVA, I do not know what it is. It is to be hoped these efforts will not succeed, but people should know the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, whatever its intention, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended amendments to the appropriation bill which, if adopted, would in their combined effect, destroy TVA.

They have reduced the appropriations required to add the facilities the system needs to continue giving service to this vital area and suggested that revenues should be used for these expenditures. At the same time they have demanded an increase in the annual dividend—calling it "interest"—required from the system's revenues, a combined burden which will operate to strip TVA of the cash required for reinvestment in the business or to be held as liquid assets in reserve. If these proposals are adopted, the TVA power system will be required to amortize the power investment provided by appropriations in 40 years, and to pay interest at the same time—a burden that no regulatory commission would permit a private power company to saddle on its consumers. At the same time the owners are intent on starving the system by refusing new capital required.

The committee states that the interest provision "included in this bill is intended to help the Tennessee Valley Authority and stop the increasing amount of criticism that is developing because of its expanding power requirements." In 1948 the same argument was advanced for the so-called amortized requirement. Before that pay-back provision was added as a rider to the appropriation bill by the 80th Congress, TVA was already making payments from power proceeds into the general receipts of the Treasury. Twenty-three million dollars had already been paid in from power proceeds, either to mature bonds or to offset appropriations. But it was contended by sponsors of the payback rider that such payments should be regularized in order to reassure the taxpayers that the money provided by the Federal Treasury for TVA's power facilities would, in fact and under the law, be repaid within a reasonable period. They are being repaid. TVA is about $10 million ahead of its schedule right now.

Now the committee suggests that the payment of interest in addition to amortization will allay criticism of TVA's expanding power requirements. Yet the provision clearly has failed to persuade the committee itself that funds should be made available for additional power-generating facilities in this vital area. No appropriation to meet the expanding power requirements is recommended by the committee. Instead, the budget approved by the President has been reduced. However benign the committee's intentions may have been, clearly the adoption of its proposals would be calamitous.

WHAT THESE AMENDMENTS WOULD DO TO THE CASH BALANCES

The effect of the committee's action in denying the appropriation request and proposing that funds for essential expenditures be provided from the cash intended to be reserved for contingencies means, in fact, that if average conditions prevail, TVA will begin fiscal year 1956 with a cash-reserve balance of somewhere between $2 and $8 million.

TVA had expected, on the basis of the budget estimates of revenue and expenditures, assuming average streamflow conditions, that the power program would have a cash balance at the end of year 1955, reserved for contingencies, of $39,920,712—page 2413 of hearings.

It had been expected that the nonpower funds available for contingencies would be $5,897,000—page 2413.

These two items, with the continuing fund of $1 million provided for in section 26 of the TVA Act, apparently make up the estimate June 30, 1955, balance of corporate funds of $46,817,712 referred to by the committee in its report.

The recommended use of $37,618,000 of corporate funds in lieu of appropriations could therefore reduce the year-end balance of power-program funds from $39,920,712 to $2,302,712.

To the extent that the nonpower corporate balance, estimated at $5,897,000, was reduced instead, the balance of power funds might be correspondingly larger than $2,302,712, but the total could be no larger than $8,199,712, on the basis of present estimates of revenues and expenditures, even if the nonpower balance were reduced to zero.

THE CASH RESERVE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE COMPARED WITH THE PRACTICE OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The committee believes that TVA's cash reserve can be safely reduced. But no explanation is given to indicate what type of analysis preceded the committee's decision. The judgment could not have been based on an analysis of the prevailing practice in private business, nor on the experience of TVA, the largest power producer in the United States. In fiscal 1955, the total assets of its power system will be over a billion dollars. A reserve cash balance of $8 million, the largest possible if the program of additions and replacements anticipated by TVA and approved by the committee is carried out but paid for out of the reserve instead of appropriations, would mean that TVA would have available as liquid assets somewhere in the neighborhood of one-half of 1 percent of its total power assets.

Contrast the situation of the world's largest automobile manufacturer, whose last annual report revealed liquid assets of more than $300 million, 8 percent of its total assets. The world's largest steel company likewise reported liquid assets of more than $300 million, about 11 percent of its total assets. The world's largest chemical company had liquid assets of more than $250 million, 15 percent of total assets. Yet the committee believes that the world's largest power system, owned by the Government of the United States, requires at the most liquid assets of one-half of 1 percent of total assets.

Compare the cash reserve considered adequate for TVA with the reserve maintained by private utility systems in the United States, all smaller than TVA, and all with borrowing powers denied to TVA. Detroit Edison Co. has found it

desirable to have liquid assets of as much as $50 million, 9 percent of total assets, while liquid assets of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. have exceeded 8 percent of total assets.

All these companies can borrow money in the event their cash reserve should prove to be inadequate. TVA has no such power to incur debt. Yet the committee is willing to take the risks involved by reducing TVA's cash balance to one-half of 1 percent of total assets.

The management of TVA could not take that risk. TVA would be obliged to postpone replacements, delay improvements, in order to build up the cash reserve. The system would suffer. Operating costs would rise. Disaster would result to this great public power system upon which a whole region depends, upon which critical installations for defense must depend for national security.

Mr. Chairman, on Monday I referred to the assistance the Government is now offering private utilities in the form of tax amortization. The following is a list of the private electric utilities that have been issued tax amortization certificates through September 21, 1953:

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
ALABAMA						
Alabama Power Co, Birmingham, Ala	Barry generating station unit No. 1, near Mobile Ala	125,000	$22,448,373	$22,284,837	55	$12,256,660
Do	Barry generating station unit No. 2, near Mobile Ala	125,000	16,094,185	16,094,185	65	10,461,220
Do	Transmission line to McIntosh, Ala., and construction of a switching station in Washington County, Ala.		276,724	275,480	25	68,870
Do	Chickasaw plant, 1-unit extension and transmission connections.	40,000	5,771,188	5,765,202	25	1,441,301
Do	Martin Dam, 1-unit hydro extension	55,000	2,468,500	2,468,500	50	1,234,250
Do	Gorgas plant, 2-unit extension and transmission connections.	100,000 100,000	24,611,395	12,171,695 12,439,700	25 55	3,042,924 6,841,835
Do	Transmission connection to River Junction plant		306,695	306,695	50	153,348
Do	Increased transformer capacity to serve Camp Rucker		24,153	24,153	65	15,699
Do	Gorgas steam plant, unit No. 8, Gorgas, Ala	156,250	24,979,098	24,979,098	35	8,742,684
Alabama total						44,258,791
ARIZONA						
Arizona Edison Co., Inc., Phoenix, Ariz	Diesel-Electric generating unit at Miami, Ariz	1,235	164,245	164,245	40	65,698
Arizona Public Service Co., Phoenix, Ariz	Saguaro steam electric station near Red Rock, Ariz	90,000	10,900,000	10,900,000	45	4,905,000
Do	do	90,000	14,000,000	13,950,000	40	5,580,000
Do	Powerplant at Douglas, Ariz		176,392	176,392	45	79,376
Do	Powerplant at Yuma, Arizona	2,500	316,340	316,340	20	63,268
Do	Generating equipment at Ajo, Ariz		98,268	98,268	40	39,307
Do	Transmission line at Luke Field, north of Litchfield, Ariz.		23,632	23,632	50	11,816
Central Arizona Light & Power Co., Phoenix, Ariz	Line and substation facilities		150,000	33,000 84,000	40 25	13,200 21,000
Citizens Utilities Co., Greenwich, Conn	Electric power substation and connecting lines, Santa Cruz County, Ariz.		13,112	13,112	30	3,934
Phelps Dodge Corp., New York, N. Y	Extension to powerplant building at Morenci, Ariz	12,500	2,325,000	2,325,000	65	1,511,250
Arizona total						12,293,849
ARKANSAS						
Arkansas Power & Light Co., Little Rock, Ark	Microwave system—various locations in eastern and southern Arkansas.		122,000	120,000	65	78,000
Do	Capicator installations at Gum Springs, Ark		249,519	249,519	55	137,235
Do	Transmission facilities, Arklahoma, South Little Rock, Bull Shoals, Harrison, Guy, Heber Springs, Cold Creek.		6,635,000	6,635,000	55	3,649,250
Do	Cecil Lynch power station, unit No. 3, North Little Rock, Ark.	105,000	12,650,000	12,650,000	55	6,957,500
Do	Harvey Couch power station unit No. 2, Stamps, Ark	105,000	12,750,000	12,750,000	65	8,287,500
Arkansas Power & Light Co., Pine Bluff, Ark	Transmission line from Moses steam station		660,000	660,000	45	297,000
Do	Transmission and substation facilities, Ingalls, Donan-Ingalls, Ingalls-Warren, Warren-Pine Bluff, Heber Springs-Newport, Remmel Dam-Jones Mills.		4,160,201	4,160,201	55	2,288,111
Do	Addition to generating plant, Lake Catherine power station, unit No. 3, Jones Mills, Ark.	90,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	55	5,115,000
Arkansas Power & Light Co	Transmission line from Jonesboro to Parkin		561,000	561,000	45	252,450
Do	Transmission line from Moses steam station to West Memphis.		528,000	528,000	45	237,600
Do	Installation of capacitor at Jones Mills	13,000	272,000	272,000	45	122,400
Do	Hamilton Moses steam electric station (units No. 1 and No. 2).	132,000	13,100,000	12,160,000	45	5,472,000
Do	Transmission line from Monticello to Warren, Ark		200,000	200,000	45	90,000
Do	Transmission line from Jones Mills to Gurdon		420,000	420,000	45	189,000
Arkansas total						33,173,046
CALIFORNIA						
California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif	Switchyard at Highgrove steam generating station, San Bernadino County, Calif.		349,950	349,950	35	122,483
Do	San Bernardino transmission substation, California		379,695	243,645	35	85,276
Do	Highgrove-San Bernardino transmission line, California.		147,595	147,595	35	51,658
Do	Terminal facilities for transmission line from Highgrove powerplant and Valley substation, to San Diego line.		261,585	248,085	35	86,830
Do	Transmission terminal facilities at Highgrove powerplant.		137,300	137,300	35	48,055
Do	Substation and facilities Edwards Air Force Base, Kern and San Bernardino Counties.		401,635	383,498	55	210,924
Do	Highgrove steam electric station, unit No. 3	40,000	5,568,221	5,568,221	35	1,948,877
Do	Transmission connections to new Highgrove powerplant.		346,605	346,605	35	121,312
Do	Panoche substation, San Benito County, Calif		311,796	311,796	45	140,308
Do	Transmission connection to pit No. 4 hydroelectric plant, Shasta County, Calif.		2,684,323	2,624,323	45	1,180,945
Do	San Mateo and Moraga substations facilities		2,463,660	2,463,660	45	1,108,647
Do	New hydroplant (plant No. 4), Shasta County, Calif	85,000	25,171,247	25,171,247	45	11,327,061
Do	New steam-electric powerplant in central California (location undetermined).	250,000	44,310,600	44,310,600	45	19,939,770
Do	Moraga substation, Contra Costa County, Calif., additional facilities.		75,000	75,000	20	15,000
Do	Transmission lines in Kern and San Luis Obispo Counties, Calif.		500,422	500,422	20	100,084

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
CALIFORNIA—continued						
California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif.	Transmission lines, Williams and Calpella in Colusa and Mendocino Counties, Calif.		$3,826,827	$3,826,827	20	$765,365
Do	Transmission line from Monte Rio to Gualala in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif.		666,120	666,120	40	266,448
Do	Transmission line from San Luis Obispo to Santa Maria, Calif.		504,441	504,441	40	201,776
Do	Contra Costa steam plant to Maranga, Contra Costa County, Calif.		496,000	496,000	40	198,400
Do	McCall substation about 12 miles southeast of Fresno County, Fresno, Calif.		1,583,138	1,583,138	40	633,255
Do	Tesla-Panoche transmission line—San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced and Fresno Counties, Calif.		1,146,292	1,146,292	40	458,517
Do	Transmission line in Monterey and Santa Clara Counties, Calif.		667,000	667,000	40	266,800
Do	Panoche-McCall transmission line right-of-way, Kings County, Calif.		211,875	211,875	40	84,750
Do	Transmission line, Bridgeville to Fruitland Junction		181,886	134,021	40	53,608
Do	Hamilton Field Air Base substation, Marin County, Calif.		59,550	59,550	40	23,820
Do	Transmission and substation facilities, southeast of San Francisco, Calif.		8,225,208	8,225,208	40	3,290,083
Do	Transmission line in Humboldt County, Calif.		487,177	339,087	40	135,635
Do	Tesla substation, San Joaquin County, Calif.		178,394	178,394	40	71,358
Do	Humboldt substation, Humboldt County, Calif.		429,300	429,300	40	171,720
Do	Transmission facilities, vicinity Red Bluff, Tehema County, Calif.		67,843	67,843	40	27,137
Do	San Miguel substation (increase capacity)		51,408	51,408	40	20,563
Do	Terminal facilities at the Marage substation for Contra Costa plant (6 miles northeast of Oakland in Contra Costa County).		147,731	147,731	20	29,546
Do	Transmission facilities, Alameda County, Calif.		220,500	220,500	20	44,100
Do	Contra Costa steam electric, Contra Costa County, Calif.	200,000	28,198,500	28,198,500	55	15,509,175
Do	Install 2 kilovolt underground circuits between station G, El Cerrito, and the proposed substation at Richmond, Calif.		760,000	760,000	20	152,000
Do	Transmission facilities to Dow Chemical Co. at Pittsburg, Calif.		282,700	282,700	20	56,540
Do	Transmission facilities in Humboldt, Trinity, and Shasta Counties, Calif.		5,519,530	5,511,530	40	2,204,612
Do	Transmission facilities Panoche-Ora Lima substation in San Benito and Fresno Counties, Calif.		634,606	634,606	40	253,842
Do	Transmission facilities Mountain View, Santa Clara County, Calif.		37,070	37,070	40	14,828
Do	Mendocino substation, Mendocino County, Calif.		113,588	113,588	20	22,718
Do	Transmission facilities, Pittsburg to Panoche, Alameda, Contra Costa, Stanislaus and Merced Counties, Calif.		7,273,914	7,273,914	45	3,273,261
Do	Murphys hydroelectric plant, Calaveras County, Calif.	3,850	1,204,168	1,204,168	35	421,459
Do	Transmission line, Shasta County, Calif.		265,162	265,162	40	106,065
Do	Transmission line, Humboldt-Newberg Junction, Humboldt County, Calif.		97,511	97,511	40	39,004
Do	Cooley Landing substation, East Palo Alto, Calif.		545,118	545,118	40	218,047
Do	Pittsburg Powerplant, units No. 1 and No. 2, Pittsburg, Calif.	250,000	42,522,751	42,522,751	45	19,135,238
Do	Pittsburg powerplant units No. 3 and No. 4, Pittsburg, Calif.	250,000	31,999,922	31,999,922	45	14,399,965
Do	Maraga substation, Contra County, Calif.		175,000	175,000	40	70,000
Do	Substation and transmission facilities, Fort Ord station, Monterey County, Calif.		134,570	59,570	35	20,850
Do	Transformer bank at Vaca-Dixon substation, Solano County, Calif.		804,000	804,000	40	321,600
Do	Transmission line and substation, Ames, Calif.		1,054,204	1,009,204	55	555,062
Do	Panoche to McCall transmission line, Kings County, Calif.		1,819,000	1,740,584	40	696,234
Do	Benicia Arsenal and vicinity, Solano County, Calif.; distribution facilities.		41,966	41,966	40	16,786
Do	Electric distribution system at Fairfield, Solano County, Calif.		48,319	48,319	30	14,496
Do	Transmission line, Newberg to Bridgeville, Humboldt County, Calif.		272,790	272,790	20	54,558
Do	Transmission line from Brighton substation to Sacramento, Calif.		129,538	129,538	20	25,908
Do	Transmission line between Newark and Mabury stations and related equipment at Newark substation, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties.		192,094	192,094	20	38,419
Do	Transmission line, Panoche-Midway-Kern steam plant, near Bakersfield, Calif.		2,045,221	2,045,221	20	409,044
Do	Transmission line from Moraga substation to station U, San Leandro, Calif.		2,019,000	2,019,000	20	403,800
Do	Transmission line from Salisbury station to Mather Heights, Sacramento County, Calif.		81,274	81,274	30	24,382
Do	Transmission line from Trinidad to Orick, Humboldt County, Calif.		308,699	308,699	20	61,740
Do	Installation of transformers at Decoto substation, Alameda County, Calif.		24,750	24,750	20	4,950
Do	Transmission line from Essex junction to Trinidad, Humboldt County, Calif.		244,272	244,272	20	48,854
Do	Increase Lathrop substation capacity, San Joaquin County, Calif.		39,595	39,595	20	7,919
Do	Substation at San Leandro, Calif.		329,700	329,700	25	82,425
Do	Transmission facilities, Redwood Creek area, Humboldt County, Calif.		228,382	135,642	20	27,128
Pope & Talbot Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	Extension to industrial powerplant	2,500	148,607	148,607	40	59,443
Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	Transmission line in Los Angeles County, Calif.		95,787	95,787	40	38,315
Do	Electric distribution facilities, to Northrop Aircraft, Inc., Hawthorne, Los Angeles County, Calif.		28,982	28,982	20	5,796
Do	Transmission line and facilities to Nigg Corp., Corina, Calif.		31,803	31,803	30	9,541
Do	Redondo steam-electric station No. 2, Redondo Beach-Los Angeles, Calif.	250,000	43,500,000	19,065,000 24,335,000	30 25	5,719,500 6,083,750

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
CALIFORNIA—continued						
Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	Antelope substation, Los Angeles County, Calif.		$2,113,517	$2,091,662	40	$836,665
Do	Transmission connections to center substation near Los Angeles, Calif.		2,415,208	1,362,755	20	272,551
Do	Etiwanda steam generating station waste-water disposal facilities, Etiwanda, San Bernardino County, Calif.		1,076,000	1,076,000	40	430,400
Do	Etiwanda steam electric station, San Bernardino County, Calif.	100,000	35,500,000	35,182,000	40	14,072,800
Do	Transmission facilities to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.		228,000	228,000	55	125,400
Do	Center substation near Downey, Calif.		5,242,050	5,066,550	20	1,013,310
Do	Line extension and substation near Pomona, Calif.		62,146	62,146	35	21,751
Do	Etiwanda steam station transmission facilities.		2,854,931	2,681,788	40	1,072,715
Do	Oil and gas line facilities for Etiwanda steam station, Etiwanda, San Bernardino City, Calif.		2,560,000	2,525,000	40	1,010,000
Do	Transmission line from Chino substation to Ganesha substation.		93,864	93,864	40	37,546
Do	Laguna Bell substation facilities.		4,196,296	2,926,788	40	1,170,715
California total						133,901,218
COLORADO						
Frontier Power Co., Trinidad, Colo.	Transmission lines, Las Animas and Huerfano Counties, Colo.		439,655	439,655	45	197,845
Public Service Co. of Colorado, Denver, Colo.	Lacombe steam-electric station unit No. 2, Denver, Colo.	60,000	10,897,000	10,897,000	45	4,903,650
Do	Alamosa electric powerplant—addition—unit No. 6, Alamosa, Colo.	7,500	1,782,376	1,782,376	55	980,307
Do	Steam electric stations at Arapahoe and Grand Junction.	127,500	25,519,643	15,104,382	25	3,776,096
Colorado total						9,857,898
CONNECTICUT						
Connecticut Light & Power Co., Hartford, Conn.	Extension to existing Montville station, Uncasville, Conn.	75,000	17,300,000	17,300,000	40	6,920,000
Do	Thompsonville gas turbine electric plant, Thompsonville, Conn.	10,000	2,875,600	2,864,600	50	1,432,300
Do	Construction of new gas turbine electric plant, Danielson, Conn.	10,000	2,822,450	2,822,450	45	1,270,103
Do	Willimantic-Rockville 69-kilovolt transmission line.		349,572	349,572	25	87,393
Do	Devon-Norwalk transmission line.		1,269,125	948,125	25	237,031
Do	Montville-New Britain transmission line.		1,800,000	1,797,161	25	449,290
Connecticut Power Co., Hartford, Conn.	Transmission line, Berlin to New Britain, Conn.		355,000	293,122	45	131,905
Do	Transmission facilities, Middlesex and Hartford Counties.		2,495,000	2,495,000	55	1,372,250
Derby Gas & Electric Co., Derby, Conn.	Housatonic steam electric station, Derby, Conn.		763,942	763,942	20	152,788
Electric Power, Inc., Hartford, Conn.	Shepaug hydroelectric generating station, Southbury, Conn.	36,000	13,643,000	13,015,000	30	3,904,500
Hartford Electric Light Co., Hartford, Conn.	New steam electric generating station, Laurel steam electric station, Middletown, Conn.	60,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	55	7,975,000
United Illuminating Co., New Haven, Conn.	Transmission facilities to United Aircraft Corp., north of New Haven, Conn.		470,000	466,500	20	93,300
Do	Extension to English steam electric station, unit No. 8 510 Grand Ave., New Haven, Conn.	30,000	8,500,000	8,482,000	55	4,665,100
Connecticut total						28,690,960
DELAWARE						
Delaware Power & Light Co., Wilmington, Del.	Transmission and generation facilities, Edge Moor generating station, unit No. 3, New Castle County, Del.	60,000	12,650,000	11,910,000	45	5,359,500
Delaware total						5,359,500
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C.	Extension of power station, Washington, D. C.	25,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	60	5,400,000
District of Columbia total						5,400,000
FLORIDA						
Florida Power & Light Co., Miami, Fla.	Riviera steam electric station, Palm Beach County, Fla.	60,000	9,340,000	9,340,000	50	4,670,000
Do	Installation unit No. 4 at Cutler steam electric station, Cutler, Fla.	60,000	8,884,000	8,801,564	45	3,960,704
Do	Cutler steam electric station, unit No. 5 with transmission facilities (about 12 miles south of Miami, Fla.)	60,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	40	4,400,000
Florida Power Corp., St. Petersburg, Fla.	Extension to Avon Park steam electrical station, Avon Park, Fla.	40,000	6,365,820	6,289,820	30	1,886,946
Do	New Suwannee River plant, Suwannee, Fla.	30,000	5,535,000	5,510,000	30	1,653,000
Do	Transmission facilities, Higgins plant, Fort Mead-Lake Wales area.		1,768,200	1,768,200	30	530,460
Do	Extension to Higgins steam electric station, Oldsmar, Fla.	80,000	12,559,000	12,559,000	35	4,395,650
Do	New Higgins steam electric station, Oldsmar, Fla.		7,011,805	6,994,229	20	1,398,846
Do	Transmission facilities, Jasper-Quincy line; will connect with the new Suwanee plant, Florida.		868,478	868,478	20	173,696
Gulf Power Co., Pensacola, Fla.	Pensacola plant, 1 unit extension and transmission connections.	30,000	4,837,682	4,819,682	50	2,409,841
Do	River Junction plant, new 2-unit plant and transmission connections.	40,000 60,000	15,156,012	10,272,082 4,883,930	55 65	5,649,645 3,174,555
Florida total						34,303,343

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
GEORGIA						
Georgia Power Co., Atlanta, Ga	Lockheed Aircraft substation, Marietta, Ga		$203,486	$203,486	40	$81,394
Do	Transmission line near Augusta, Ga		579,371	579,371	55	318,654
Do	Extension to Hammond generating station, unit No. 3. Transmission connections and substation reinforcements.	100,000	15,990,588	15,885,588	65	10,325,632
Do	Hammond steam plant, unit No. 1, Rome, Ga	109,000	15,765,220	15,549,220	55	8,552,071
Do	Hammond generating station, unit No. 2, Rome, Ga	100,000	12,967,000	12,967,000	55	7,131,850
Do	Bartlett's Ferry, 1-unit hydroextension and transmission connections.	20,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	25	365,000
Do	Yates plant, 1-unit extension and transmission connections.	100,000	12,143,673	12,143,673	50	6,071,837
Do	Plant McManus, new 1-unit plant and transmission connections.	40,000	7,748,277	7,564,677	50	3,782,339
Do	Furman Shoals, 2-unit hydroplant and transmission connections.	45,000	16,764,800	15,286,800	50	7,643,400
Do	Transmission reinforcement, Macon-Eastman-Vidalia		1,255,544	630,544	25	157,636
Do	Transmission reinforcement, Commerce-Athens, Warrenton.		1,316,291	1,316,291	25	329,073
Do	Transmission reinforcement and connection to River Junction plant.		838,620	[1] 742,967	50	371,484
Do	Extension of existing hydroelectric plant with generating units and accessories at Goat Rock Dam, near Columbus, Ga.	10,000	931,000	931,000	35	325,850
Georgia Power & Light Co., Atlanta, Ga	Transmission facilities, Jasper-Waycross from Florida-Georgia State line to Waycross, Ga.		875,000	706,829	30	212,049
Florida Power Corp., St. Petersburg, Fla	Jasper-Waycross transmission line, from Jasper to Georgia State line, Waycross, Ga.		83,500	83,500	30	25,050
Georgia total						45,693,319
IDAHO						
Idaho Power Co., Boise, Idaho	Hydroelectric power development, Snake River, transmission lines and terminal facilities.	27,500 27,500 27,500	21,109,010	20,047,610	50	10,023,805
Do	Transmission line from American Falls, Idaho, to Don substation near Pocatello, Idaho.		832,642	832,642	25	208,161
Do	Don substation, Pocatello, Idaho		899,405	725,915	25	181,479
Do	Don substation, Pocatello, Idaho, transformer banks		1,034,000	1,034,000	40	413,600
Utah Power & Light Co., Salt Lake City, Utah	Substation at Goshen, Idaho		129,640	129,640	35	45,374
Do	Transmission line and facilities, Goshen-Scoville, Idaho.		565,529	282,765	35	98,968
Idaho total						10,971,387
ILLINOIS						
Central Illinois Light Co., Peoria, Ill	Transmission line and substations, De Kalb, Ill		345,000	205,000	30	61,500
Do	Wallace steam electric station and transmission lines	60,000	12,079,796	8,334,246	25	2,083,562
Do	Transmission line, Peoria to Springfield, Ill		744,000	744,000	45	334,800
Do	Transmission and substation facilities, northeast Peoria.		225,000	200,000	45	90,000
Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., Rockford, Ill	Sabrooke generating station, unit No. 3	30,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	55	3,630,000
Do	Transmission loop for serving city of Rockford		1,711,100	1,271,900	55	699,545
Central Illinois Public Service Co., Springfield, Ill.	Transmission line to Joppa powerplant, Joppa, Ill., and additions to substation at West Frankfort, Ill.		3,100,238	3,100,238	55	1,705,131
Commonwealth Edison Co., Chicago, Ill	Substation and underground service extension to chemical plant.		201,000	201,000	35	70,350
Do	Underground service extension to munitions plant		245,000	245,000	35	85,750
Illinois Power Co., Decatur, Ill	Hennepin steam-electric station, unit No. 1, near Hennepin, Ill., Putnam County.	60,000	16,773,000	16,538,000	35	5,788,300
Do	Addition to Wood River steam-electric station, unit No. 4, Madison County, Ill., near city of Wood River.	90,000	15,784,800	15,784,800	35	5,524,680
Do	Transmission connections to West Frankfort, Ill		2,301,300	2,301,300	55	1,265,715
Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois, Chicago, Ill.	Transmission line, Waukegan to Wisconsin boundary		525,000	525,000	65	341,250
Do	Transmission line and substation at Sterling, Ill		1,200,000	1,160,000	45	522,000
Union Electric Power Co., St. Louis, Mo	Transmission facilities, Roxana, Ill		160,789	117,446	40	46,978
Do	Transmission facilities, East St. Louis, West Frankfort, Ill.		5,670,344	5,670,344	55	3,118,689
Illinois total						25,368,250
INDIANA						
Indiana and Michigan Electric Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.	Transmission line, Twin Branch, South Bend, Ind		611,179	661,179	25	165,295
Do	Tanners Creek No. 1, Indiana new steam electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	150,000	21,034,840	20,928,340	25	5,232,085
Do	Tanners Creek No. 2, Indiana; extension to steam electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	150,000	17,468,691	17,468,691	45	7,860,911
Do	Transmission line and substations, Union City, Dunkirk, Ind.		1,753,840	1,748,840	45	786,978
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Substations at Marion, Anderson, and Muncie, Ind		270,750	270,750	55	148,913
Do	Transmission lines, Anderson, Ind		110,770	110,770	30	33,231
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., New York, N. Y.	Tanners Creek steam plant, unit No. 3, near Lawrenceburg, Ind., to vicinity of Fort Wayne, Ind., to vicinity of East Dunkirk, Ind.	200,000	41,899,000	41,869,000	45	18,841,050
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., care of American Gas & Elect. Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Transmission facilities, Marion, Ind		179,485	179,485	35	62,820
Do	Transmission facilities, Fort Wayne, Ind		76,100	76,100	35	26,635
Do	Transmission facilities, near LaPorte, Ind		237,846	182,503	55	100,377
Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Indianapolis, Ind	New speedway substation west of Indianapolis, Ind		508,715	508,715	55	279,793
Do	Addition to existing White River generating plant, Morgan County, 25 miles southwest of Indianapolis (unit No. 4).	60,000	8,287,977	7,900,761	55	4,345,419
Do	Addition to existing White River generating plant, Morgan County, 25 miles southwest of Indianapolis (unit No. 5).	60,000	10,458,394	9,992,519	55	5,495,885

[1] Amended from $838,620.

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
INDIANA—continued						
Northern Indiana Public Service Co., Hammond, Ind.	Transmission and substation installations near La Porte, Ind.		$1,396,300	$1,133,900	30	$340,170
Do	Substation enlargement, East Chicago, Ind		89,636	52,261	20	10,452
Do	Transmission facilities to serve American Cyanamid Co., northeast of Michigan City, Ind.		78,505	64,775	35	22,671
Do	Substation and transmission facilities, Indiana Harbor, Ind.		209,305	209,305	35	73,257
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc., Plainfield, Ind.	Wabash River power station, approximately 6 miles north of West Terre Haute, Ind., on Wabash River.	180,000	28,829,500	28,829,500	30	8,648,850
Do	Transmission facilities, Wabash River station to Kokomo—substation at Kokomo, addition to existing Highland substation, Wabash River station to Columbus—substation at Columbus.		9,679,570	9,658,370	30	2,897,511
Do	Extension of Wabash River station north of West Terre Haute, Ind.	180,000	24,879,000	24,879,000	40	9,951,600
Do	Wabash River power station No. 5, 6 miles north of West Terre Haute, Ind.	125,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	40	6,800,000
Do	Transmission substation at Kokomo and Columbus, Ind.		1,702,500	1,702,500	40	681,000
Do	Transmission and substation facilities connecting Wabash River generating station to system at Lafayette, Kokomo, and Columbus, Ind.		5,666,800	5,666,800	40	2,266,720
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., Evansville, Ind.	Read St. substation for new defense loads, Evansville, Ind.		454,000	422,652	30	126,796
Do	Culley generating station 14 miles east of Evansville, Ind., on Ohio River.	40,000	10,552,500	10,443,500	45	4,699,575
Do	Transmission line, Evansville to Oakland, Ind		1,322,000	1,294,500	35	453,075
Indiana total						80,351,069
IOWA						
Iowa Electric Light & Power Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	Steam electric generating station, Marshalltown power station, Marshalltown, Iowa.	30,000	7,776,782	7,761,162	55	4,268,639
Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa	Des Moines power station No. 2 (steam electric generating station), Des Moines, Iowa.	66,000	9,776,900	9,769,301	50	4,884,651
Do	Council Bluffs power station, Council Bluffs, Iowa	44,000	9,362,900	9,352,850	50	4,676,425
Iowa Public Service Co., Sioux City, Iowa	Hawkeye steam electric generating station, unit No. 2 at Storm Lake, Iowa.	11,500	2,700,000	2,700,000	55	1,485,000
Do	Transmission line and substations, Sioux City to Fort Dodge.		4,435,282	4,425,282	55	2,433,905
Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Centerville, Iowa	Bridgeport steam electric station units Nos. 1 and 2	40,000	8,926,000	4,117,134 4,747,966	50 30	2,058,567 1,424,390
Iowa total						21,231,577
KANSAS						
Central Kansas Power Co., Abilene, Kans	Hill City steam electric generating station, Hill City, Kans.	11,500	1,906,776	1,900,852	50	950,426
Do	Transmission line, Hill City, Hays, Kans		474,734	474,734	50	237,367
The Empire District Electric Co., Joplin, Mo	Riverton unit No. 8, Riverton, Kans	40,000	6,961,000	6,961,000	40	2,784,400
Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Wichita, Kans	Murray Gill steam plant	40,000	8,306,686	8,036,000	40	3,214,400
Do	Murray Gill steam electric unit No. 2—and transmission facilities—6 miles southwest of city of Wichita, Kans.	60,000	8,785,000	8,605,000	55	4,732,750
Do	Neosho steam generating electric station, No. 3 unit, Parsons, Kans.	60,000	10,981,000	10,969,200	65	7,129,980
The Kansas Power & Light Co., Topeka, Kans	Lawrence steam electric station, unit No. 2, Lawrence, Kans.	30,000	5,500,353	5,425,000	55	2,983,750
Lion Oil Co., El Dorado, Kans	Power installation at Chemica plant near El Dorado, Kans.	3,000	260,065	260,065	55	143,036
Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc., Kansas City, Kans.	Steam electric generating station, Heiser, Kans., initial unit.	15,000	3,517,000	3,495,000	55	1,922,250
Do	Smith Center-Medicine Lodge, Kans., transmission line and associate substations.		2,020,288	2,020,288	55	1,111,158
Kansas total						25,209,517
KENTUCKY						
Kentucky Utilities Co., Lexington, Ky	Green River Steel Corp., 3 miles east of Owensboro, Ky., transmission facilities.		1,024,476	1,024,476	40	409,790
Do	Transmission connections, Green River powerplant at Paducah.		2,452,578	2,442,578	55	1,343,418
Do	Green River powerplant, unit No. 3, Muhlenburg County, Ky.		9,497,000	9,497,000	45	4,273,650
Kentucky & West Virginia Power Co. (American Gas & Electric Service Corp.), New York, N. Y.	Transmission line, Bellefonte, Ky., and thence to Ohio State line.		672,420	607,420	40	242,968
Do	Transmission facilities at and between Hazard, Perry County, and Leslie substation, Leslie County, Ky.		216,615	216,615	20	43,323
Kentucky total						6,313,149
LOUISIANA						
Central Louisiana Electric Co., Alexandria, La	St. Landry generating addition and substation	40,000	7,069,018	3,200,560	40	1,280,224
Do	Teche generating station and transmission line, Alexandria Army Base.			3,286,500	55	1,807,575
Do	Transmission line, St. Landry			511,700	20	102,340
Do	Transmission line, Bayou Sale, La			27,500	25	6,875
Do	Gas pipeline to supply Teche No. 1 steam-generating unit at Baldwin, La.		246,000	246,000	55	135,300
Do	Transmission line, St. Landry-Baldwin; stepup substation at Baldwin steam electric station, transmission line, Shady-Oaks-Beaver Creek.		1,069,000	823,550	55	452,953
Gulf States Utilities Co., Beaumont, Tex	Transmission and substation facilities, Erath, La		216,100	216,100	20	43,220
Do	Transmission facilities near Lake Charles, La		202,100	202,100	40	80,840
Do	Louisiana power station, units 2A and 3A, Baton Rouge, La.	80,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	65	10,725,000
Do	Transmission facilities from Scott, to Eunice, La., and substation at Nelson general plant.		600,000	598,000	55	328,900

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
LOUISIANA—continued						
Gulf States Utilities Co., Beaumont, Tex	Nelson power station unit No. 1 Scott, La	60,000	$10,000,000	$9,940,000	65	$6,461,000
Do	Transmission facilities from Plaquemine, La., to Port Allen, La.		1,000,000	999,500	55	549,725
Do	Transmission facilities, Lake Charles, La		50,800	50,800	45	22,860
Do	Addition of 2 bays in Riverside substation, Lake Charles, La.		598,000	598,000	45	269,100
Do	Louisiana power station unit No. 9, Baton Rouge, La	60,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	55	4,675,000
Louisiana Power & Light Co., New Orleans, La	Transmission facilities between Raceland, La., and Plaquemine, La.		845,002	735,720	45	331,074
Do	Churchill-Luling and Churchill-Westwego transmission lines (Louisiana).		362,600	362,600	55	199,430
Do	Transmission lines: Minden, La., to Arkansas State line, Minden, La., to station E, and standard to Winnfield.		508,960	485,388	55	266,963
Do	Substation and transformer at Beaver Creek, La		202,000	202,000	55	111,100
Do	Ninemile Point power station unit No. 2, New Orleans, La.	90,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	55	5,445,000
Do	Transmission lines and substations from Sterlington power station to Minden, La.		1,322,500	1,114,579	55	613,018
Do	Transmission facilities, Ninemile power station to Snake Farm substation, New Orleans, La., and switching structure at Snake Farm.		741,000	711,430	55	391,287
Do	Ninemile Point steam electric station-steam electric generating plant.	60,000	8,123,633	7,936,955	45	3,571,630
Louisiana total						37,870,414
MAINE						
Central Maine Power Co., Augusta, Maine	Oil storage at Mason powerplant	10,000	1,604,100	151,324	25	37,831
Do	Transmission line from Mason station, Wiscasset, Maine, to Moshers substation, Gorham, Maine, and substation facilities.		1,184,235	1,184,235	55	651,329
Do	Indian Pond hydrodevelopment substation and transmission line on upper Kennebec River in Chase Stream and Indian Pond Townships, Maine.	45,000	17,101,187	16,540,600	45	7,443,270
Do	Mason steam electric station Wiscasset, Maine, units Nos. 3 and 4.	60,000	8,701,791 4,179,700	8,701,791 4,179,700	40 55	3,480,716 2,298,835
Maine total						13,911,981
MARYLAND						
Consolidated Gas & Electric Light & Power Co., Baltimore, Md.	Electric generating station, Riverside generating plant, Turner, Md.	75,000	10,318,751	10,255,113	20	2,051,023
Do	Substation addition		49,738	49,738	20	9,948
Do	Reinforcement of existing 110 kilovolt		5,075,807	4,613,857	20	922,771
Do	Gould St. steam electric station, Gould St., Baltimore, Md.	100,000	13,907,039	13,907,039	35	4,867,464
Do	Construction of Harford substation near Aberdeen, Md.		905,000	905,000	30	271,500
Do	Reinforcement of underground circuits between Westport and south Baltimore substations.		79,008	74,290	20	14,858
Do	Riverside steam electric station, Turner 22, Md. (extension to).	75,000	14,525,000	14,480,550	40	5,792,220
Do	Herbert A. Wagner steam electric station, Stony Creek Rd., Anne Arundel County, Md., 1st unit.	125,000	24,465,000	24,465,000	45	11,009,250
Potomac Edison Co., Frederick, Md	Transmission line from Williamsport, Md., to West Virginia State line.		18,730	18,730	20	3,746
Do	Transmission facilities to Fairchild Aircraft Division plant 1, Hagerstown, Md.		39,715	39,715	25	9,929
Do	Transmission line from Williamsport to Reid, Md		489,050	484,050	25	121,013
Maryland total						25,073,722
MASSACHUSETTS						
Boston Edison Co., Boston, Mass	Transmission line, Braintree to Walpole and substation extension at Weymouth, Mass.		1,021,940	1,021,940	35	357,679
Do	Transmission line, Braintree to Whitman, Mass		301,344	301,344	30	90,403
Do	Transmission facilities, Massachusetts, Middlesex County, Woburn, Burlington, Lexington, and Waltham.		532,300	532,300	30	159,690
Do	Extension to existing Edgar generating station No. 75, North Weymouth, Mass.	81,250	16,613,400	16,613,400	35	5,814,690
Do	Substation facilities at West Medway, Mass		268,000	238,770	30	71,631
Do	Substation and transmission facilities, Edgar station and Edgar station to Walpole substation, Massachusetts, Norfolk County.		3,626,100	3,626,100	30	1,087,830
Do	Extension to Edgar steam electric station No. 75, North Weymouth, Mass.	81,250	14,100,000	14,100,000	30	4,230,000
Western Massachusetts Electric Co., Greenfield, Mass.	West Springfield station, West Springfield, Mass	40,000	7,257,545	7,257,545	40	2,903,018
Massachusetts total						14,714,941
MICHIGAN						
Consumers Power Co., Jackson, Mich	Justin R. Whiting powerplant and transmission facilities on Lake Erie.	106,000	17,275,000	17,275,000	40	6,910,000
Do	Dort transmission substation, north of Flint, Mich		492,600	430,500	20	86,100
Do	Justin R. Whiting powerplant and transmission lines, Lake Erie.	[2] 170,000	31,095,000	31,086,000	35	10,880,100
Do	Construction at Hemphill substation to serve power to Chevrolet motors division at Flint, Mich.		192,700	165,739	40	66,296
Do	Transmission facilities, Flint, Mich. (Genesee County).		62,400	62,400	40	24,960
Consumers Power Co., West Jackson, Mich	Power supply to Corboloy department of General Electric Co. at Edmore, Mich., transmission facilities.		200,822	191,902	35	67,166

[2] Units 1 and 2 85,000 each.

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
MICHIGAN—continued						
Consumers Power Co., Jackson, Mich.	Substation at Continental Motors and supplying transmission line in Muskegon, Mich.		$117,191	$117,191	30	$35,157
Do.	Installation of circuit breakers and metering equipment, Flint, Mich.		60,000	60,000	30	18,000
Do.	Transmission facilities, Adrian-Beecher substation, Adrian, Mich.		565,000	565,000	40	226,000
Do.	Transmission line, Flint, Mich.		505,600	505,600	30	151,680
Do.	Transmission facilities, Pontiac, Mich.		320,000	320,000	25	80,000
Do.	Transmission facilities, Edmore, Mich.		34,993	34,993	30	10,498
Do.	Powerplant extension, John C. Weadock plant, unit No. 7, Bay County, Mich.	135,000	27,838,559	27,838,559	35	9,743,496
Do.	Floodlighting equipment at 4 principal generating stations, B. C. Cobb plant, Muskegon, Mich.; B. E. Morrow plant, Kalamazoo, Saginaw River plant, Saginaw and J. C. Weadock plant, Essexville, Mich.		44,900	44,900	55	24,695
Do.	Transmission facilities, Adrian, Mich.		75,000	75,000	20	15,000
Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.	St. Clair powerplant unit No. 4, East China Township, St. Clair County, Mich.	125,000	33,450,000	33,450,000	35	11,707,500
Do.	Connors Creek No. 15 and No. 16	200,000	42,798,750	42,798,750	25	10,699,688
Do.	St. Clair No. 1	125,000	39,040,600	39,040,600	45	17,568,270
Do.	St. Clair No. 2	125,000	20,448,550	20,448,550	65	13,291,558
Do.	St. Clair No. 3	125,000	18,867,450	18,867,450	65	12,263,843
Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Steam electric plant at Midland	30,000	9,905,000	9,905,000	50	4,952,500
Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.	Ford powerhouse No. 1		485,000	463,238	65	301,105
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Transmission lines and facilities in the Sturgis-Niles area, Pokagon, Mich.		601,102	601,102	40	240,441
Do.	Hickory Creek substation, 2½ miles south of St. Joseph, Mich.		598,507	594,757	40	237,903
Lake Superior District Power Co.	Substation and transmission facilities, Ironwood, Mich.		473,000	437,545	40	175,018
Michigan Gas & Electric Co., Three Rivers, Mich.	Substation at Cassopolis, Mich.		72,173	72,173	20	14,435
Upper Peninsula Power Co., Houghton, Mich.	Transmission and associated facilities, Ontonagen County, Mich.		261,884	136,290	55	74,960
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Lower Paint Dam hydroelectric station, approximately 7 miles southeast of Crystal Falls, Mich.	100	487,820	487,820	35	170,737
Do.	Hemlock Falls hydroelectric station on the Michigamme River, Iron County, Mich.	2,800	976,040	976,040	40	390,416
Do.	Michigamme Falls hydroelectric station on the Michigamme River, Iron County, Mich.	4,800	2,064,100	2,064,100	40	825,640
Michigan total						101,253,162
MINNESOTA						
Minnesota Power & Light Co., Duluth, Minn.	Aurora steam electric station units Nos. 1 and 2, transmission facilities.	44,000 44,000	13,703,000	13,703,000	55	7,536,650
Do.	Extension to steam electric station (M. L. Hibbard, unit No. 4).	33,000	4,350,000	3,955,000	35	1,384,250
Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minn.	Minnesota Valley steam plant, unit No. 3, Granite Falls, Minn.	40,000	7,926,600	7,926,600	40	3,170,640
Do.	Coon Rapids to St. Cloud, Minn., transmission line		904,500	904,500	40	361,800
Do.	Black Dog steam electric station, unit No. 3, Nicols, Minn.	90,000	13,495,000	13,495,000	40	5,398,000
Do.	Steam electric station, Black Dog No. 1 (6 miles south of Minneapolis).	50,000	9,673,400	9,673,400	40	3,869,360
Do.	Transmission line, Granite Falls, Minn., to Sioux Falls, S. Dak.		2,271,950	2,203,220	40	881,288
Do.	Extension to power station, Mankato, Minn.	12,500	1,662,350	1,662,350	25	415,588
Do.	Transmission line, Black Dog-Minnesota Valley, Nicols, Minn.		3,741,250	3,741,250	40	1,496,500
Do.	Extension to steam-generating plant, Black Dog steam electric station, unit 2, Nicols, Minn.	90,000	14,518,000	14,518,000	40	5,807,200
Minnesota total						30,321,276
MISSISSIPPI						
Mississippi Power & Light Co., Jackson, Miss.	Generating station at Natchez, Miss.	60,000	7,622,123	7,587,123	45	3,414,205
Do.	Microwave system, various locations in western Mississippi.		180,000	160,000	65	104,000
Do.	Delta power station, units Nos. 1 and 2, Cleveland, Miss.	200,000	23,545,000	23,265,000	55	12,795,750
Do.	Generating plant, Rex Brown steam electric station, unit No. 3.	60,000	6,244,435	6,156,935	45	2,770,621
Do.	Transmission line from Rex Brown steam electric station, Jackson, Miss., to Grenada.		1,942,500	1,930,000	45	868,500
Do.	Supervisory control facilities at Tunica, Batesville, and Winona, Miss. substations.		81,600	81,600	30	24,480
Mississippi Power Co., Gulfport, Miss.	Transmission line, Collins, Magee, Miss.		284,500	281,500	55	154,825
Do.	Transmission facilities from Alabama-Mississippi State line to Lucedale, southeast Mississippi.		535,000	535,000	55	294,250
Do.	Transmission facilities Biloxi, Miss.		422,690	422,690	45	190,211
Do.	Sweatt plant, new 2-unit plant and transmission connections.	40,000 40,000	11,696,000	6,060,000 [3] 5,596,000	25 65	1,515,000 3,637,400
Do.	Tie-in substation between 100 kilovolt transmission systems, primarily for Biloxi Air Base.		465,947	461,007	25	115,252
Mississippi total						25,884,494
MISSOURI						
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., Blytheville, Ark.	Transmission line, Potosi and Troutt, Mo.		72,201	72,201	30	21,660
Do.	Transmission facilities Washington County, Mo.		138,855	138,855	35	48,599
Kansas City Power & Light Co., Kansas City, Mo.	Hawthorn steam-electric station unit No. 3, Kansas City, Mo.	90,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	55	7,535,000
Missouri Public Service Co., Warrenburg, Mo.	Pleasant Hill steam electric station unit No. 1	24,500	3,240,000	3,240,000	45	1,458,000
Union Electric Co. of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.	Metering equipment at Moberly substation, Moberly, Mo.		66,143	66,143	50	33,072
Do.	Venice-Mound underground transmission circuit (with terminal facilities at Mounds plant).		208,218	208,218	55	114,520

[3] 40,000 excluded for land in fee.

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
MISSOURI—continued						
Union Electric Co., of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.	Keokuk-Page Ave. transmission line, from St. Louis to Keokuk, Iowa (Missouri portion).		$172,885	$172,885	55	$95,087
Do	Electric substation, Washington County, Mo.		365,500	364,500	35	127,575
Do	Meramec steam electric station unit No. 1, St. Louis County.	110,000	23,875,000	23,735,015	50	11,867,508
Do	Meramec plant unit No. 2, St. Louis County	110,000	18,132,700	16,155,363	55	8,885,450
Do	Osage substation to provide power supply to Moberly, Mo.		998,750	919,690	50	459,845
Do	Transmission line, Meramec to Cahokia, Watson line		843,250	808,250	50	404,125
Do	Transmission line, Meramec Rivermines substation		1,374,900	1,324,900	50	662,450
Do	Osage-Moberly transmission line, to connect with system of Kansas City Power & Light Co.		2,137,000	2,035,800	50	1,017,900
Do	Osage hydroelectric station units 7 and 8, St. Louis, Mo.	45,000	3,891,300	3,711,300	55	2,041,215
Do	Venice-Mound underground transmission circuit (from Venice powerplant to Mississippi River) with terminal facilities at Venice plant.		59,085	59,085	55	32,497
Do	Keokuk-Page Ave. (St. Louis) transmission line (conversion of 1 circuit of the double circuit). (From Hamilton to Keokuk.)		640,650	640,650	55	352,358
Missouri total						35,156,861
MONTANA						
Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.	Frank Bird steam electric station near Billings, Mont.	60,000	5,444,630	5,410,000	25	1,352,500
Montana total						1,352,500
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, Manchester, N. H.	Extension to Schiller generating station, Portsmouth, N. H.	80,000	8,505,497	8,457,737	45	3,805,982
Do	Transmission facilities		749,105	749,105	20	149,821
Do	Transmission and substation facilities, State of New Hampshire, Schiller substation and Gregg Falls substation.		1,289,984	112,109	25	28,027
Do	Schiller station in Portsmouth, N. H., transmission line to Bow with substations at Portsmouth and Bow.	40,000	1,310,320	1,310,320	45	589,644
			9,076,200	9,076,200	45	4,084,290
New Hampshire total						8,657,764
NEW JERSEY						
American Cyanamid Co., New York, N. Y.	Electric generating extension at Bound Brook, N. J.	4,000	2,164,800	2,164,800	40	865,920
Atlantic City Electric Co., Atlantic City, N. J.	Extension of Deepwater powerplant, Penns Grove, N. J.	60,000	13,871,000	13,871,000	45	6,241,950
Hercules Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.	Hercules Powder Co. plant, Parlin, N. J.	3,000	1,420,000	1,420,000	40	568,000
Public Service Electric and Gas Co., Newark, N. J.	New transmission substation, North Brunswick, N. J.		2,252,850	2,252,850	55	1,239,068
Do	Transmission line from the Sewaren steam electric station to United States Metals substation.		104,800	104,800	20	20,960
Do	Transmission connections from Burlington and Trenton, N. J., to Philadelphia Electric Co. system.		607,850	607,850	20	121,570
Do	Transmission line from Trenton switching station to Fernwood substation.		493,250	441,100	20	88,220
Do	Camden switching-Richmond generating station line (Public Service portion), transmission line to the Pennsylvania State line (Delaware River crossing).		635,000	635,000	20	127,000
Do	Construction at Marion, Kearney, Essex and Burlington generating stations, N. J.		142,000	142,000	55	78,100
Do	Transmission facilities to U. S. Navy Laboratory near Trenton, N. J.		881,000	721,000	15	108,150
Do	Transmission facilities to Studebaker plant, New Brunswick Township, N. J.		95,165	95,165	35	33,308
Do	Transmission facilities to Wright Aeronautical Corp., Garfield, N. J.		48,200	48,200	35	16,870
Do	No. 7 and No. 8 units at Kearney generating station, Newark, N. J.	290,000	21,000,125 24,998,555	20,883,293 24,837,692	55 45	11,485,811 11,176,961
Do	Transmission facilities to Fort Dix, Burlington County, N. J.		41,500	41,500	40	16,600
Do	Burlington generating plant, Burlington, N. J.	185,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	40	10,800,000
Do	Camden switching station, Camden, N. J.		823,704	823,704	45	370,667
New Jersey total						43,359,155
NEW MEXICO						
El Paso Electric Co., El Paso, Tex.	Transmission line from El Paso, Tex., to Las Cruces, N. Mex.		456,000	443,702	65	288,406
Do	Rio Grande power station, Dona Ana County, N. Mex.		1,591,254	1,575,000	20	315,000
Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Person steam electric station unit No. 3, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	30,000	4,626,278	4,626,278	55	2,544,453
Do	Person steam electric station units Nos. 1 and 2 and transmission facilities, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	40,000	6,044,923	3,175,292 2,856,471	55 65	1,746,411 1,856,706
Southwestern Public Service Co., Carlsbad, N. Mex.	Substation with transformer 15 miles east of Carlsbad, N. Mex.		58,000	58,000	20	11,600
Southwestern Public Service Co., Amarillo, Tex.	Eddy County generating plant, unit No. 1, Artesia, N. Mex.	50,000	7,127,700	7,092,700	55	3,900,985
Do	X plant to Tucco plant transmission line		555,810	555,810	55	305,696
Do	Plant X to Curry County interchange substation transmission lines.		698,400	698,400	55	384,120
Do	Transformer and transmission substation at Carlsbad steam electric plant, Carlsbad, N. Mex.		271,200	271,200	55	149,160
Do	Transformer and transmission substation at X steam electric plant.		1,209,100	1,209,100	55	665,005
Do	Carlsbad steam electric plant, Carlsbad, N. Mex.	18,700	3,333,850	3,333,850	55	1,833,618
New Mexico total						14,001,160

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
NEW YORK						
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Syracuse, N. Y.	Powerplant expansion near Syracuse, N. Y.	20,000	$2,600,000	$2,600,000	40	$1,040,000
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Danskammer Point steam station, town of Newburgh, Orange County, N. Y.	60,000	10,961,575	10,961,575	40	4,384,630
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	2 generating units, Astoria generating station units Nos. 1 and 2.	160,000 160,000	54,990,000	54,990,000	45	24,745,500
Do.	2 generating units, East River generating station units Nos. 5 and 6.	125,000 133,000	45,800,000	45,800,000	20	9,160,000
Do.	Hudson Ave. generating station unit No. 10, pressure boiler and turbogenerator.	60,000	20,700,000	14,904,000	20	2,980,800
Do.	East River generating station unit No. 7, pressure boiler and turbine-generator.	160,000	31,600,000	31,600,000	45	14,220,000
Long Island Lighting Co., Mineola, Long Island, N. Y.	Extension to existing Glenwood Landing station, Nassau County, Long Island, N. Y.	90,000	16,075,000	15,575,000	55	8,566,250
Do.	Glenwood electric power station No. 3, Glenwood Landing, Long Island, N. Y.	90,000	17,894,500	17,894,500	45	8,052,525
Do.	Far Rockaway electric power station, Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.	90,000	18,024,500	18,024,500	55	9,913,475
New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Binghamton, N. Y.	New turbine generator station (Milliken station near Heddens, N. Y., on the east shore of Cayuga Lake) and transmission facilities.	108,000	25,342,200	25,287,200	45	11,379,240
Do.	Power supply line to Village of Horseheads, Chemung County, State of New York.		64,195	64,195	30	19,259
Do.	Transmission reinforcement in northeast New York State (Nicholville, Lyon Mountain, Brainardsville, and Kents Falls).		1,846,800	1,836,868	45	826,591
Do.	Goudey station extension near Binghamton, N. Y.	60,000	8,121,359	8,121,359	20	1,624,272
Do.	Transmission tap from East Springfield on the Colliers-Inghams line to Richfield Springs, N. Y. (10.0 miles).		227,959	227,959	20	45,592
Do.	Beaverkill-West Woodbourne, 114 kilovolt transmission line (extension of existing Delhi Beaverkill to West Woodbourne), Liberty, N. Y. area.		974,994	974,994	20	194,999
Do.	Extension to Greenidge electric generating station unit No. 4, Dresden, N. Y.	80,000	17,142,300	17,142,300	45	7,714,035
Do.	Extension at East Corning, N. Y., Hickling station and 114 kilovolt transmission line.	40,000	7,836,155	7,823,439	35	2,738,204
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Syracuse, N. Y.	Albany steam station and transmission line in New York State.	80,000	15,328,000	15,278,000	30	4,583,400
Do.	Transmission line, Olean Nile, N. Y.		330,000	330,000	40	132,000
Do.	Transmission facilities, Tonawanda, N. Y.		76,454	55,454	40	22,182
Do.	Transmission facilities near Watervliet, N. Y.		279,722	194,077	40	77,631
Do.	South Colton hydro development, South Colton, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y.	19,350	3,964,000	3,962,000	30	1,188,600
Do.	Transmission facilities, East Syracuse, N. Y.		140,100	94,600	40	37,840
Do.	Transmission extension near Utica, N. Y.		100,700	99,900	40	39,960
Do.	New automatic hydro plant, Five Falls, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y.	22,000	4,275,000	4,274,700	30	1,282,410
Do.	Transmission facilities, New Hartford, N. Y.		92,150	92,150	40	36,860
Do.	Transmission facilities, Medina, N. Y.		77,710	77,710	40	31,084
Do.	Albany steam electric station, Albany, N. Y.	80,000	12,000,000	11,609,000	40	4,643,600
Do.	Carry Falls Reservoir, on the Racquette River, town of Colton, St. Lawrence County, N. Y.	8,300	2,631,000	2,631,000	30	789,300
Do.	New steam electric station and transmission facilities.	80,000 80,000	28,500,000	28,333,320	30	8,499,996
Do.	Turbine generator including boiler and auxiliaries.	80,000	10,572,378	10,572,378	20	2,114,476
Do.	Steam electric station, Buffalo, N. Y.	160,000	25,200,000	25,200,000	40	10,080,000
Do.	Stewart's Bridge hydro development, Hadley, N. Y.	30,000	4,929,780	4,927,135	20	985,427
Rockland Light & Power Co., Nyack, N. Y.	Interconnection facilities at Sugar Loaf, N. Y.		555,000	555,000	40	222,000
Do.	Transmission facilities between Grahamsville, N. Y., and Shoemaker substation, Middletown, N. Y.		875,000	875,000	55	481,250
Do.	Hudson steam electric station, Tomkins Cove, N. Y.	60,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	55	7,425,000
Do.	Grahamsville hydroelectric plant, Grahamsville, N. Y.	18,000	2,330,000	2,326,948	55	1,279,821
New York total						151,558,209
NORTH CAROLINA						
Carolina Power & Light Co., Wilmington, N. C.	Steam generating unit, Wilmington, N. C.	100,000	17,436,000	17,416,000	65	11,320,400
Carolina Power & Light Co., Raleigh, N. C.	Wilmington steam electric station, Wilmington, N. C.	100,000	13,175,000	13,175,000	55	7,246,250
Carolina Power & Light Co.	Lumberton steam electric station, North Carolina unit No. 3.	70,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	55	5,087,500
Nantahala Power & Light, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thorpe transformer station, Franklin, N. C.		171,500	171,500	65	111,475
Do.	Bear Creek power development, Jackson County, N. C.	9,000	2,730,303	2,562,111	65	1,665,372
Do.	Tuckasegee hydroelectric development, Jackson County, N. C.	3,000	885,758	218,292	55	120,061
Do.	Cedar Cliff hydroelectric development, Jackson County, N. C.	6,375	1,224,848	1,109,509	65	721,181
North Carolina total						26,272,239
OHIO						
Appalachian Electric Power Co., Roanoke, Va.	Phillipsburg No. 3, Graham, Ohio, extension to steam-electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	150,000	16,210,450	16,210,450	25	4,052,613
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	Clermont power station unit No. 3, Cincinnati, Ohio	125,000	20,419,600	20,384,600	65	13,249,990
Do.	Clermont power station unit No. 1	100,000	24,842,866	24,736,316	35	8,657,711
Do.	Clermont power station unit No. 2	100,000	15,025,335	15,025,335	50	7,512,668
Do.	Transmission line to serve AEC plant, Fernald, Ohio		2,118,666	2,118,666	65	1,377,133
Do.	Transmission facilities, Lockland, Ohio		118,284	118,284	40	47,314
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Industrial service connection in Cleveland		235,332	235,332	40	94,133
Do.	Lake shore switch house to East Cleveland area		554,035	554,035	20	110,807
Do.	Substation to serve Electric Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio.		22,743	22,743	20	4,549
Do.	Transmission line and substation facilities, Ashtabula County, Ohio.		72,595	72,595	20	14,519
Do.	Transmission line to General Motors Corp., Brook Park Village, Ohio.		64,620	64,620	30	19,386
Do.	Transmission facilities to the Murray Ohio Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.		34,512	34,512	25	8,628

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
OHIO—continued						
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Installation of facilities—Lake Shore plant to Newburgh substation, Cleveland, Ohio.		$509,595	$509,595	20	$101,919
Do	East Lake powerplant unit No. 4, Eastlake Village, Ohio.	150,000	26,868,000	26,265,365	65	17,072,487
Do	Lakeshore power station units 16 and 17, Cleveland, Ohio.	160,000	19,619,495	19,619,495	25	4,904,874
Do	Transmission facilities, Cleveland, Ohio		43,859	43,859	35	15,351
Do	Transmission facilities, Cleveland (Newburgh Heights), Ohio.		881,700	750,150	35	262,553
Do	Transmission facilities, Bedford, Ohio		32,045	32,045	35	11,216
Do	Eastlake powerplant units 1, 2, and 3 Erie Rd. and Lake Erie, Eastlake Village, Ohio.	300,000	55,539,000	19,071,000 36,053,000	40 50	7,628,400 18,026,500
Factory Power Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	Water-treating facilities for boiler plant, Cincinnati, Ohio.		107,000	107,000	45	48,150
Indiana-Michigan Electric Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Switching facilities for service to AEC project near Portsmouth, Ohio, at Tanners Creek plant.		987,000	987,000	65	641,550
Marietta Electric Co., Marietta, Ohio	Transmission interconnection		177,282	177,282	25	44,321
Ohio Edison Co., Akron, Ohio	Substation and transmission line, Newton Falls, Warren and Niles, Ohio.		764,000	751,000	30	225,300
Do	Transmission facilities, Mansfield, Ohio		170,000	150,000	40	60,000
Do	Transmission facilities, Marion to Springfield, Ohio		2,061,000	2,048,000	30	614,400
Do	Transmission facilities, vicinity of Youngstown, Ohio		60,000	60,000	55	33,000
Do	Niles power station units Nos. 1 and 2 (steam electric generation station) on Mahoning River in Trumbull County, Ohio.	212,000	31,878,818	31,878,818	35	11,157,586
Do	Extension to R. E. Burger power station, Belmont County, Ohio.	270,000	47,740,000	47,543,000	60	28,525,800
Ohio Power Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Transmission facilities, Sterling condenser project, 2½ miles south of Lima, Ohio.		316,000	316,000	40	126,400
Do	Transmission facilities, Canton, Ohio		110,095	110,095	35	38,533
Do	Substations and transmission lines near West Malta, Ohio.		601,725	581,425	40	232,570
Do	Canton, Ohio, Wagenhals condenser project		344,210	344,210	55	189,316
Do	South Tiffin substation 3 miles southwest of Tiffin, Ohio.		290,730	290,730	40	116,292
Do	Transmission facilities, Canton, Ohio		716,245	620,880	35	217,308
Do	Philo generating station, Ohio		560,800	80,540	40	32,216
Do	Transmission facilities in vicinity of Lima, Ohio		424,080	330,080	40	132,032
Do	Subtransmission and distribution facilities near Portsmouth, Ohio.		947,533	809,728	55	445,350
Do	Transmission line near Ironton, Ohio, and thence to Kentucky State line.		182,850	182,850	40	73,140
Do	Transmission line, Lucasville to AEC, Portsmouth area, Ohio.		356,550	344,700	65	224,055
Do	8 transmission substations in eastern and central Ohio.		709,885	709,885	55	390,437
Do	Transmission facilities to Brilliant, Ohio		61,110	61,110	35	21,389
Do	Substation to serve Timken Roller Bearing Co., Bucyrus, Ohio.		62,520	61,270	30	18,381
Do	Transmission line and substation for Detroit Steel Corp., Portsmouth, Ohio.		207,725	207,725	25	51,931
Do	Portable transformer for use in Ohio and West Virginia		244,600	244,600	55	134,530
Ohio Power Co., Canton, Ohio	Transmission line, Muskingum-Lima, Ohio		12,089,925	12,074,925	65	7,848,701
Do	Phillip Sporn No. 4, Graham, Ohio, extension to steam-electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	150,000	19,197,630	19,197,630	25	4,799,408
Do	Muskingum Nos. 1 and 2, Ohio, new steam-electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	200,000 200,000	55,608,275	55,534,275	65	36,097,279
Do	Transmission line and substations, West Lancaster to Sterling, Ohio.		4,652,450	4,639,950	45	2,087,978
Union Carbon & Carbide Co., New York, N. Y.	Powerplant near Marietta, Ohio	160,000	33,200,000	33,200,000	65	21,580,000
Ohio total						199,380,104
OKLAHOMA						
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.	Mustang steam-electric generating station, unit No. 3, Canadian County, Okla.	105,000	11,982,000	11,982,000	65	7,788,300
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Okla	Southwestern steam-electric station, unit No. 2, Washita, Okla., and associated transmission facilities.	60,000	9,008,025	8,973,575	55	4,935,466
Do	Southwestern steam-electric station, unit No. 1, and transmission facilities, Carnegie, Okla.	60,000	12,000,000	11,750,729	55	6,462,901
Oklahoma total						19,186,667
OREGON						
Bohemia Lumber Co., Culp Creek, Oreg	Steam and power installation		225,000	219,000	55	120,450
California-Oregon Power Co., Medford, Oreg	Power plants and transmission facilities, Soda Springs, Fish Creek, Clearwater No. 1 and No. 2, Lemolo No. 1 and No. 2, Crescent City and Big Bend No. 2.	193,000	38,210,420	30,036,540	65	19,523,751
Portland General Electric, Portland, Oreg	Clackamas River, Oreg., facilities to increase output of existing hydroelectric plants.		4,800,000	4,294,000	65	2,791,100
Do	Pelton hydroelectric plant	108,000	22,320,000	22,260,000	65	14,469,000
Do	Station "B" hydroelectric development	15,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	50	1,150,000
Weyerhauser Timber Co., Tacoma, Wash	Industrial powerplant, Springfield, Oreg	12,500	1,492,000	1,492,000	50	746,000
Woodward Lumber Co., Cottage Grove, Oreg	Powerplant extension at Cottage Grove	4,000	523,091	523,091	55	287,700
Oregon total						39,088,001
PENNSYLVANIA						
Ohio Edison Co., Akron, Ohio	Transmission facilities near Sharon, Pa		31,400	31,400	40	12,560
Pennsylvania Electric Co., Johnstown, Pa	Shawville steam electric station, Shawville, Pa., units Nos. 1 and 2.	125,000 125,000	25,835,774 13,939,926	25,835,774 13,939,926	55 45	14,209,676 6,272,967
Do	Transmission facilities from Shawville to Montevello via Lewistown.		7,175,181	5,515,884 1,634,000	55 45	3,033,736 735,300
Pennsylvania Power Co., New Castle, Pa	Greenville substation, Greenville, Pa		58,000	58,000	30	17,400
Do	Transmission line and customer substation at Ellwood, Pa.		79,500	79,500	25	19,875
Do	New Castle steam electric station, unit No. 3	85,000	13,206,500	13,206,500	35	4,622,275
Do	Transmission facilities near Sharon, Pa		28,820	28,820	40	11,528
Do	Transmission line, Mercer County, Pa., to supply Sharon Steel Corp.		31,000	31,000	35	10,850
Do	Transmission line, Mercer County, Pa		33,100	31,849	35	11,147

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
PENNSYLVANIA—continued						
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Allentown, Pa.	East Lancaster, South Akron-Earl-Grace mine transmission line.		$1,184,940	$1,184,940	35	$414,729
Do	Sunbury steam electric station, unit No. 3	100,000	24,598,850	24,598,850	25	6,149,713
Do	Martins Creek steam electric station near Martins Creek, Pa.	132,500	32,209,550	31,962,100	45	14,382,945
Do	Extension to Sunbury steam electric station, unit No. 4; Shamokin Dam west side of Susquehanna River, about 2 miles south of Sunbury, Pa.	125,000	36,907,000	36,907,000	55	20,298,850
Pennsylvania Water & Power Co., Baltimore, Md.	Extension to existing Holtwood station, Holtwood, Pa.	60,000	13,591,000	13,591,000	45	6,115,950
Do	Coal recovery plant near Safe Harbor, Pa.		6,000,000	6,000,000	40	2,400,000
Do	Transmission line between Manor and Hummelstown substations in Pennsylvania.		1,193,000	1,193,000	55	656,150
Philadelphia Electric Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Transmission facilities, Camden switching station, Richmond generating station line (Philadelphia Electric portion).		899,500	989,500	20	179,900
Do	Extension to Delaware steam electric station, 1401 Beach St., Philadelphia, Pa., units 7 and 8.	250,000	45,000,000	44,200,000	55	24,310,000
Do	Structures and improvements, station equipment, Island Road, 78th and Eastwick Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.	250,000	2,860,000	2,860,000	55	1,573,000
Do	Transmission facilities from Emilie substation to Burlington.		1,610,000	1,610,000	20	322,000
	Transmission facilities to supply new Fairless plant, United States Steel.		910,500	910,500	30	273,150
Do	Cromby steam electric station, Cromby, Pa.	150,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	55	14,850,000
Do	Cromby steam electric station, Cromby, Pa., unit No. 2.	200,000	30,500,000	30,207,090	30	9,062,127
Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Steam boiler installation at Neville Island	11,400	1,836,000	1,836,000	60	1,101,600
St. Lawrence River Power Co. (St. Lawrence plant), Pittsburgh, Pa.	Synchronous condenser and accessory switching facilities, miscellaneous water facilities.		367,800	367,800	85	312,630
West Pennsylvania Power Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Transmission facilities, Albright to Lake Lynn		233,670	233,670	40	93,468
Do	Springdale power station, unit No. 8, Sprindale, Pa.	125,000	20,332,000	19,023,258	50	9,511,629
Do	Transmission lines in southwest Pennsylvania		1,491,110	1,491,110	45	671,000
Do	Transmission line from a point near Washington, Pa., to a point near Waynesburg, Pa.		669,293	664,293	40	265,717
Do	Transmission facilities, Allenport, Pa.		557,755	557,755	35	195,214
United States Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Extension to boiler plant, Clairton Byproduct Coke Works, Clairton, Pa.		2,430,000	2,430,000	45	1,093,500
Pennsylvania total						143,190,586
SOUTH CAROLINA						
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Columbia, S. C.	Transmission line in Aiken County, S. C.		225,000	225,000	45	101,250
Do	Transmission line, Accabee substation to Hagood steam plant, Charleston County, S. C.		104,855	85,276	20	17,055
Do	Transmission line near Aiken, S. C.		104,463	103,963	20	20,793
Do	Transmission line, Allendale-Barnwell, S. C.		165,100	165,100	20	33,020
Do	Transmission line to AEC plant, Aiken County, S. C.		190,000	190,000	50	95,000
Do	Transmission circuit in Charleston, S. C., area		44,500	44,500	45	20,025
Do	Service extension to Air Force Base near Charleston, S. C.		33,150	33,150	45	14,918
Do	Service extension to Air Force plant, near Charleston, S. C.		26,000	26,000	40	10,400
Do	Extension of steam electric station, Hagood plant, Charleston, S. C.	40,000	8,371,150	5,667,064	20	1,133,413
Do	Substation enlargement, Charleston, S. C.		260,000	260,000	20	52,000
Do	Transmission line and substation facilities between Yemassee and Graniteville, S. C.		1,253,000	1,253,940	20	250,788
South Carolina Generating Co., Columbia, S. C.	Urquhart steam electric station, units 1 and 2, Beech Island, Aiken County, S. C.	150,000	24,102,900	24,048,500	45	10,821,825
South Carolina total						12,570,487
SOUTH DAKOTA						
Black Hills Power & Light Co., Rapid City, S. Dak.	Transmission facilities from Rapid City, S. Dak., to Rapid City Air Base and substation at air base.		142,000	126,367	55	69,502
Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minn.	Extension to power station, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	20,000	3,320,100	3,320,100	25	830,025
South Dakota total						899,527
TENNESSEE						
Appalachian Electric Power Co., Roanoke, Va.	Transmission line, Holston-Boone Dam, Tenn.		212,300	212,300	25	53,075
Knoxville Power Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Transmission line, Calderwood to Alcoa, Blount County, Tenn.		940,900	938,700	65	610,155
Nantahala Power & Light Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Tennessee Creek hydro-electric development, Jackson County, Tenn.	9,000	3,980,000	3,897,050	65	2,533,083
Tennessee total						3,196,313
TEXAS						
Central Power & Light Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.	Transmission line and associated substations, Laredo to Falfurrias to Edinburg, Tex.		1,528,563	1,446,536	40	578,614
Do	Transmission line near Corpus Christi, Tex.		185,700	184,575	55	101,516
Do	do		230,704	230,704	35	80,746
Do	Victoria steam electric station, unit No. 3, Victoria, Tex.	30,000	5,231,180	5,231,180	40	2,092,472
Do	Lon C. Hill steam electric-generating station, unit No. 1, Calallen, Tex.	60,000	8,159,288	8,046,969	45	3,621,136
Do	Transmission line and terminal facilities, Victoria to Calallen to Falfurrias, Tex.		3,274,000	3,187,325	40	1,274,930
Citizens Utility Co., Nogales, Tex.	Valencia gas-diesel engine near Nogales, Tex.	1,250	418,000	418,000	45	188,100
Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.	Parkdale steam electric generating unit No. 2, Dallas, Tex.	115,000	11,100,000	11,100,000	65	7,215,000
Do	Addition to Dallas steam electric station unit No. 3, Dallas, Tex.	60,000	8,860,000	8,860,000	65	5,759,000
Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex.	Extension to boiler plant, Freeport, Tex.		640,630	640,630	50	320,318
Do	Extensions to power stations, Freeport, Tex.	75,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	50	5,750,000
Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Industrial power installations at plant B and plant A, Freeport, Tex.	60,000	15,833,300	15,833,300	40	6,333,320
Do	Industrial powerplant A at Freeport, Tex.	40,000	10,675,000	10,675,000	40	4,270,000

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
TEXAS—continued						
Gulf States Utilities Co., Beaumont, Tex.	Transmission facilities, Orange, Tex.		$404,100	$404,100	35	$141,435
Houston Lighting & Power Co., Houston, Tex.	Webster steam electric station units Nos. 1 and 2, 25 miles northeast of Houston, Tex.	200,000	22,624,000	12,175,000	55	6,696,250
				10,172,000	65	6,611,800
Do.	Deepwater steam electric station No. 7 unit, Pasadena, Tex.	125,000	16,300,000	16,069,880	65	10,445,422
Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.	Knox Lee steam electric generation station unit No. 4, Longview, Tex., and associated transmission and substation facilities.	60,000	8,610,716	8,610,716	50	4,305,358
Do.	Lone Star steam electric station, unit No. 1, Longview, Tex.	40,000	6,886,769	6,883,769	55	3,786,073
Southwestern Public Service Co., Amarillo, Tex.	Moore County generating unit, near Sunray, Tex.	50,000	7,050,000	7,030,000	55	3,866,500
Do.	Amherst steam electric plant, units No. 1 and No. 2 near Littlefield, Tex.	50,000 100,000	16,778,642	16,510,642	55	9,080,853
Do.	Extension to power station, Amarillo, Tex.	37,500	4,394,169	4,394,169	25	1,098,542
Do.	Stepup substation, Amarillo, Tex.		263,568	263,568	25	65,892
Do.	Transmission line, Amarillo to Canyon Corner, Tex.		216,670	216,670	25	54,168
Do.	Plant "X", Hale County transmission line and substation.		755,600	755,600	55	415,580
Do.	Substation and line facilities near Borger, Tex.		713,436	678,132	35	237,346
Do.	Plant "X" electric generating station, unit No. 3, Lamb County, Littlefield, Tex.	110,000	12,849,915	12,849,915	55	7,067,453
Do.	Transformer bank at Moore County plant, Texas.		485,070	485,070	55	266,789
Do.	Transformer bank at Denver City plant, Denver City, Tex.		370,740	370,740	55	203,907
Texas Electric Service Co., Fort Worth, Tex.	Morgan Creek electric station, unit No. 4, Colorado City, Tex.	60,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	65	4,875,000
Do.	Tarrant County (Eagle Mountain) electric station, Fort Worth, Tex.	100,000	12,000,000	11,279,145	65	7,331,444
Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.	Transmission facilities between Whitney, Lake Creek, Waco and Temple, Tex.		2,599,000	2,599,000	45	1,169,550
Do.	River Crest electric station No. 1, Paris, Tex.	100,000	12,650,000	12,650,000	65	8,222,500
Do.	Transmission lines between Franklin and Paris, Franklin and Sulphur Springs, Commerce and Sulphur Springs.		3,912,000	3,912,000	65	2,542,800
Do.	Lake Creek electric station, unit No. 1, Waco, Tex.	60,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	55	6,050,000
Do.	Initial unit of Collins County steam electric station of Prosper, Tex.	145,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	65	11,375,000
Do.	Transmission line, substation, and terminal facilities for Collins County steam electric generating station, Tex.		2,360,000	2,196,100	65	1,427,465
West Texas Utilities Co., Abilene, Tex.	Steam-electric generating station No. 2 unit, Paint Creek plant and substation, Stamford, Tex.	30,000	3,945,370	3,945,370	45	1,775,417
Do.	Transmission line, Paint Creek generating plant to Stamford line.		100,790	100,790	40	40,316
Do.	Transmission line, Paint Creek generating plant to Abilene generating plant.		426,917	426,917	55	234,804
West Texas Utilities Co., Stamford, Tex.	Transmission line, Paint Creek generating plant, Haskell line.		72,637	72,637	55	39,950
West Texas Utilities Co., Abilene, Tex.	Transmission facilities, Hamlin, Tex.		143,057	117,857	25	29,464
Do.	Transmission line near Eldorado, Tex.		141,186	141,186	20	28,237
Do.	Transmission line near Sterling City, Tex.		107,796	107,796	20	21,559
Do.	Paint Creek steam electric station No. 1 unit, near Stamford, Tex.	30,000	4,400,000	4,375,000	55	2,406,250
Do.	Concho steam electric station, unit No. 2, San Angelo, Tex.	30,000	3,954,400	3,954,400	55	2,174,920
Do.	Ballinger gas turbine electric station near Fort Stockton, Tex.	5,000	770,679	767,579	40	307,032
Texas total						141,980,225
UTAH						
Utah Power & Light Co., Salt Lake City, Utah	Tooele-Dugway transmission line at Tooele, Utah		170,670	170,670	40	68,268
Utah total						68,268
VERMONT						
Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Rutland, Vt.	Gas turbine and hydro redevelopment, Rutland and Weybridge.	9,750	2,122,610	1,987,610	25	496,903
Do.	Rutland gas turbine, units Nos. 2 and 3, Rutland, Vt.	10,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	30	690,000
Vermont total						1,186,903
VIRGINIA						
Appalachian Electric Power Co., Roanoke, Va.	Transmission lines Glen Lyn-Roanoke-Salem, Va.		2,743,240	2,743,240	25	685,810
Do.	Transmission line, Saltville, Va., Kingsport, Tenn.		774,030	774,030	25	193,508
Appalachian Electric Power Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Electric power supply to Foote Minerals Co., Sunbright, Va.		208,510	208,510	40	83,404
Do.	Fieldale substation addition, Fieldale, Va.		601,130	507,630	20	101,526
Do.	Transmission line and substation near Mount Union, Va., Lone Star project.		931,920	931,920	30	279,576
Do.	Transmission lines to Saltville, Smyth County, Va.		431,290	335,500	25	88,875
Do.	Transmission facilities Roanoke, Va.		238,920	238,920	20	47,784
Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C.	Potomac River plant, Alexandria, Va.	90,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	40	6,400,000
Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.	Addition to Portsmouth, Va., power station.	90,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	35	5,075,000
Do.	Transmission line extension to Fort Eustis, Va.		60,000	60,000	55	33,000
Do.	Transmission line extension near Norfolk, Va.		170,000	170,000	45	76,500
Do.	Transmission line and substation, near Norfolk, Va.		1,200,000	1,188,000	45	534,600
Do.	Transmission line, Suffolk to Newport News and substation at Langley Field, Va.		4,195,000	4,185,000	55	2,301,750
Do.	Reeves Ave. steam plant unit No. 7	40,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	25	750,000
Do.	Rossum Point steam plant unit No. 2	60,000	9,862,000	9,200,000	25	2,300,000
Do.	Chesterfield steam plant unit No. 3	90,000	14,390,000	13,600,000	55	7,480,000
Do.	Gilmerton steam plant, new	90,000	17,500,000	17,100,000	55	9,405,000
Do.	Possum Point-Chesterfield, 110-kilovolt transmission line.		2,965,000	2,955,000	25	738,750
Do.	Buggs Island-Chase City, 110-kilovolt transmission line and 110-kilovolt/66-kilovolt substation.		825,000	823,000	25	205,750
Do.	Chesterfield-Hosier Rd., 110-kilovolt transmission line.		2,650,000	2,650,000	25	662,500
Do.	Chesterfield-Newport News, 110-kilovolt transmission line.		2,200,000	2,200,000	55	1,210,000
Do.	Transmission line, Portsmouth power station, Portsmouth, Va.		440,000	440,000	45	198,000

Electric power projects approved for tax certificates—Continued

Name of applicant	Location and type of facility	Rated capacity (kilowatts)	Amount of application	Amount eligible	Recommended percent	Amount certified for accelerated amortization
VIRGINIA—continued						
Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.	Transmission lines, southwest of Richmond, Va., near the North Carolina-Virginia border.		$1,300,000	$1,300,000	45	$585,000
Do	Transmission line near Norfolk, Va.		180,000	180,000	45	81,000
Virginia total						39,517,333
WASHINGTON						
J. Neils Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg.	Powerplant at Klickitat, Wash.	3,000	125,000	95,000	55	52,250
Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland, Oreg.	Yale hydroelectric project, Lewis River, Wash.	100,000	26,450,000	26,170,000	75	19,627,500
Washington Veneer Corp., Olympia, Wash.	Alterations to boilerhouse	6,000	248,500	248,500	55	136,675
Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.	Cabinet Gorge hydroelectric plant	200,000	35,000,000	34,425,000	65	22,376,250
Do	Transmission line and substation to serve Van Stone mine near Aladin, Stevens County, Wash.		155,240	142,990	35	50,047
Washington total						42,242,722
WEST VIRGINIA						
Appalachian Electric Power Co., Charleston, W. Va.	Transmission line		133,850	133,850	65	87,003
Appalachian Electric Power Co., New York, N. Y.	Transmission facilities, Huntington, W. Va.		184,470	184,470	35	64,565
Appalachian Electric Power Co., care of American Gas and Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Portable transformer for use in West Virginia and adjacent States.		244,600	244,600	55	134,530
Do	Substations at Logan and Becco, W. Va.		173,700	173,700	40	69,480
Do	Transmission facilities vicinity Graham Station, West Virginia.		74,690	74,960	40	29,984
Appalachian Electric Power Co., New York, N. Y.	Substation and transmission expansion, Charleston, W. Va.		1,121,745	1,073,745	40	429,498
Appalachian Electric Power Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Improvements at Cabin Creek steam-electric generating plant, southeast of Charleston, W. Va.		89,400	89,400	20	17,880
Do	Bradley substation addition, Price Hill, W. Va.		118,810	118,810	20	23,762
Do	Transmission facilities vicinity of Charleston, W. Va., Glen Lyn, Radford, Switchback and North Bristol, Va.; Kingsport, and Canney Branch, Tenn.; and Crestmont, N. C.		68,393	59,543	40	23,817
Appalachian Electric Power Co., Roanoke, Va.	Transmission line Glasgow-Balleysville, W. Va.		1,873,700	1,873,700	45	843,165
Do	Kanawha Nos. 1 and 2, West Virginia	200,000	47,939,310	31,826,206	45	14,321,793
Do	New steam electric generating plant and connecting transmission line.	200,000		[4] 15,913,104	65	10,343,518
Monongahela Power Co., Fairmont, W. Va.	Transmission interconnection to Marietta, Ohio		34,504	34,504	25	8,626
Do	Albright power station unit No. 2 and transmission line near Clarksburg, W. Va.	60,000	14,022,497	13,952,297	40	5,580,919
Do	Line extension to Fairview, W. Va.		47,790	47,790	25	11,948
Do	Rivesville power station unit No. 6, Rivesville, W. Va.	74,750	12,097,800	12,097,800	25	3,024,450
Do	Line extension and substation, Hastings, W. Va.		185,000	185,000	35	64,750
Do	Transmission facilities, Vienna, W. Va.		128,200	124,700	40	49,880
Do	Transmission facilities, Weirton, W. Va.		42,800	42,300	40	16,920
Do	Albright generating station, Albright, W. Va.	125,000	17,082,500	16,682,500	45	7,507,125
Northern Virginia Power Co., Frederick, Md.	Transmission line from Millville, W. Va., to double toll gate, Virginia.		384,230	318,880	20	63,776
The Potomac Edison Co., Frederick, Md.	Transmission line from Ridgeley, W. Va., to Marlowe, W. Va., portion of the line in Maryland.		361,960	126,360	50	63,180
Do	Albright power station unit No. 1 and transmission line, Ridgeley, W. Va.	60,000	13,397,710	13,337,310	40	5,334,924
Potomac Light & Power Co., Frederick, Md.	Transmission line and substation, Ridgeley, W. Va., to Marlowe, W. Va.		1,645,770	1,222,730	50	611,365
Do	Transmission line from Maryland stateline to Millville, W. Va.		53,510	25,510	20	5,102
Wheeling Electric Co., Charleston, W. Va.	Transmission line		223,105	223,105	65	145,018
Wheeling Electric Co., New York, N. Y., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp.	Substation expansion, Natrium, Marshall County, W. Va.		96,880	91,880	35	32,158
Wheeling Electric Co., care of American Gas & Electric Service Corp., New York, N. Y.	Transmission service facilities, Round Bottom, W. Va.		471,616	466,446	35	163,256
Do	Transmission facilities to supply munitions plant		74,033	63,766	35	22,318
West Virginia total						49,094,710
WISCONSIN						
Lake Superior District Power Co., Ashland, Wis.	Addition to steam electric station, Bay Front steam-electric station, unit No. 5, Ashland, Wis.	20,000	3,342,000	3,244,799	30	973,440
Northern State Power Co., Eau Claire, Wis.	Extension line in Eau Claire to LaCrosse, Wis.		1,565,000	1,565,000	40	626,000
Thilmany Pulp & Paper Co., Kaukana, Wis.	Expansion to steam and power installation, Kaukana, Wis.	7,500	1,581,461	1,581,461	35	553,511
Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Oak Creek steam-electric station, unit No. 1 (on shore of Lake Michigan, 10 miles south of city limits of Milwaukee, Wis.).	120,000	25,142,500	25,142,500	35	8,799,875
Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Oak Creek steam-electric plant No. 2 (on shore of Lake Michigan), approximately 10 miles south of city limits of Milwaukee, Wis.	120,000	21,268,400	20,393,400	40	8,157,360
Wisconsin Power & Light Co., Madison, Wis.	Rock River steam electric station, unit No. 2, 4 miles north of city of Beloit, Wis., on Rock River.	60,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	55	6,050,000
Do	Transmission lines out of Rock River generating station and substations at Fond du Lac, Randolph, Beaver Dam, Darlington, Turtle and Lake Geneva.		3,802,005	3,794,505	55	2,086,978
Do	Rock river steam electric station, unit No. 1, Rock County, Wis.	60,000	13,296,850	13,246,850	55	7,285,768
Wisconsin total						34,532,952

[4] $200,000 excluded for land fee.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Is it not true the Government pays the TVA for all the power it uses?

Mr. GAVIN. There is no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke from the Democratic side, but from the hostile attitude exhibited toward me I thought it would be better to come back on the Republican side today.

Before the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] gets a chance to get on his feet, I might advise him that I do not know whether the policy adopted by the Appropriations Committee on TVA is the program of the President or not.

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

Mr. GAVIN. However, if I had my way, it would be.

Now, President Eisenhower is one of the great Presidents of all time.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield to my good friend from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower is one of the greatest Presidents of all times. He is turning in a magnificent performance of which the Nation is proud.

Just a few short months ago, the Democrats were admonishing the Republicans and saying they were supporting the Eisenhower program to a greater extent than were the Republicans. Well, only time will tell.

I might say though to my Democratic friends that they might as well get used to President Eisenhower and his programs as we are going to have him for 6 more years.

Yesterday it was called to the attention of the House that in the past 20 years $1.750 billion have been put into the TVA by the American taxpayers. Believe me, this is no small sum. And yet, we hear cries from the valley complaining that the Federal Government is letting them down. This is gratitude.

Now my State, the great State of Pennsylvania, is making the fight of its life for its industrial existence and we pay from 8 percent to 10 percent for all Federal projects. I figure that Pennsylvania has put about $175 million into the TVA.

Each Member of the House can figure the approximate percentage of the money his State pays into the Federal Treasury, and you can figure how much your State has invested in the TVA.

I am of the opinion that we have been rather generous—overgenerous—to the TVA; particularly when it is giving the Tennessee Valley preferential status over other States to attract industries into the area and crucifies the economic and industrial life of other States.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield.

I might point out that the Aluminum Co. of America started in Allegheny County in my State, but when they decided to expand, do you think they located in Pensylvania? No; they go down to the Tennessee Valley where there is cheap hydroelectric power, federally subsidized, tax-exempt.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield, and ask that the Chair permit no further interruptions.

You will find all big industrial corporations located there, not because it is any more attractive than any other section of country but because it is more profitably attractive. They can get low power rates and they are in business to make a profit. Other States cannot meet this subsidized competition.

The greatly increased demand for power and the potentials of the valley have been pointed out. I am pleased such a condition exists, but there certainly is no reason why they cannot develop their own steam powerplants with their own money without assessing other States in the Nation to create industrial prosperity for the Tennessee Valley.

I would like to have the $175 million that Pennsylvania put into the TVA right now to be used for the distressed coal areas in my State.

Certainly it is time for the TVA to stand on its own feet and develop its own power in competition with the other States in the Nation.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 1 additional minute.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. One will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. EVINS. I offered to give it to you.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee state if it is not true that the Aluminum Co. of America was located at Alcoa, in the district that I represent, many, many years before TVA came to Tennessee?

Mr. PRIEST. I certainly will state that at least 10 years before TVA ever came to Tennessee the Aluminum Co. of America plant was located at Alcoa, in the district represented by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment, and I hope for just a few minutes, if I may, to discuss the amendment, because it presents to us a very real and present problem. I hope we can all get out of our minds the various tags and labels that have been pinned on one of the greatest agencies of the Federal Government and get down to the basic problem presented by the pending amendment.

I like to agree with my adversary as far as I can. I think it was Shakespeare who admonished us to do that. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] in two respects.

The gentleman from North Carolina said that there is not currently a power shortage in the Tennessee Valley. With that I agree.

The gentleman from North Carolina said further that this was not a budget request. With that I agree.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, unless the House adopts this amendment today, I predict on what I believe to be very sound authority that within less than 60 days the Bureau of the Budget will be here requesting an additional appropriation so that some of these steam units may be constructed. Why do I make that prediction? I base it on some correspondence I have had with the Atomic Energy Commission, and I shall ask permission later in the House to insert this correspondence in the RECORD.

Now, why is there not a budget request for this $85 million? Because, of the 1,205,000,000 kilowatts of energy now being supplied the Paducah plant, the Budget recommended that about 600,000 kilowatts of that power be transferred to private utilities. Subsequently the Atomic Energy Commission had an offer. They are now discussing that offer with the Bureau of the Budget. That offer was from a private group which said in effect that they would also have to build a steam plant in order to furnish the power, and that it would cost the taxpayers, if you please, $4 million a year more than they are now paying for the same amount of energy from TVA.

Subsequent to that situation the Atomic Energy Commission has requested, within the last month, 200,000 additional kilowatts for the Oak Ridge plant. They have asked TVA to submit a proposal for supplying that amount of energy.

Mr. Chairman, there is a clear question here of about 800,000 kilowatts of power. The people in the Valley, I am sure, will not be greatly concerned so long as they know they are going to have adequate power for their own needs. The Bureau of the Budget, in seeking to relieve TVA of 600,000 kilowatts, admitted by that action that there will be a shortage by 1957, a shortage in which that much power will be needed for the normal demands of the area.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the Atomic Energy Commission will get what they need. If they need 800,000 kilowatts they are going to get it. We are certain of that, but we face the situation wherein, if that comes from the TVA supply somebody in the Valley may suffer. The Andrews' amendment would permit the beginning of some steam-plant construction which may be completed in 3 years and will take care of the new demand that has been made, and the growing normal demand. I believe that within less than 60 days there will be a request for still more than 200,000 additional kilowatts at Oak Ridge. I have very good reason for believing that that will happen.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we face here today a very real and practical problem with which this Congress must come to grips and I believe come to grips with very speedily. We can do that, Mr. Chairman, by adopting the Andrews' amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot too strongly urge the House to consider these pertinent facts as they apply to the question of whether TVA power is subsidized or whether, instead, it pays its way and more.

It is true that a portion of the funds invested in TVA power operations has come from congressional appropriations. But let us look a bit further.

In order to finance power facilities Congress has provided TVA with $722,-

930,576. However, TVA has repaid $81,-131,519 of that amount, leaving the net investment of Government money in the power program at the end of June 1953 of $641,799,057. Now, the remaining amount of $214,280,092 represents the earnings of the power system reinvested in power facilities.

Now it may be seen that through June 30, 1953, one-fourth of TVA's investment in power facilities came from the people of the Tennessee Valley through the bills they pay for electricity.

Under the law what has been advanced from the Federal Treasury must be repaid over a 40-year period. When these funds are repaid the Government will own the facilities, as it does today, and they will continue to be income-producing sources.

I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any subsidy in a plan under which the users of electricity repay the cost of power facilities, it is extremely difficult for me to find it.

It appears clearly evident that the rates, revenues, and earnings are more than ample to cover all operating and maintenance costs, depreciation, interest, tax payments to State and local governments, and still leave a generous margin of income for the Federal Government.

I want to point out further, Mr. Chairman, that Congress did not establish the TVA power program as a source of income-tax revenue for the Federal Government. A great deal has been said as to why TVA and the municipal power systems do not pay Federal income taxes.

Let me emphasize again, as I have emphasized ever since I became a Member of the House, that all of TVA's net income goes to the Federal Government, to be used either for general purposes or for reinvestment in the TVA power system.

Congress gave TVA specific direction to charge the lowest possible rates consistent with making the power program self-supporting and self-liquidating.

It is a matter of fact that the income which the Federal Government receives from TVA's power operations exceeds the income taxes which a private utility would pay if it owned and operated the system.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that Members of the House will give very earnest study to this question. The TVA is a great and tremendously important national asset. It was created by the Congress and told to do a specific job. How well it has done that job the record of the last two decades will testify.

It would seem to me that the basic facts in connection with this Government corporation should be studied most carefully particularly by all Members of the House, to the end that we shall not continue to face each year a situation in which so much apparent misunderstanding of the facts appears. There is a deal of difference between a philosophy with reference to public power and the facts and figures in the TVA operation.

The following correspondence, I believe, will be of interest to the House:

FEBRUARY 11, 1954.

Mr. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: In disapproving a request by the Tennessee Valley Authority for funds to begin construction of the proposed Fulton steam plant, the Bureau of the Budget suggested as an alternative that TVA be relieved of its commitment of around 600,000 kilowatts of the load being made available to the Atomic Energy Commission. Under this proposal private utilities would build plants to make up this deficit to the AEC.

As you may well understand, this is a matter in which the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley region are intensely interested since it involves the question of an adequate power supply for that area.

It is one also in which all the American people have a vital interest because it appears that such an arrangement inevitably will cost the Government considerably more in the long run.

As you know, a minimum of approximately 3 years is required to construct and place into operation a steam generating plant.

I have not yet been successful in efforts to obtain any definite information about any negotiations entered into or contemplated for carrying out the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget that AEC depend on private utilities for a half million kilowatts now being supplied or to be supplied by TVA. Appropriations for the next fiscal year will be approved within the next few months.

In view of these circumstances, and because this is a matter of the most urgent importance to the whole economy of the Tennessee Valley region, I believe we should know at this time just what the status of negotiations, if any, may be insofar as putting into effect the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

Has the Atomic Energy Commission reached such a point in any negotiations that you feel confident that, as of any certain date, you will be able to obtain from privately built steam plants the amount of electric energy you will require?

Are you in a position to give to the Congress estimates on the cost to AEC of 600,000 kilowatts obtained from privately built steam plants, and a comparison of that cost with the present cost of TVA power?

I hope you will understand, Mr. Chairman, that I am seeking this information because I believe it to be necessary before the Congress can act wisely on appropriation bills for fiscal year 1955.

As I see it, your own appropriation as well as that of TVA is involved here. Unquestionably the AEC appropriation, now or in the near future, must of necessity contain funds for the purchase of this private power if the administration's policy as set forth in the budget is to be made effective.

In my own opinion we should not take an unnecessary risk at this time, a risk that involves not only a large load of power needed by the Atomic Energy Commission, but power necessary for the normal needs of the Tennessee Valley area.

Unless there are presently some more specific plans for supplying the Atomic Energy Commission's power needs than have been made public or given to the Congress, then I believe we will be taking a great risk if we do not proceed with the construction of the Fulton plant.

I shall deeply appreciate whatever information you may give me on this extremely important question.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

MARCH 19, 1954.

Mr. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: With further reference to my letter of February 11, 1954, and your reply thereto, I feel that it is now more imperative than ever that the exact situation with reference to the budget proposal to relieve the Tennessee Valley Authority of its commitment of 600,000 kilowatts to the Atomic Energy Commission be clarified.

My reason for taking this position is the information I have received in the last few days that the Atomic Energy Commission has requested that the Tennessee Valley Authority supply an additional 20,000 kilowatts of power for use at the Oak Ridge plant.

You explained in your letter that an offer had been made to the Commission with reference to the 600,000 kilowatts and that it was being considered as the basis of further discussions with the Bureau of the Budget and that you would let me have the detailed information as soon as it was available.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations, as I understand it, is now in the process of marking up the independent offices appropriation bill for the next fiscal year. Very shortly that bill will be reported to the House of Representatives for consideration.

Under the circumstances it appears to me that Members of the House from all parts of the country, and particularly from the Tennessee Valley area, will be placed in an extremely uncertain and difficult situation unless at that time we can have some assurance that the power needs, both of the Atomic Energy Commission and the private consumers in the Tennessee Valley area, are to be met adequately and economically.

If there is not some reasonable assurance that the load of 600,000 kilowatts plus the new request for 200,000 kilowatts can be made available without a very serious consequence to the economy of that area, then the Congress should have that assurance before consideration of the appropriation bill.

If the cost of private power under the terms of the offer that has been made to the Commission will be greatly in excess of TVA power, then certainly the Congress should have that information.

Without any desire or intention of appearing to be impatient in this matter, I do feel that the Congress needs a very clear picture of the present and contemplated future circumstances in connection with this entire matter if the Congress is to act wisely and in the public interest.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1954.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PRIEST: In response to your letter of March 19, 1954, the discussions with the Bureau of the Budget on 600,000 kilowatts of power covered in our previous letters of March 5, 1954 and March 22, 1954, concerned the possibility of relieving TVA of this amount from their present contract commitment to furnish 1,205,000 kilowatts for the gaseous diffusion project at Paducah, Ky.

The AEC contracts with TVA for the Oak Ridge area now provide for the power required to operate the major production facilities including the expansion authorized by the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1953.

Recently, to provide for additional new load at Oak Ridge in the amount of 200,000 kilowatts, the TVA was requested to submit a proposal for the supply of this additional power. This power will be used to operate new facilities now under contruction for which funds were provided in the Appropriation Act of 1954, and for facilities for which funds are being requested in the 1955 Budget Estimates, now before the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget is considering both problems together. Recent discussions with them indicate their appreciation of your concern and their plan to draw the studies to a conclusion as rapidly as possible.

They have pointed out to us the President's budget message indicated that, in the event

negotiations for furnishing these load requirements for the Atomic Energy Commission from other sources are not consummated as contemplated, or new defense loads develop, the question of starting additional generating units by the Tennessee Valley Authority will be reconsidered. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget have stated that, if under these circumstances, it becomes necessary to reexamine the question, this will be done in time to allow TVA to submit a supplemental request for consideration by Congress during this session.

Sincerely yours,

K. D. NICHOLS,
General Manager.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in order to clarify, if I can, the misunderstanding that seems to prevail with respect to the point of order which I made yesterday in regard to public housing. I would like to put in the RECORD just what the situation is.

In the bill of last year the following language was contained:

The Administrator shall not "after the date of the approval of this act, enter into any new agreements, contracts, or other arrangements, preliminary or otherwise, which will ultimately bind the Public Housing Administration during fiscal year 1954 or for any future years with respect to loans or annual contributions for any additional dwelling units or projects unless hereafter authorized by the Congress to do so."

Now, that effectively put an end to public housing. That is the law today. No public housing except that already contracted for.

Now, the bill on yesterday contained this provision:

Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1955 the commencement of construction of in excess of 20,000 dwelling units.

It was contended that this 20,000 was put in there because they were houses that were not new, that were already contracted for when we passed last year's act. That may or may not be correct. But, this language was such that it was feared that it affected or repealed or modified the language of the previous year.

What I was seeking to do and what we did do by obtaining the elimination of this language was to see that existing law remains as is. Last year we put a stop to public housing after the completion of the contracted units. By that amendment which was in the bill yesterday, the provision that was stricken out, it was uncertain whether or not that would revive the authorization of public housing, so the purpose of my point of order was to see that the law remained intact. Now, if we are obligated to build 35,000 units, I do not care whether we build them this year or next year. What I am seeking to do is to keep the door closed on the thing we did last year to definitely and finally end public housing. It was quite clear from the debate last year as to what happened and what Congress intended. It was the positive understanding of this House that there was an end to public housing by the language which was reported in the independent offices bill of last year.

And, I want to quote from some of the members of the committee who wrote that language. I quote from one member of the committee who wrote that language:

We have cut out what is described by the gentleman from Virginia, in essence, as socialized housing, which is expensive, uneconomical, and political. The testimony before the committee indicates that public housing is expensive, that the average cost of a house is $14,000, and they can be built better, as a rule, by private builders for less money. It is uneconomical; it is highly political.

And, may I add, is still highly political.

I quote from another member of the committee who helped draft that language:

I do not want any misunderstanding. It was our intent, and so far as I am concerned, it is my earnest desire that we meet this issue foursquare. I hope that by that language we are terminating public housing, as such, forever and through all eternity, because I believe it is the most monstrous, un-American, uneconomical, socialistic, and expensive legislation ever written by any Congress in all our history.

Now, that is language of members of the committee who wrote it, and it was the clear intention of Congress that the act of last year close the door and completely do away with public housing, with the exception of the houses that were already contracted for. Now, if you contracted for 35,000, I do not care whether you build them this year or next year, just so this door remains closed, and it does remain closed by the action of the House on yesterday in striking out the clause which would have changed the law.

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

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can we agree on a limitation of time on this amendment only? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to read to the Committee a United Press dispatch that I have just culled from the wires of the teletype machine in the lobby:

Speaker MARTIN said he expects Congress to give the administration a go-ahead on commitments for the construction of about 70,000 public housing units in the next 2 years.

This would be in line with President Eisenhower's request for a 4-year program of 140,000 public housing units.

MARTIN told reporters he saw no confusion in what the House did yesterday on public housing. A proposal to limit public housing commitments to 20,000 in the next fiscal year starting July 1, was stricken from an appropriations bill.

MARTIN said the effect of this was to give the administration authority to commit the Government to the subsidizing of 35,000 additional units next year.

The 35,000 units for the following year will be authorized, MARTIN continued, in a general housing bill which the House planned to take up later today.

The general housing bill, as presented to the House, contained no provision for additional public housing commitments. MARTIN said the Republicans would support an amendment providing for the additional 35,000 units.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee. That would bring us to 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand it, the request refers to the pending amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct, the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN yielded his time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLLING yielded his time to Mr. YATES.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KRUEGER yielded his time to Mr. JONAS of North Carolina.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I think his interpretation of the existing law is correct. The language that went into the appropriation bill last year, in my judgment, terminated authority for construction of new units. It was never the intention of our committee at any time to prevent the construction of any units which were the subject of firm contract previously entered into between the Government of the United States and various housing authorities. The committee recognized the validity of such contracts at all times. I pointed this out to the House yesterday when I argued the point of order, and subsequently, the majority leader agreed with me.

With respect to what my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has said regarding the statement of Speaker MARTIN appearing on the teletype, let me say that I am glad to see that Speaker MARTIN has approved the construction of 35,000 housing units. But remember, Mr. Chairman, these are units that were authorized during a Democratic administration; as of the present date, there is no authority for the construction of

new housing units. There will be none, apparently, unless it is inserted in the new housing bill. It will be interesting to see whether the President's party will vote for such authority. Certainly, they never voted for appropriations for the purpose.

I certainly hope that when the housing bill is brought to the floor, appropriate authority will be voted for the construction of sufficient units in accordance with the President's program. What has happened to that program? I do not know how Speaker MARTIN obtains the impression that 70,000 units are going to be constructed this year. As the law now stands, only 35,000 are provided for. If the Speaker proposes an additional 35,000 he will be opposing the President's recommendation, for the President asked for 140,000 new units, not 35,000 new units. He did not include in his program units which had been authorized by the Democratic administration over 2 years ago.

That is the housing picture at this time. It seems that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and I are in agreement as to what the picture is, even though yesterday it appeared we were at opposite ends. In effect, we are now completing the liquidation of the public housing program which began last year.

Under existing law, under a decision of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Public Housing Authority can proceed to the construction of 35,000 housing units. I certainly hope and trust that the Public Housing Authority will not go back on its agreements with the various municipal housing authorities but will continue to respect its commitments, and that that number of units will be constructed.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee, dominated and controlled, of course, by the Republicans, seek by unreasonable cuts in appropriations to strangle TVA, to "let it die on the vine."

The paralyzing effects of the committee's action is seen in the effort to reduce the appropriations by $38,218,000, and yet at the same time directing the Tennessee Valley Authority to make total expenditures in accordance with the President's budget, with the exception of a $600,000 reduction in the resources development activities.

Of the total corporate funds to be used, instead of appropriations, approximately $37 million, would come out of power proceeds, thus denying to TVA sufficient operating capital. Clearly this is aimed at only one objective, force up rates of TVA on the users of electric power in the TVA area. Of course, the attendant result will be an immediate increase of rates of all private power utilities as soon as the TVA "yardstick" is broken. The amount of $40 million, which the TVA by its budget hopes to reserve for possible emergencies and contingencies which may arise in connection with the TVA program, is not large, for the operation of a power system with a capital investment of over a billion dollars, and whose gross revenues for the years 1954 and 1955 is expected to be approximately $335 million, and whose direct expenditures estimated to be above $260 million.

Without adequate working capital, no business could long operate profitably. Normal business operations require fast adjustments to frequent changes in operating conditions, cash must be in hand to meet contingencies and to grasp opportunities. The world's largest automobile manufacturer maintains liquid assets ranging up to $312 million, or 8 percent of the total assets. The world's largest steel company has had liquid assets of $322 million or 11 percent of total assets, and the world's largest chemical company has had liquid assets of $266 million or 15 percent of total assets. In the electric utility field, the Detroit Edison Co. has found it desirable to have liquid assets of about 9 percent of its total assets, the Arkansas Power & Light Co.'s liquid assets have exceeded 8 percent of total assets, and up to 10 percent of the assets of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. have been in liquid form.

The drastic action of the House Appropriations Committee would reduce the working capital of TVA power program to only $3 million, less than one-half of 1 percent of total power assets. No private power utility would think of attempting to operate on such low percentage of working capital. What is the purpose of this drastic action on the part of the Appropriations Committee? It is apparent that the end sought is not more efficient operation of TVA, because not even TVA's worst enemy can charge inefficiency. This, in my judgment, is a deliberate effort to hamper and hamstring the TVA in carrying out the basic act of TVA, and is aimed to bring about an upward trend in all utility rates.

The bill, as reported by the Appropriations Committee, and as presented to the Rules Committee, had, contrary to the rules of Congress, several items of legislation, all of which would have been greatly injurious to TVA. Thanks to the action of the Rules Committee in not granting a rule waiving points of order on these legislative riders, we have been able to eliminate from this bill these drastic provisions relating to interest and resale rates. But the subcommittee shows its hand and its feeling with reference to TVA, by incorporating these legislative riders in the bill. What are they, and what will they do to TVA?

The bill requires TVA each year to pay interest upon the investment in the TVA power system derived from appropriations, including construction in progress, or from transfers of property by other agencies. The interest rate is to be the Government's average interest cost on the public debt. The interest requirement is to be superimposed upon the existing requirements under the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, for the amortization of the appropriation financed investment in power facilities. This requirement is wrong in principle, subversive of good management and sound business, and deprives consumers in the Tennessee Valley area of the assurance of adequate electric service.

Even though referred to as a requirement for payment of interest, actually the payments would be in the nature of dividends. TVA is wholly owned by the Federal Government, all of its earnings belong to the United States, and any payments—other than for the return of capital, for which provision is already made in the 1948 act—are really dividends, whatever they may be called. Charging interest might be appropriate if the owner of TVA was content with the role of creditor and exercised some of the prerogatives of ownership. But TVA is under continuous congressional supervision, and congressional control is frequently exercised in ways having substantial effect upon costs.

In any well managed organization, dividends are paid when earnings are available in excess of those required for the successful and profitable operation of the enterprise including such working capital and contingency reserves as prudent operation of the particular business requires. The effect of the bill, therefore, is not merely to attempt to legislate a level of profits but also to require those profits to be paid each year irrespective of fluctuations in business conditions, earnings, or of the requirements for the operation of the business.

TVA, like any electric utility company, has a public service obligation which should transcend every other consideration. The continuous availability of an adequate supply of power is essential in our modern economy. Five million people in the TVA area are wholly dependent upon TVA as the source of their power supply. This public service obligation requires large outlays for transmission and substation facilities quite aside from the requirements for generating units which are financed entirely from appropriations. Such outlays should be a first charge upon net revenues.

Paradoxically, the proposal for imposition of a minimum dividend requirement comes at a time when no funds are provided for new starts on electric generating capacity. As a result, TVA would be required in future years to make greater use of its higher cost steam plants than would otherwise be the case with a resultant adverse effect on profits.

It may be noted that the so-called interest requirement stipulates a formula for determining the applicable rate of interest which goes beyond the announced purpose "to repay the taxpayers of the country the amount the taxpayers must pay in interest on the money to finance the TVA power program." The standard is to be the interest cost on the public debt which includes nonmarketable issues, the interest rates on which are entirely arbitrary.

The power supply contract under which TVA sells and locally owned distribution systems by electric power includes an agreement by the distributor as to the rates which the distributor will charge in reselling the power to the ultimate consumer. This provision is included in the TVA contract in order to

carry out the stated objective of the TVA Act that the benefits of the Federal investment in TVA's power system shall be spread as widely as possible in the area in which TVA operates. The basic act directs that TVA projects be considered primarily as for the benefit of the people of the section as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom the power can economically be made available, and that sales to industry be a secondary purpose. Section 10 of the act specifically provides for the inclusion of resale rate schedules in power contracts. The effect of the proposal of the Appropriations Committee is both to amend the act and to defeat its purpose.

The committee report, in the single sentence devoted to this matter, says merely that the committee does not believe it is good policy for the TVA to interfere in the business of municipalities and local units of government. This assumes that the Federal Government has no interest in the level of rates charged the ultimate consumers for power produced at Government projects. It implies also that the people of the area regard resale rate agreements as interference. Neither of these implications are true.

The broad purpose of the TVA-power program is to promote the prosperity of the Tennessee Valley region. Without such a contract provision the benefits of the Federal investment in the TVA dams and steam plants might never reach the people or help to build a stronger and more prosperous economy.

Without such agreements each local community would be subjected to great pressures both to divert the benefits of the TVA-power program to some limited group or interests and to compete with every other community in the region and elsewhere for industrial customers by making discriminatory rate concessions either to industries as a class or to specific industrial customers. Such concessions would be at the expense of small consumers, householders, farmers, and small-business men. If even a few of the 148 distributors should be forced to yield to such pressures the others would be under almost irresistible compulsion to do the same.

Every State in which TVA sells large amounts of power has adopted legislation specifically authorizing municipalities, cooperatives, or both, to enter into contracts containing resale rate schedules. The establishment of the prevailing rates to consumers by an agreement with TVA is a part of the public policy of the valley States. The distributors and consumers of TVA power far from regarding such rate schedules as an interference consider it a necessary and stabilizing feature of the power supply arrangements of the Tennessee Valley area.

The power consumers of the whole country have a stake in the committee's proposal. The resale rate schedules have established a national pattern for increased consumption, higher load factors, and lower unit costs of generation and distribution. It is the universal opinion that the force of the example in the Tennessee Valley area has stimulated the utilities to increase their load building activities and to reduce their unit costs, with the result that electric rates in the Nation have not followed the inflationary spiral to nearly the same extent as other commodity prices, while at the same time electric company profits have been maintained and increased. The destruction of the TVA example would invite the electric utilities to abandon the progressive principles of operation which they are now beginning to put into practice.

Adoption of this proposal would deal a great blow to the small consumer of the Tennessee Valley area. He has been encouraged to increase his use of electricity to twice the national average because of his faith in the stability of the electric rate structure in the area. If Congress should set aside the resale rate provisions, there would be an immediate impact upon his willingness to purchase new appliances as well as his willingness or ability to continue to use those which he has already purchased.

In the face of the general satisfaction in the area with the prevailing method of establishing resale rates and the regional and national interest in preserving such rates, it is difficult to see any valid reason for the committee's prohibition with respect to resale rate schedules, and the committee report suggests none.

The committee would deny any appropriated funds for resource development and place a ceiling of $600,000 on corporate funds used for resource development. Last year the committee recommended complete elimination of this program. At that time TVA said:

> While this reduction in money represents only about 1 percent of the total amount approved, the action of the House, if sustained by the Senate, would destroy TVA's effectiveness as a regional development agency. * * * The activities eliminated by the action of the House establish an essential link between river control operations and the institutions and people of the Tennessee Valley—between engineering works and the people for whose use such works are built. * * * The methods by which these activities are carried on encourage State and local institutions to accept increasing responsibility for comprehensive work in regional development. * * * We are convinced that this furtherance of State and local activity in the resource development field is the key to lasting accomplishment in regional development.

Our conviction as to the worth of this program and its contribution to the effective development of the Tennessee Valley's resources has not changed.

This is not a new program; its methods have been thoroughly tested, and they have been productive in the past. Nor is it an expanding activity; it is the remainder of a program which required about $4 million of funds as late as 1947. Expenditures in the program since 1947 consistently have declined as State and local agencies have gained strength. But the timing of Federal assistance is critical, and a ceiling of $600,000 will, for all practical purposes cause the disappearance of this program as an effective instrument in the region. It will force the premature abandonment of partly completed experiments which are important not only to the region but for the Nation.

The repudiation by the House committee of TVA's resource-development program contradicts national policies which are receiving increasing endorsement and acceptance. It will set backward the development of adequate State and local resource programs in the region, it will terminate a small watershed program of great promise, and it will destroy the only Federal forestry program which emphasizes the potentialities of private ownership, rather than Federal ownership of forest land. As examples of TVA resource development, we believe that both the watershed program and forestry activities are worthy of the committee's reconsideration.

It is not the time to abandon the only well-established experiments and demonstrations in tributary watershed development in a region where farm income, erosion control, and rural depopulation are still serious problems, during a year when a State has first indicated that it will start such a program. Only 2 months ago the governor of one of the valley States wrote TVA:

> We are now prepared to assume a leading part in the rendering of technical and professional advice and assistance to local groups in such localized (watershed programs). * * * We will necessarily need to continue to look to TVA for substantial assistance in making such a program a success.

So far as is known this is the first time in the Nation that a State government has undertaken to set up its own watershed program; its initiative should be encouraged.

It makes no sense to abandon the TVA forestry program at this time. In a region in which 82 percent of the forest lands are privately owned, where useful forest growth could be trebled, at a time when large-scale wood-using industry is experimenting with plant location in the valley, activities directed toward reforestation, forest protection, and better forest management are of critical importance. As a Federal program directed exclusively toward assisting improvement of privately owned lands, which does not depend on Federal ownership, TVA's record is well known. To capitalize on past efforts, this program must be allowed to run its course rather than being brought now to an untimely end.

TVA is a boon and a blessing not only to the people of our area but to all America. It has been and is the strong right arm of our Nation in time of peril, a great and dynamic force for the development of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, no one has heard me criticize TVA or the people of the great State of Tennessee in this Chamber or elsewhere. All down through the years they have been loyal, patriotic, industrious, and courageous. I know of no greater people in the United States. May I add that one of the things that made them great is the fact that at one time they were citizens of the great State of North Caro-

lina. We were sorry to lose them. We would like to have them back.

I am not trying to do anything to TVA. I have taken the position simply that TVA is now a full-grown giant engaged in the business of distributing power—the biggest power system in the United States.

My attitude toward TVA is that of an indulgent parent that asks himself when his son reaches voting age, has a family, a booming business, and bank account, yet still comes back home for a big handout: "Won't that boy ever make his way by himself?"

I would say to TVA, "Since you have received $1¾ billion from the Public Treasury of the United States, and since you are the biggest power system in the United States with an income from the sale of power of more than $200 million per year, you ought to be able to finance your own future operations."

With respect to whether there will be a shortage several years hence, let me remind the committee of this fact, one that I pointed out last Monday: TVA this year is obtaining from 11 to 12 percent of all the power it distributes from private power companies operating around the periphery of the Tennessee Valley area. The record will show that three of those companies have proposed to furnish TVA all of the additional power TVA will need in 1957—at what kind of rate? At a rate which will be approved by the Federal Power Commission. What could be fairer than that?

Many speeches have been made on this floor, this year and last year, claiming that TVA is entitled to most of the credit for bringing electricity to the rural people of the Tennessee Valley.

I would not take away any credit from TVA that it deserves, but I think some of the proponents of expansion for TVA are giving that organization more credit than it is entitled to for development of rural electrification in the Tennessee Valley.

I invite their attention to the following facts with respect to rural electrification in the great State of North Carolina. Most of the people in our State are proud of the development of this program to bring electricity to the rural areas in our State. I am certainly a supporter of REA and expect to continue to advocate and support the expansion of that program. But listen to these facts:

On January 1, 1954, there were 154,000 farm family consumers of cooperative electricity in North Carolina. They represented some 600,000 individuals, and in addition, some 14,000 organizations such as churches, schools, rural stores, and rural industries were likewise being served to bring the total of connected consumers up to 168,000.

Nearly 40,000 miles of electric line has been erected to serve these consumers of the 300 million kilowatt-hours of power which they used in 1953. This power was used to operate 126,000 refrigerators, 120,000 washing machines, 50,000 water systems, 51,000 electric ranges, 33,000 water heaters, and 21,000 home freezers. In addition, many items of farm equipment were being operated by electricity. It is estimated that the consumers of this power in North Carolina have already invested over $200 million in electric appliances and equipment.

Today more than 94 percent of rural North Carolinians have electricity.

The REA organizations in North Carolina, of which there are 32, have accomplished these results by using $71 million in construction loans. They have repaid nearly $10 million of these loans and about $5 million in interest. All of them are either up to date or up to schedule in making principal and interest payments.

May I add, in conclusion, that all of this has been accomplished without any help from TVA and without any grants or subsidies from the Federal Government. The Federal Government has advanced money for the construction that was necessary in the program, but the consumers of REA electricity in North Carolina are repaying the borrowed money plus interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise because of the suggestion made by my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] that if the atomic plant needed more power it would certainly get it but that the consumers in the Tennessee Valley who are now getting power would then lose it. I submit to my friend, if those companies are to lose that power, I would like to read the names of a few of those companies who are presently benefiting from the low cost power and our subsidies in the Tennessee Valley. Tennessee Eastman Corp., the Knox Forstmann Co., the Bemberg Rayon Co., Atlas Powder Co., Monsanto Chemical Co., Du Pont, National Carbon, B. F. Goodrich, Armour, Firestone, Continental Can, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if the choice is between appropriating more taxpayers' money in order to provide these companies with low cost power or between requiring those companies to buy their power from private utilities at rates which private utilities can afford to sell, then the choice is easy for us.

The question of appropriating more and more federally collected tax money for expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been argued on this floor and in committee rooms of the House many, many times in the past.

On most of those occasions the arguments have been pro and con on the theory of Government or publicly owned power versus privately owned power.

I prefer to leave the theory of the question for argument by those better qualified than I am to debate them. I would like to talk about another phase of this problem which is of prime importance to me as a Representative from Ohio, particularly from the Eleventh District of Ohio.

And I am sure that what I say is of equal importance to the gentlemen from Michigan, from Pennsylvania, from California, New York, all of the New England States, Illinois, Indiana, Texas— in fact I am sure of the importance of this to all the gentlemen from all of the States except perhaps Tennessee, itself, and to those from some districts of a half dozen other States which fall within the area of direct influence of TVA.

I want to discuss jobs—and I mean the jobs of the average American workingmen. I want to discuss the living standards of those workingmen and of their wives and children. I want to keep in mind the investments in homes and towns that those workingmen have made, and which we are duty bound to protect. I think about the taxes that those same workingmen have paid and are paying now, and about the taxes that they and their children will have to continue to pay as far into the future as any of us now can foresee.

I am concerned about the jobs, the taxes, and the living standards of the average American when I think about the TVA, and particularly so when I think about this Congress appropriating more money for one particular phase of TVA—I mean the appropriation of more money for the building of enormous, expensive coal-fired electric generating plants to make electricity with coal in the Tennessee Valley.

I am distressed and puzzled when I think of this Congress appropriating tax money collected from people across the entire country to build coal-operated electric plants in one locality, to build up that locality in such a fashion as to reduce opportunity for the workingmen of all other localities—the other localities being the principal source from which these same tax moneys were derived.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has today—and I am quoting His Excellency, the Governor of Tennessee—"a hydroelectric generating capacity of 3,291,435 kilowatts and 1,836,550 kilowatts of steam power."

That means that today more than one-third of the total power output of TVA is coal-generated. It means that some 35 to 36 percent of the generating capacity has nothing at all to do with dams or waterpower, but simply comes from coal-burning powerplants such as are built and operated throughout our land with the exception of those places where natural or manmade water impounding has made waterpower possible.

That means that Congress, in the past, has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for building steam generating plants and transmission lines to benefit one area of our country and to help that area to outstrip in industrial growth and in job opportunities other areas which are just as deserving and which should be given at least an equal opportunity with Tennessee.

I believe that the people of this country were in sympathy with that Congress of years ago which created the TVA, since the purposes of that creation, as we know and as most of the people know, were threefold:

First, to prevent disastrous flooding of the great Tennessee Valley; second, to improve navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries; and third, incidentally, to make use of such waterpower as the flood control and navigational improvements might make possible.

That is what the original congressional authorization provided.

But what do we have now?

We have an enormous Government-financed, Government-owned, and tax-subsidized power producer, tremendously enlarged by the type of generating plants that could as well be built in any part of the country, actively and insidiously engaged in wooing industry—and incidentally workingmen's jobs—away from every other part of the country to the Tennessee Valley Authority area.

Every city and town in Tennessee that has a chamber of commerce, or a board of trade, or an industrial council, or any kind of a committee for industrial expansion has become a militant TVA salesman to all industry—and I mean big industry and big business. These cities and towns are working in every way possible to get industry and business to Tennessee—either to move plants there from other localities, or to influence them to locate their plants there when expansion or enlargement programs are undertaken.

Now this program of selling TVA by the towns and cities of Tennessee is understandable, and from their viewpoint at least, extremely commendable. But what are the special inducements most generally offered by chamber of commerce salesmen of TVA areas? Certainly the great State of Tennessee has many advantages to offer, but there are two that seem to be going hand in hand, more and more. These two advantages are cheap power and cheap labor.

I have here a very fine example of what I am talking about. This happens to be the creation of the Governor's Industrial Council, Department of Conservation—and please note that "conservation"—of Nashville, Tenn.

I would like you to notice that in summing up the advantages of Tennessee as a haven for industry, this very excellent sales brochure has this to say:

> Because of central location, low-cost power, waterway access to gulf ports, available raw materials, ample loyal labor, etc., etc., possibly Tennessee is the place for your plant.

In the name of justice, is it not enough that the people of the rest of the country provide Tennessee with navigable streams, waterpower, flood control, and natural resources conservation, without also building coal-operated powerplants to enable them to sell cheap power to industry to do economic injury to the rest of the Nation?

Just about a year ago, out in Indiana, the town of Madison believed for a time that its natural advantages, plus its progressive citizens, its supply of excellent labor, and other progressive steps by the city itself had earned for it the location there of a sizable aluminum-producing plant. But what happened? This industry needed a great supply of power, since enormous amounts of electrical energy are used in reduction of aluminum ores. The plant, and the jobs, went to the TVA area because of cheap power.

Now I am in favor of cheap power, or cheap automobiles, or cheap porterhouse steak for all of the people. I am in favor of low-cost electricity for homes and factories. But I also am in favor of having electric bills paid by those who use the electricity, and that is not the case for the fortunate folks who live in the TVA area, or for those industries which have plants there.

I want to quote once more the Governor of Tennessee, Mr. Frank G. Clement, who, in a letter to the President of the United States, wrote proudly that—

> The average domestic (electric) consumer in the (TVA) region uses approximately twice as much electricity as the average for the entire Nation, and pays only half as much per kilowatt-hour.

That is all very fine for the average domestic consumer in Tennessee, but what the good governor did not say, is that the average domestic consumer of electricity in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, California and all of the other States pay in taxes for that other half of the Tennessee folks' electric bills.

I have no argument against the flood control, the navigational improvements, the hydroelectric features, or the conservation developments of TVA, but I do have plenty of argument with the idea of subsidizing one section of the country with tax money collected in the rest of the country. It becomes a form of economic self-destruction that we as Congressmen are wrongfully forcing our people to accept.

I cannot understand how our great labor unions can stand quietly by and see this Government-financed program of industry pirating, this shifting of jobs to cheap labor areas, go unchallenged by them.

I say that the people of the States most of us represent, pay the taxes that make TVA advantages possible for the people of Tennessee.

I maintain that if Tennessee is entitled to tax money to build coal-operated powerplants to serve industry at rates that amount to about one-half what industry could provide for itself, then the rest of the country is entitled to that kind of treatment, too.

But, if the other 47 States were to have public-power developments authorized by Congress that would be equal in each State to just the coal-operated power development in Tennessee—and in light of the TVA development why should they not?—we might as well put the Government in charge of all power production and let private enterprise die in that field.

If such a thing were done, however, our additional tax burden, together with our loss of tax revenue would be so staggering that even the most avid public-power exponent would tremble at the prospect.

Some of our past Congresses have sold the workingmen of my State down the Tennessee River.

And for the benefit of you gentlemen who sit on the other side, politically, I might add that these are a few of the concerns to which in the past you have voted taxpayers' subsidies in the form of tax-financed low-cost power:

Tennessee Eastman Corp., Knox Porcelain Co., Bemberg Rayon Co., Atlas Powder Co., Monsanto Chemical, E. I. du Pont, National Carbon, B. F. Goodrich, Armour, Firestone, Continental Can, General Motors.

If further expansion of power facilities is desired in Tennessee—more power to that area—but let the resource and initiative of its own citizens, not of the rest of the country, put it there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, you know it makes me feel kind of bad to have to oppose this amendment, especially since my favorite candidate for Democratic nominee for Senator from Tennessee is on the other side. I hate to oppose him because I hope if they have to have a Democrat from Tennessee that it will be Pat. But just the same I want to make 2 observations, and 2 only, in order to record my opposition to the entire idea. This is a practical demonstration of the fact that when once you enter into a policy of socialism, there is no end. Once you start, and once the camel's nose is in the tent, then you are continually met with the argument that having started, you must not stop. I remember well when this idea was sold to us as a waterpower project. Now it is to be almost entirely a steampower project. So, my second point is that we are probably the easiest fooled people in the world. I am in opposition to the entire idea of the Federal Government subsidizing a certain section of the country. Public power is nothing but raw socialism. I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, and also to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andrews amendment.

The TVA officials told the President, and the Bureau of the Budget, that they needed $85 million with which to start new steam plants, at New Johnsonville, at Gallatin, at Fulton, and at John Sevier, Tenn., in order to be able to meet the rising power needs of the Tennessee Valley. Under present conditions a shortage is expected in 1957.

The TVA is a utility serving the power needs of a large area. It is owned by the Government of the United States. We must give it an opportunity to make good. TVA has no statutory authority, as I understand it, to go to the bank and borrow money. Since TVA is owned by the Government of the United States, it must annually come to the Congress of the United States for funds with which to construct new facilities to meet the growing power needs of the area it serves.

So, in a sense, every Member of Congress is a member of the board of directors of the largest power generating concern in the entire world. In order

to have electric generating capacity, when it is needed, the generators, in this case the steam plants, must be constructed in advance. The new steam plants must be placed on the line when they are needed if TVA customers are not to suffer.

There has been considerable talk outside the record, and I believe some mentioned in the debate here that there is very great reason to believe that before long the Government will have to call on TVA to furnish additional new thousands of kilowatts of electric power for the Atomic Energy Commission. The record is plain that by 1957, if there are no new calls by the Atomic Energy Commission, there will be a power shortage in the Tennessee Valley.

If TVA were a privately owned utility, there is no question but that its board of directors would sit down and anticipate future needs and gear its construction program to meet those needs.

The very worst thing we can do to TVA is to cripple its operations and thereby diminish its value. If allowed to operate as any well-managed power generating and distributing utility would operate, TVA bids fair, within a reasonable time, to pay back to the Treasury of the United States every nickel that has been invested in it, and at the end of the payback period, the Government will own TVA as a valuable national asset. I understand that TVA has been diligent to repay to the Treasury the amounts which it has been called upon to repay and, as a matter of fact, it is $13 million ahead of schedule. If allowed to operate next year, without crippling restrictions, it will probably pay to the Treasury of the United States another $40 or $50 million.

The question is not whether you are for public or private power. We all recognize that there is ample room in our economy for the effective and efficient operation of TVA and of the private power companies. As a matter of fact, if America continues to grow and if our defense needs continue to expand, then all our power resources, both TVA and the privately owned companies will be challenged to produce all the power possible.

In the long run, we will not help private power companies by destroying TVA. We should continue to encourage TVA and the privately owned power companies to work effectively to serve the needs of a growing economy.

I am aware of the problems, the cross-currents, the conflicts of opinion with reference to public and private power. A part of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, in Cullman, Franklin, and Winston Counties, is served by power from TVA. Other sections of the Seventh Congressional District are served by rural electric co-ops, draw their power from private power sources. In Walker County, my home, a private power company owns and operates the largest privately owned steam generating plant in the entire Southeast. Each of these power units, TVA, REA Co-ops, and privately owned power companies should be encouraged to do the best job possible.

I am for the Andrews amendment to give TVA the money to start the steam plants which it needs. If the Andrews amendment is voted down, I will vote for an amendment to raise the appropriation for TVA for the next fiscal year from $103 million to the $142 million recommended by the President's budget. To me the cut of the appropriation from $142 million to $103 million is indefensible. That cut has the effect of depriving TVA of the operating capital it needs.

TVA in the fiscal year 1955 will be burning coal at the rate of 15 million tons a year. Its coal costs, including those of transportation, will run in the neighborhood of $75 million a year, or at the rate of $6,250,000 per month. For TVA to stockpile coal for 90 days advance use, would cost nearly $19 million. It is wrong to deprive TVA of its operating capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] that it should be borne in mind that the industrial rate charged by TVA, and the industrial rate charged by private power is substantially the same.

Mr. EVINS. Yes, and it should also be pointed out that the TVA under the authority of the act has no power to borrow money, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio. The TVA must come each year to the Congress for its appropriations for operating funds.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. JONES of Alabama and Mr. RAINS was given to Mr. EVINS.)

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Referring to the list of companies read by the gentleman from Ohio a moment ago, is it not a fact that in time of emergency these companies will be totally engaged in manufacturing defense materials?

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct; they were manufacturing armament and materials for defense.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I presume then, if we had another conflict, they would turn to the production of armaments and implements for waging war, and consequently would be the beneficiaries of such a national defense program.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Mr. Chairman, what we have witnessed here, it seems to me, is a very shortsighted and narrow point of view with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I like very much the statement of the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when he made, what I term, a statesmanlike speech referring to the great national defense importance of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its tremendous contribution to the welfare of the entire Nation, and especially to the security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we are beginning to become accustomed to the attacks of our colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], who are the most ardent foes of the TVA both in and out of Congress.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] a few years ago, it will be recalled, stated that literally hundreds of industries were lured down South into the TVA area, but he mentioned in his speech only one instance; he said hundreds, yet when he got down to stating cases he referred to only one industry. I took occasion to took into the facts of the situation of one industry cited and found that it had located in the Tennessee Valley in 1930. The TVA Act was not passed until 1933, and TVA power was not available to this particular county for more than 6 years later. So that industry cited as having been lured into the valley because of the availability of power had been located in the area more than 9 years prior to the time when TVA power was available in that area; and, of course, my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] has already demonstrated that the Alcoa plant was located in the Tennessee Valley prior to the passage of the TVA Act.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note the observations and remarks made by our very genial friend, the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, on independent offices, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for whom I have a very high regard. The gentleman from California stated when he referred to TVA that the Committee on Appropriations has neither the intention nor the desire to destroy the TVA. Those are very nice words, but expressed in such a negative fashion. Instead of saying that TVA is a great agency of our Government, a great national asset, a great agency for the welfare and the defense of our country, instead of praising the TVA, he starts out with a negative proposition, apologizing, if you please, for the action of the committee, I assume.

Mr. Chairman, I think a very important factor to be taken into consideration in connection with the operation of TVA is the money that TVA has returned into the United States Treasury. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a statement obtained from official sources of the Tennessee Valley Authority itself showing the amount of repayments into the Treasury of funds from the power operations of TVA. Beginning with 1945, the TVA provides a return on funds appropriated from power purposes, not for navigation and flood control, but on funds appropriated from power purposes into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, TVA turned into the Treasury in 1945, $12,597,743.81; and similar amounts each year; in 1946, $10,336,264.01; in 1947, $3 million, roughly; in 1948, $5 million; in 1949, $4,174,482; in 1950, $3 million; 1951, $15,047,127.61; in 1953, $22 million in round figures making a total of funds turned into the Treasury from the sale of power by the TVA since 1945 of $79,598,165.57.

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

Mr. EVINS. Let me finish this statement and I will be glad to yield.

In addition to the revenue turned in by TVA on its power operations it has also redeemed bonds sold to the Treasury and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation over the years in a total amount of $36,072,500.

The total amount of payments into the Treasury on both these accounts—power proceeds and redemption of bonds—totals up to $115,670,665.57.

In other words, the Tennessee Valley Authority has repaid into the Treasury of the United States in excess of $115 million; and in addition the TVA is a great national asset still owned by all the people of these United States.

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee know—and I state it as a fact—that for the fiscal year 1955 the sum of $50 million is projected to be paid into the Treasury by TVA.

Mr. EVINS. Yes, that is my information and as the gentleman knows the TVA is paying into the Treasury annually large sums of money. The TVA is a highly successful and going operation.

Yet there are those who want to snipe at the TVA—throttle it and kill it. To those who protest that they do not have in mind killing TVA, I can only reply by paraphrasing Shakespeare, who said something about protesting too much.

It is difficult to reconcile actions of the Congress in voting billions of dollars for foreign aid and foreign relief and yet deny the reasonable and modest requests for capital investment and improvement of a great asset of our Government—the TVA—that benefits not only the South, but the Nation as a whole.

We may recall that recently President Eisenhower prevailed upon former president of the American Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Eric Johnston, to make a visit to the Middle East with a view of building friends for our Government. The President requested Mr. Johnston to report back his recommendations on what course of action our Government could take to help the people in that area of the world. Mr. Johnston's report, upon his return, as many of us recall, recommended the building of a series of five hydroelectric power dams on the ancient Jordan River. He indicated that such a program would do more toward helping the people in that area of the world than any other action which our Government might take.

In other words, build a TVA on the Jordan River. What inconsistency—an administration that favors a TVA in the Middle East, but denies to the TVA in our own country adequate funds for its normal growth and development—all in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment under consideration proposes to restore to the TVA budget $85 million for beginning construction of eight additional steam-generating units—badly needed by the facility to supply future power needs of the area—for normal growth and demands and for national defense.

I for one cannot see why anyone would want to vote to cripple and impede the normal growth of a great section of our country and take a chance on impairing the national defense and security of our country.

I urge my colleagues to join the friends of TVA in supporting this amendment.

This additional power which these funds would provide is needed. It is greatly needed. A case has been fully made out—both before the Budget Bureau and the Committee on Appropriations that considered the TVA request.

The estimates of the best experts and authorities are all that during the next 3 years some additional 600,000 kilowatts of power will be needed and required by the Atomic Energy Commission at Paducah, Ky., and 200,000 additional kilowatts at the Oak Ridge plant has been recently requested.

All agree that these additional power requirements will be called for by the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, it has not been the expectation of any of us, following the President's own display of casualness toward TVA, that the great Appropriations Committee would deal generously and adequately with this agency in fiscal matters.

We Members of Congress who are certainly accustomed to an annual fight to preserve the TVA have not been under any delusion in the matter.

We expected the fight to be more demanding this year than in any year since the TVA was created. And the reason is simple.

For the first time since TVA was built into one of the greatest economic boons this country had ever known, the private power lobby is riding the crest of the wave and, in a congenial atmosphere, is dispensing its propaganda under the most favorable conditions possible.

So what have we been given to consider this year? We have been handed a bill which reduces the appropriation for the TVA to its lowest level.

The bill, in effect, directs that we, the Congress of the United States, increase the power bill of the people of the TVA region of the country by a minimum of approximately $30 million a year. This is what the enemies of TVA are proposing in recommending an interest rate charge on TVA power funds.

We are being asked also to surrender all thoughts of future economic expansion and progress— to stop all proposed expansion dead in its tracks.

We are being asked to sanction a virtual dimout of the great TVA region within 3 years.

But more important, Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing something new and something far more critical than a higher electric bill or a dimout of private power requirements.

The present cut in appropriations for TVA suggests that we equivocate with our atomic-energy program and our national security.

Not only has the administration and the Appropriations Committee drastically cut the operating budget of the TVA, but the recommendation is made that the corporate funds be reduced and TVA operations financed from any source other than appropriations.

In addition, the committee has recommended a cut of $12 million for transmission facilities.

Essential improvements and future projects have been reduced $227,000.

Funds have been denied for necessary equipment transportation facilities, and other general operations.

The committee has further recommended a decrease of $25 million in the reserve fund of the TVA. In other words—deny one need, transfer another function, reduce the corporate and reserve funds—the net effect of which is to cripple and weaken the great strength and structure of the TVA by the general process of sniping at its various functions and financial structure—killing by strangulation.

All of these crippling actions demonstrates the extent to which the enemies of TVA and the private power interests will go in their desire and unrelenting efforts to kill the TVA.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will beat back these reactionary efforts.

The Andrews amendment under consideration would restore to the TVA budget the $85 million requested to begin the construction of essential generating units needed.

If there are those who are prejudiced against TVA, I appeal to you not to permit your prejudice to extend to the national defense and security of our country.

All the evidence clearly demonstrates that approximately 50 percent of the power production of TVA is needed for national-defense purposes.

In no other region of the country is as great a proportion of the total power supply being devoted to the national defense.

In the 5-year period beginning with 1951 and ending with 1956, the defense requirements of Federal agencies supplied by the TVA will increase from about 400,000 kilowatts to 3,400,000 kilowatts.

The use of electricity by these agencies which increased from 2,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1951 to 7 billion in 1953, will reach 28½ billion kilowatt-hours in 1956.

By 1956 about one-third of the total system demand and nearly one-half of all the energy generated by the system will be delivered to Federal agencies, primarily for atomic-energy plants.

The pending amendment would insure that the national-defense requirements of TVA for power will be met.

The request for funds for beginning construction of these essential steam-generating units has repeatedly been made and, as indicated, a case in justification has been fully made out.

I strongly urge adoption of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I inquire if the Chair has allowed the gentleman from Tennessee to use the time that was allotted to me and which I yielded to him by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and the other time that was transferred to the gentleman also.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for debate has been fixed, and the Chair cannot entertain such a request.

Mr. EVINS. I have been trying for 2 days to obtain time, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the chairman of the subcommittee, would yield me 1 minute of his time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have but 4 minutes; I am sorry, I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, about 2 weeks ago I gave a talk on atomic-energy development for nuclear power. I pointed out that the day of nuclear-powered electrical generating plants is dawning. There has not been one moment's consideration given to that development today. If this amendment to provide a downpayment of $85 million on some quarter billion of steam plants goes through, these plants may be outmoded by atomic developments before they are even built and the American taxpayer will be stuck with the bill.

The time is at hand when we are going to start taking from the atomic-energy program instead of putting into it.

Blindly voting money for steam electrical-generating plants by floor amendments without fully going into the matter of generating this power in nuclear plants would, in my opinion, be a new height of fiscal irresponsibility and a new low in the execution of our duty to spend the taxpayers' money wisely.

I reiterate my plea that not 1 cent of money be appropriated for this or any other electricity-generation project until full consideration is given to the amazing technological strides being made toward development of electrical energy from nuclear power.

We do not have enough money to be able to squander it on equipment that technical progress is outmoding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is not an attempt to destroy TVA, but to make it right and honest—to let it pay interest upon the money it borrows to build these powerplants.

Here we have a request for $85 million to build new steam plants, and almost every single bit of it is outside of the Tennessee Valley area that they originally had. Every single municipality in that territory can go out and borrow money and build the plants themselves and get just as good service. Then they do what everybody else would do—they would pay interest on the money which they borrowed. Every single power outfit that this Government finances except the TVA pays interest upon the money it gets. Why should they have special privileges? Why should not everybody be treated alike?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in concluding this debate, which is strictly on the amendment to add $85 million to the funds appropriated for the TVA, and has nothing to do with anything else, I start by saying to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] I do not see any reason why I cannot say the things he wanted me to say about the TVA having given a very fine service. The question before us is, Where are the limits to be put? If we adopt this proposal to add eight new steam units, then we have gone beyond the requests of the budget; we have gone beyond anything that has been justified before our committee; and, to quote my friend from Tennessee, who has been standing, and to whom I cannot yield at the present time, we have anticipated the thought that perhaps in 60 days there may be a demand. That may be true, but the time is not here yet. There are negotiations going on with private companies beyond the area originally set up for TVA, which is proposed to be served by these eight steam units, to see whether that power can be provided elsewhere.

This is only the downpayment. I think that has been overlooked today. The total cost of these steam units, which have not been requested and have not been justified before the committee, is $227 million. This $85 million is the downpayment on them. It has been pointed out that the TVA presently buys from private power companies 10 percent of its power, and can buy more, and that the rates are under the control of the Federal Power Commission.

As was just pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], we are spending money for the start of a great power reactor which may make it unnecessary to have all of these units in the future. My suggestion briefly is that we vote down the amendment proposing to add $85 million.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have been trying to find out whether this is the program promised by President Eisenhower in his campaign speech at Memphis, Tenn., in October 1952.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have no time—in only 4 minutes—to engage in politics. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is this the program of President Eisenhower?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman well knows the President is not trying to destroy TVA but, in the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], trying to keep it honest.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman said there was no request. That was no request by the Budget?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right. No request by the Budget.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will agree that the Budget in disapproving the request of the agency, based it upon the possible transfer of a load of approximately 600,000 kilowatt-hours to private utilities?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That, and whether TVA needs that amount, which was not fully justified; and, third, the possibilities for the future of other possibilities of power.

I ask for a "no" vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS) there were—ayes 87, noes 139.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. ANDREWS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: Amend by striking on line 25, page 42, the figure "$103,582,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$141,800,000."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I sat here for over 2 days continuously and did not say a word on this bill. My amendment simply does this, in plain and simple language. It restores to this bill the exact amount of money recommended by President Eisenhower and by the Bureau of the Budget. That is all there is to it. The bill provides $103,582,000. My amendment would raise that by $38,218,000.

I think this is important to the United States of America. I am not going to talk about Tennessee. We did not ask the United States to bring TVA to Tennessee. I should like some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to know that. We did not come here begging for TVA. We are not beggars in Tennessee.

This corporation is a more than billion-dollar corporation. It is the biggest power company in the world. That is right. This Congress created it and put out of business every power company in Tennessee. We cannot have lights, we cannot have industrial power without TVA. If this amendment is not adopted, it is my honest-to-goodness opinion, speaking with some little knowledge of business, that TVA cannot operate efficiently.

I have the greatest respect for the distinguished members of this subcommittee. They say there is a carryover of $46 million. That is correct. That is cash. This $38 million cut would take all of that but $8 million. We can figure that in our heads. That would leave TVA $8 million on which to operate. Five million dollars of that is from nonpower sources, such as fertilizer, and some of the plants that run down there. That would leave a little less than $3 million on which to operate this corporation.

I should like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] to hear this. He represents a great coal district, as do I. Next year, in the fiscal year 1955,

beginning on July 1, 1954, the Tennessee Valley Authority will burn 15 million tons of coal. I have been in the coal business myself. Do you realize that just a 60-day stockpile would take over $5 million?

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield briefly, for a question only.

Mr. GAVIN. They may burn 15 million tons of coal, but they are not burning very much Pennsylvania coal. Most of it comes from Kentucky and West Virginia.

Mr. BAKER. Incidentally, southern Illinois is shipping a lot of coal down there, as well as Kentucky and Tennessee.

A 5 percent increase in the price of coal would wipe out TVA's cash. A 5 percent increase in wages, if you please, would more than wipe out that cash. That cannot be answered. A 5 percent increase in wages would mean more than $5 million; that is correct.

The Congress set up this corporation down there. As I said a while ago, we did not come here on bended knees from Tennessee. I was of age when they came there. I was 32 years old; and I wore shoes, incidentally, a little better pair of shoes than I have on now, when they came down there. We did not come here begging for it. The Congress of the United States put it there.

Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to see that this great corporation succeeds. TVA must go on uninterrupted. The Oak Ridge plants use more electricity than the whole State of Texas. If you do not put this money back in, that the Bureau of the Budget so painstakingly and carefully examined for months and recommended to this Congress, TVA cannot operate at maximum efficiency, as President Eisenhower promised it would do, and the whole United States will suffer perilously and dangerously. They are getting half of their electricity there from TVA. You cannot run a billion-dollar corporation on $3 million worth of capital. It just does not make sense.

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

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

Mr. SCHERER. Can they not raise the rates?

Mr. BAKER. I would say yes, but I am not discussing rates.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I hope to be able to do is to relieve the concern in the mind of my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. The Budget Bureau sent down a request for $141 million. The committee has recommended that you vote $103 million. The reduction is exactly $38,218,000. Therefore, on behalf of the committee I will tell you how that reduction was made.

We said that certain of this money should be paid out of the corporate funds. We felt that $12 million for power line extension should properly be charged against the corporate funds and not taken out of the taxpayers' pockets. We said that site improvements, which is a doubtful need at the moment, $152,000 should be paid out of the corporate funds. We said that certainly $125,000 for investigations toward future steam plants could wait until a decision on whether or not those steam plants were to be constructed. We made a total, therefore, to be charged against the corporate funds, if they were needed, of only $12,488,000.

Now I have to account to you for $25,729,500. Of that amount, $729,500 was the only money denied the TVA, $729,000. Of that amount $640,000, or six-sevenths of it, has to do with resource development, which in every other State in the United States is carried on by the States, the chambers of commerce, the counties, or other agencies of government. An equal amount is in the Tennesee Valley budget, less than half, half that was to be paid for by the taxpayers—a year ago we said we were not going to do it again, and the people in the Tennessee Valley came and said that they would add it to the budgets of the States and counties. That leaves only $25 million that I have to account to you for. That was not cut. The TVA like AEC and NACA and other agencies accumulates year after year funds of money that they do not use. They will have next year $309 million in a construction fund to be used, and at the end of that year, the TVA admits they will have left over $46 million—they admit. Therefore, we will know that they will have that much more because any agency would estimate conservatively out of that $46 million we took only $25 million, telling them to use that money which they have already received from the taxpayers for the purposes that they want to spend it. This is not a reduction of $38 million. Even the amount that you discuss as a transfer of reduction is only $13 million, and we say there is only a reduction of $729,500, on part of which they received warning, and an agreement was made last year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER to the amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 42, line 25, after "vehicles" strike out "$141,800,000" and insert "$171,800,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as will be recalled, I have spoken several times in the House of Representatives in support of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and spoke again at some length on February 2 of this year.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House again this session in support of adequate appropriations for TVA and especially the Fulton steam plant.

The budget submitted by President Eisenhower does not provide any funds for the Fulton plant, and does not include any money for any of the new units requested by TVA. The Appropriations Committee has not only failed to include any funds for any of these units, but has reduced the appropriation for TVA below the amount in the budget by about $40 million.

Amendments are being offered in the House to restore this sum, and also to provide the funds for units requested by TVA.

I am offering an amendment in the House to provide funds for the Fulton steam plant.

NECESSITY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE FULTON STEAM PLANT

Eighteen months ago, analyzing the growth in power demand which it would have to meet in 1956, TVA requested the Bureau of the Budget to submit to Congress a request for funds to begin construction on a steam generating plant at Fulton, Tenn., in fiscal 1954. A site at Fulton was selected because it was the point at which the power could be added to the system with the greatest economy and the highest efficiency, taking into consideration the loads of the system, the costs of fuel, of transportation, and of transmission lines. The Fulton plant was included in the budget presented by the outgoing administration, but the revised budget submitted by the new administration eliminated funds for Fulton. Those of us who represent the area tried our best on the floor of the House to add $30 million to begin the Fulton plant to the TVA's budget for fiscal 1954, but we failed. That was last year. We hoped and prayed that the President's budget for this year would permit construction to start as soon as the next fiscal year begins, and that TVA could make up the time lag by an accelerated schedule.

The need for power from the Fulton plant is even more compelling now. Load growth has continued; TVA's estimates of need are justified. I cannot help but recall that in November of 1952 we were promised that TVA would continue to operate at maximum efficiency if the Republican candidate for President were elected. He was chosen. But he has not yet realized that maximum efficiency demands that the Fulton plant be built, and soon. The nearest major generating plant on the TVA system is more than a hundred miles from the principal loads in west Tennessee and north Mississippi, and until the Fulton plant is built these loads can be served only through heavy added investments in transmission lines, a large part of which would be unnecessary if generating capacity were located nearer to the loads. In addition to the waste of money and materials for the transmission lines, the use of such long lines entails large losses of energy and capacity. In the nature of things, service over long transmission lines cannot be as dependable as service from generating stations near the loads.

As a substitute for the capacity to be provided by the Fulton plant the administration has suggested that TVA will be relieved of its obligation to provide 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts to the AEC facilities at Paducah. We understand that negotiations are underway now in the hope that that load can be shifted to private companies and that TVA's capacity can be devoted to the normal load growth of the area. The taxpayer will pay in increased power costs for AEC if such an alternative is selected and even if it is, the Fulton plant will have to be built. There is no question about it. The power users of

the Tennessee Valley will require the energy it will produce. Like every other project on the TVA system the Fulton plant will be a good investment for the Government. Like every other project it will return the money advanced for its construction. Delay is costly. Delay is dangerous. We need the Fulton plant now.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to strongly support the amendment offered by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. There can be no question but that from a sound business point of view these funds for operating purposes are absolutely essential for the operation of this great Government agency.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, when the citizens in the Tennessee Valley area were invited to provide facilities for the distribution of power to be purchased from the newly created Tennessee Valley Authority, it was contemplated that all the power in each community would be supplied by TVA; and each community, therefore, so shaped the distribution system within its area on the assumption that wholesale power would be supplied by the Government in whatever amounts were necessary to meet the needs of the people. Therefore, systems were planned and designed and have developed on the assumption that power would be brought into these communities over transmission facilities owned and operated by Tennessee Valley Authority from TVA's power plants. TVA acquired a steam plant along with Muscle Shoals, and it has been recognized all the while that steam power would be necessary to firm up hydro power in dry years and that if, and when, the river systems with their auxiliary plants were inadequate to supply the total needs of the area that the natural expansion would be brought about by the addition of such steam capacity as would be necessary.

The city of Memphis, therefore, like all other communities, has designed its physical plant and has established its program of business development on the assumption that TVA would generate the power and wholesale the power and that the distributor would retail it to the people—to their homes, and to their commercial and industrial undertakings. The Memphis system has been laid out with no intention of providing steam plants of its own.

The production cost of power from hydro plants owned or controlled by TVA is about 1.15 mills per kilowatt-hour. The production cost in the steam plants owned and operated by TVA is 3.45 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Under the TVA Act, a municipality purchasing power from TVA takes precedence over any load other than Government load. The city of Memphis, therefore, would be foolish to relinquish its pro rata share of hydropower to which it would be entitled under the TVA Act and substitute therefor, in whole or in part, power generated in its own steam-plant.

The city of Memphis can build a steam plant which has the same characteristics and efficiencies that TVA's plant would have if the plant were the same size and operated at the same high level of output which can be obtained in TVA's plants by reason of the fact that they are part of an integrated system. The layman may not know the advantages of an integrated system. It is the reason for the large combination of big plants in a system connected together through a network of transmission lines. Each unit can be as large as the manufacturer can supply. Efficiencies increase with the size of the unit. They can be operated at near capacity, and so long as sufficient spare units are maintained on the system for system overall outages, all units in any plant can ordinarily be operated at close to full capacity.

If, however, the city of Memphis builds its own steam plant, it would have to reduce the size of each unit in the plant to maintain a spare unit in case of trouble. Units being smaller would be less efficient and there would be idle investment in a unit which was operated only as a spare unit. Or, if the plant were built by the city of Memphis and integrated with TVA, immediately the total amount of power produced in the plant would depend upon the operating arrangement with TVA and each member to the contract would seek to operate its facilities at the maximum efficiency.

TVA has attained a degree of efficiency in the production of power that is exceptionally good, and it has done so because of the large units employed and the ability to so handle the load as to get the maximum use of each plant. This advantage would be lost if Memphis and other communities in part supplied their own power and in part purchased power from TVA.

Tremendous quantities of water are necessary in a big steam plant. A steam plant, therefore, should be located on a river or lake, if maximum efficiency is to be obtained. Capacity can be obtained by using a cooling tower or circulating the water, but it is done at a loss of efficiency. Any plant supplying west Tennessee with power must be either on the Tennessee River or the Mississippi River. Likewise, coal can be delivered in tremendous quantities cheaper by barge than it can by rail, and again this makes it requisite that a plant be located either on the Tennessee or Mississippi Rivers. It should be located far enough from a big city to avoid fly ash or sulfur fumes from fouling the atmosphere within the city. It has been stated that Memphis is on the fringe of TVA's system. So, too, are Chattanooga, Bowling Green, Huntsville, and quite a number of communities along the North Carolina border of east Tennessee.

Management of the Memphis utility would be needlessly sacrificing all the advantages of hydropower and all the advantages of a large integrated system.

Therefore, big steam plants using big units, diluted with hydropower, and tied together over a transmission network make for the maximum efficiency and reliability, which means that Memphis cannot afford to build its own plant.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wonder if we can agree on time on this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina, all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes on this amendment; and if it should by chance be rejected, then I shall offer another amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the subcommittee adequately disposed of the principal amendment by calling your attention to the fact that TVA carries over from year to year vast sums of money. In order to nail that down and so the record will be perfectly clear, let me invite your attention to page 2496 of the hearings, where, in response to a request that a table be inserted showing the average monthly bank balances TVA carries, you will see that table. It will show you that TVA during every month last year had a bank balance ranging from $126 million down to $76 million at the lowest point. The position of our subcommittee simply was that with such a healthy bank balance TVA could well afford to absorb $25 million out of that surplus, particularly since the record of TVA itself shows that it will carry a surplus of $46 million into fiscal year 1956.

More than that; right at the edge of the city limits of Memphis, Tenn., a private power company is operating, which last year furnished TVA three-quarters of a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

The record contains an offer from that company to supply TVA with all of the power it needs in that area now and hereafter at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission. If that be so, why should the American taxpayers be required to put up money to build a steam plant to supply power to the Memphis area, at a point on the Mississippi River which is not even within the area originally contemplated by the TVA act?

The original act under which we are operating authorizes TVA to build dams and power installations on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and this proposed plant at Fulton is located 115 miles west of the Tennessee River at the closest point, and is on the Mississippi River.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I wonder if the gentleman will put in the RECORD the name

of the private utility that offered to supply the additional power, if the gentleman has it.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I do not even know the name of the company. It is in the record; the names of all the witnesses are there. I am not acquainted with any of the officials of the company and do not know the name of it.

Mr. PRIEST. It is in the hearings.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Yes.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman is a member of the committee and will state I am sure that no funds for the Fulton steam plant or any new starts would be involved in the amendment I offered.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. That is correct.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Is the gentleman from North Carolina familiar with the recommendation of Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce who was sent to the Middle East by President Eisenhower to construct five dams on the Jordan River, a TVA for the Middle East?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I will oppose any new TVA unless it is required to pay its way, including interest on money advanced by the Government.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if it is the thought now to so expand TVA that we will be building steam plants all over the United States? I think that is the ultimate aim of some of these gentlemen.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I may say also that there is a utility operating right in the backyard of Memphis, Tenn., today with 3 or 4 connections with the TVA system which has offered to furnish all the power TVA needs in that area. There is another power company operating out of Georgia that offered to do the same in the Chattanooga area, and it has connections with TVA right now. Last year this company furnished TVA nearly a half billion kilowatt-hours of power. There is also another company operating up in the northeast section of Tennessee and that company is on record before our committee as offering to furnish TVA any power that it will contract for at a rate to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I would like to say to my friends from Tennessee that they should quit worrying about any shortage of power now or hereafter. There is plenty of power available and more can be supplied to the extent required by TVA.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] is recognized.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague has said, the TVA is a business operation which was set up by Congress; and I want to assure my distinguished friend from Indiana who expressed fear lest the Congress be induced to expand TVA to cover the United States, that if he follows the suggestion of HOWARD BAKER and myself that will not happen. That has never been a part of our program.

The TVA was imposed upon the people of Tennessee as a business organization. Every segment of our economy, our entire being in Tennessee is dependent upon the successful operation of TVA We want to be reasonable about this thing, and I think when the suggestion is made as is embodied in my colleague's amendment that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget be restored which gives the TVA sufficient operating capital with which to conduct a successful operation, that that is a sound proposition.

Some of the figures that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated are provided in this bill to be taken out of the capital can be taken out of the capital, but the result will be that this great utility will be left with less than $3 million operating capital. There is not a utility in the United States that has as small a ratio of operating capital as TVA would have, and I dare say there is not a representative of a private utility who would recommend the depletion of the capital of TVA down to where it would have less than $3 million operating capital.

The gentleman's amendment is a reasonable one. It carries out the suggestion of the President that the TVA be operated to its maximum efficiency for the benefit of the people it serves. That is the purpose of the amendment. His policy cannot be carried out, I feel, if the recommendation of the distinguished subcommittee is adopted in this instance.

The Bureau of the Budget is a hard-boiled operation, it deals in facts and figures, it cannot be accused of padding the report in order to expand TVA beyond its present periphery. This amendment provides for construction which is not recommended by the budget. Its report contains a figure which Mr. Dodge and his associates felt is necessary for the successful operation of the TVA. I appeal to the Members on my side of the aisle to think this thing over soundly, when we are spending billions of dollars to build dams and other public improvements in the various countries of the world. To deny $38 million which the Bureau of the Budget says is necessary for the successful operation of this organization is not commonsense, and I do not believe the membership of the House will approve such a policy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Tennessee Valley section of this bill, and all amendments thereto, close in 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and also to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I want to see this program go forward and not be choked to death.

Mr. Chairman, the Fulton steam plant will not mean anything to the coal area that I represent, but it will mean approximately 2 million tons of coal consumed annually which will be furnished by west Kentucky and southern Illinois.

I am vitally concerned about the general welfare of the coal industry. The plans of TVA are to use coal to generate additional electric power. The chairman of the board, Mr. Gordon Clapp, has furnished me with this information and also stated that the plans were to use coal at the Fulton plant. We all know that the private utilities have benefited considerably from fast tax amortization plans, and there has been no objection that I know about from any Member of the Congress. We are all glad to see the private utilities expand their power units. Their expansion in recent years has been a great help to the coal industry.

There are many reasons why the present facilities of TVA should be expanded but I will not undertake to discuss them. In this atomic age we are all acquainted with the need for more power in this area. I only wish that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] would make a reappraisal of the benefits received from TVA up in his own district and find out just how many General Electric refrigerators and other electrical equipment have been sold throughout the whole Tennessee Valley area. I think we are all well acquainted with the distinguished gentleman from New York, because we are all familiar with his books, especially the book that he wrote concerning eastern Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the plant that has been started at Rogersville. In the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is not adopted, I feel that the coal sales which east Kentucky does benefit from to a limited degree will be stopped. I feel that the completion of that power unit will be halted, and if we are going to choke this program to death we might as well take a big, broad axe and go in and cut the heart out of it by a direct piece of legislation here on the floor.

Few, if any, of us want to do that. The TVA stands a monument to this Nation's greatness and is one of the first projects visited by foreign industrialists and engineers who come here to inspect America's progress. As yet, the district which I represent receives no direct power from TVA, but the plans are to establish a hookup with the REA plant near Winchester, Ky., where surplus power will be exchanged. This plan will be an actuality in the near future unless this administration is successful in its

attempt to starve the REA and the co-ops to death before the powerline can be completed. The benefits of TVA have indirectly been felt in my area as well as every State in the Union. Why do I say that? It is because the TVA has provided a yardstick for the measurement of the cost of producing electricity. This successful project has forced private utilities to give the public better service and cheaper power by the simple method of demonstrating that such service and power can be produced and delivered on a sound businesslike basis. Here we have a proposal to limit the productive capacity of TVA so that the growing power demands of their customers will require them to go to private power producers and purchase enough electricity to supply their regular customers. The action here proposed will immediately destroy the yardstick values of the TVA and if continued through future years will eventually destroy one of the most important economic assets this country has deevloped in the last half century. The question we must answer today is, Shall we support this program or shall we sabotage it by slow strangulation? I agree that I have objected to some things inside the TVA. For example I objected to, a few years ago, and fought vigorously a proposal that TVA use natural gas on an interruptable basis because it was unsound.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, of course, we in the Tennessee Valley are wholeheartedly in favor of this amendment. We know that it is needed. The subcommittee knows that it is needed. The President of the United States of America knew that it was needed. The Bureau of the Budget knew that it was needed. That is the reason why it was recommended to the Congress.

I regret that the subcommittee deleted this amount $38 million. As has been repeatedly said here, for maximum efficiency, it is absolutely necessary that we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I personally endorse the amendment of our colleague and dean of our delegation [Mr. COOPER], which asks for additional funds for the Fulton steam plant. But above all things, Mr. Chairman, if we do not get this additional $38 million that the President requested and the Bureau of the Budget requested, the TVA will be strangled.

I hope that it will not be the policy of those on the other side of the aisle to strangle TVA. I am not going to make the charge that they are trying to kill TVA because I believe that they believe in the President of the United States, their President, their choice, and that they will back him up in his request and the request of the Bureau of the Budget to give us this additional $38 million which is needed to carry forward to maximum efficiency the TVA.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER] is recognized.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate on this bill for 2½ days. It was not my intention to speak on the bill, but I have heard so many charges and countercharges that I felt it was my duty to speak briefly.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] to restore $38,218,000 to the TVA. This is the amount that was recommended by the administration and by the Bureau of the Budget.

I happen to represent the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia, which is on the periphery of the TVA area. I am one of those who believes that there is room in this country for both public and private power. I am proud of the business the private utilities are doing in my district, and I am also proud of the part that the TVA is playing.

It seems to me that it is good, common horsesense to follow the recommendations of the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget. There are many functions of TVA other than power functions which have been of great benefit to my district. Their reforestation program is certainly going to be of great value to us in future years. The resources development program has been of great value, and other phases of their program certainly are going to be of great value to us in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this House should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and then at some future time we can work out the TVA program so that it may be of advantage to all concerned, so that we may reach a meeting point where it will not be as controversial as it has been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

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

Mr. RAINS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have always supported the TVA. I am in favor of this amendment as I was of Mr. ANDREWS' amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for 7 years I have actively supported the TVA and our Congressmen who so ably represent the TVA areas.

I favor the Cooper amendment and the Baker amendment as I did the Andrews amendment and other efforts to assure adequate funds and effective methods for successful operation of TVA.

It is my hope that the House will back up the President and our Democratic leaders in their desire to prevent the adoption of crippling amendments and restore adequate funds for necessary operations.

TVA means a great deal to Alabama and to the Nation. There is no way to estimate the value of this great enterprise during World War II and we must be adequately prepared to prevent world war III through strength.

In the long run, Mr. Chairman, I am confident we will win this battle—not only to protect TVA, but to insure proper support for continued progress and development. Also I am confident that we will get the TVA headquarters located in Alabama where it belongs by law.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments should be passed and I hope the House will see fit to stand up for TVA today.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. RAINS.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. RAINS.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I listened intently as the gentleman from North Carolina spoke and I think I have discovered the reason for the opposition to this particular amendment which the Budget and apparently the President supports.

I have an idea that in the consideration of the proposal to cut the budget request the gentlemen of the subcommittee apparently were tying their kite to that section of the bill which was stricken out on a point of order. In other words, I think it is clear that the subcommittee intended not that the TVA should actually operate with $3 million of operating capital, and that is what the deal is when you break it down, but that you would force by that legislative rider which you lost in the shuffle, the upping of rates in the TVA. Whether or not that is a good thing we are not to discuss today, but I will say this: Why not come along and admit that you cannot operate a billion-dollar corporation, as this is, on a $3 million operating capital? I cannot see how you could reasonably figure otherwise than that the TVA must have more money than the $3 million. So since you lose the rate-increase amendment by virtue of the point of order, why tie further, even beyond what the Budget has asked, the hands of the TVA? I believe that must be logical. I certainly think it is reasonable.

In my own district I have a private utility and TVA, and I have the utmost regard for each of them. They are both doing a grand job. The argument that is being made here on the floor that TVA is stealing the industries, or rather luring them away from other sections, is totally erroneous, because in the areas I represent there is a private power utility and the TVA, we have as many industries that moved into the Alabama Power Co. area as we have that moved into the TVA area.

One other thing, if your amendment to allow cities to raise rates or to handle them were to have prevailed, you would have opened the door for every city in the TVA to move in with a different rate arrangement in an effort to lure industries. It would have worked the other way around.

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

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is it not a fact that we are recognizing the need of private utilities throughout the entire country by giving them tax amortization privileges in order that they may construct new generating facilities?

Mr. RAINS. Of course, there is no doubt about that and I do not think there should be any argument on the floor today about the worthwhileness of each of them. But, the thing I am trying to pinpoint is that here is a budget request made by the President, and here is an amendment offered by a friend of TVA who knows his problems urging that you give them enough working capital with which to operate. It is that plain and it is that simple. Whether we like TVA or not, we, the board of directors of TVA, should at least give them the operating capital to do an efficient job.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of both the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is very much needed. Unless the construction of the steam plant at Fulton, Tenn., near Memphis, is started immediately, the Tennessee Valley area will face a brownout in 1957 because it takes 3 years to build a steam plant and there will be a serious shortage of electric power if this plant is not built. If my friends on the left decide that they will go along with our President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget who denies any new funds for construction of this steam plant and vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], then I certainly hope they will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], which restores the appropriation to the full amount recommended by the President in his budget message to Congress last January. The President, through his Director of the Budget Bureau, recommended to the Congress a total appropriation of new money to the TVA of approximately $142 million. The Committee on Appropriations has reduced this sum down $38 million. I feel sure my friends on the left will support the President and his Director of the Bureau of the Budget and restore this money. We are only asking you to let us operate TVA at maximum efficiency, just as our President promised the people of Tennessee 2 days before the election that he would operate TVA at maximum efficiency, and the statement of the President on the TVA at that time caused the State of Tennessee, which is normally a strong Democratic State, to cast its vote for President Eisenhower by about a 5,000 majority, in my opinion. I sincerely trust that my friends on the majority side will stand by our President and will support his recommendation to Congress that the TVA be given an appropriation of $142 million by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. Will you not give TVA the full appropriation recommended to Congress by President Eisenhower?

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. HIESTAND was given to Mr. COTTON.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. KRUEGER was given to Mr. PHILLIPS.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. MACHROWICZ was given to Mr. ABERNETHY.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, with reference to this situation of Members standing so that time may be allotted to them to speak on amendments, when the time is limited, and then when they are recognized by the Chairman asking unanimous consent that their time be given to another Member, I want to state that I will not object to that procedure today but that hereafter I will object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, like my very dear and beloved friend from Pennsylvania, and incidentally my next door office neighbor during my first term in the Congress—the 78th Congress—Mr. GAVIN, I have been using what time I have had from the Democratic microphone, and like him, I am moving over to use the Republican microphone because I think it is over here where the work needs to be done. Up until now, only 2 or 3 Republicans have voted with us in support of amendments for TVA. We hope more of you will see the error of your ways and join us from here on out.

Full well realizing that another of my dear and beloved friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] may, as a result of my position, again associate me with communism, as he did all of us earlier during the day, that is, those of us who support TVA, I am willing to take that chance, which I shall do without any fear whatsoever.

I rise in support of both of the pending amendments. I should like, however, to particularly direct my remarks to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I think every Member on the Republican side knows full well what the situation is downtown regarding TVA. I do not say that in criticism of anyone just now. I am just stating the facts. I know that the situation is not in keeping with what the commitments were in the campaign 2 years ago, but for the moment that is beside the point.

I think—I am sure—you know what the situation is downtown. To put it plainly, TVA is in bad shape. Now, with that the case, I think you also know that when this budget left the Chief Executive's office and was sent up to the Capitol it had been worked over with a fine-tooth comb. Every single dollar that could be scratched from under TVA was pulled out. We all know that. You on the Republican side certainly know that to be the case. TVA was left with a bare minimum to get along with, assuming that it will get along at all.

You gentlemen know that is what the Bureau of the Budget has done. You know they did not leave a dime in the budget they thought could be dug out. They stripped TVA almost to a state of bare nakedness before this budget was sent up here. It is crippled already. Now this committee wants to wreck it.

A few days ago we sat on this floor and listened to the distinguished majority leader appeal to those of us who live in the southern section of the United States to support the tax bill. He called our attention to the fact that the Chief Executive received a terrific vote in that section of the country because of his popularity and because of his program. So, he appealed to us to stand by the President, whom many of our people supported. He asked us to support the tax bill because the President wanted it.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. In just a moment.

Now, the President has sent down to the majority leader and to the Members on the Republican side a program for TVA. It is not much of a program, far from what he promised, but nevertheless it is what he has asked for, what he wants. Now, I wonder if the majority leader is going to do on this occasion what he asked the House to do on the tax bill, that is, support the President.

I yield now to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Would you approve of my doing what you did the other day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I took my position the other day. I made it clear. I was consistent then and I am consistent now. I am asking the gentleman if he is going to stand today on his position of a few days ago.

Mr. HALLECK. I answered it with a question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, I am asking you a question. You answer mine. Are you going to take the same position that you took a few days ago, or are you going to take away from TVA $38 million of its operating capital, which your President says it should have, which I think you know and which I think everyone in this House knows that without which TVA will be seriously crippled during the fiscal year 1955 and which is another step toward choking it to death? Will not some of you Republicans stand up and vote with us just once on TVA?

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

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent Mr. BYRD yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY])

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in support of the original amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and the amendment to the amendment offered by his colleague from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. Chairman, I think it is reasonable to assume that not a single ton of the coal that would be consumed in these steam plants will be mined in the State of West Virginia. That is due to the fact that the railroads transporting our coal run east and west, and there is no possibility of its being transported to Tennessee for that purpose. I am in

favor of it because the coal industry is flat on its back, due to the importing of residual fuel oils.

We have lost 38 million tons of production of coal. I am for anything that will stabilize the coal industry by furnishing additional markets for the coal in Tennessee or in any other State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate pro and con it became evident that the two objectives of this subcommittee were, first, we will force the TVA to use approximately $25 million of their reserve for operating purposes in the hope that they can put the project in the red as an excuse for doing away with it.

Their other objective was to force up the rate so they would not be in competition with private industry.

If the gentlemen on the majority side over here want to weigh any problem I would suggest that they weigh the problem whether they are going to give lip service to their candidate for President in the last campaign, or whether they are going to render service to the people who furnished their campaign contributions.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, not for a question but in support of what the gentleman has been saying?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I have made an investigation and find that 3 private power companies in the Tennessee Valley area usually require about 3 percent of the value of their plant for operating contingencies. On such a basis—3 percent of the value of its properties—TVA would require about $27 million instead of the two or three million that will be left under the committee's proposal.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the information; and let me add that I will vote for any appropriation that will bring any stabilization to the coal industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to Mr. TABER.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this resolves itself not into a question of whether anyone is for TVA or against TVA or trying to abuse TVA; it does not even resolve itself into a question of whether or not the action of the President in connection with this setup has been in its favor or against it. I would be willing to discuss that question with anybody.

But here is the picture that presents itself from a dollars and cents standpoint, and I have been sorry to see so much misinformation given out. On the first of July next if this $103 million is appropriated the TVA will have in cash to operate $309 million; and according to their own story and taking out what they themselves propose to spend, at the end of the fiscal year 1955, they would have left at least $46 million and perhaps a great deal more; instead of there being $3 million left there would be $46 million. That is almost twice the $27 million it was said they might need as a proper operating fund and for financing the business they have in mind.

Under those circumstances the committee can see why the Appropriations Committee did not feel that it was necessary to provide the budget estimate. Even with the cut they will have the $46 million left at the end of the fiscal year, and I do not see why we should try to add to that.

The other amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] would simply provide for one of those great big steam plants way off from the regular seat of operations and not within the regular range.

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

Mr. TABER. I cannot at this time. That is something we passed on when we voted on the first amendment that was offered. I do not see why we should consider that again.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago I tried to discuss the necessity for additional power in Tennessee, basing it on the amount that was required by the Atomic Energy Commission. As you have already heard time and time again, 50 percent of the power generated by the TVA system will have to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission. If it were not for the installations for national defense in Tennessee we would not have to ask for additional power; but you all know that we have to do that now. We have to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Arnold engineering base and Alcoa, those great institutions that have done so much for our country during times of emergency. You put them there. They are constructed there and were built for national defense. You may say that TVA and the Tennessee Valley are the areas that benefit, but these other installations benefit everyone.

In the budget that is presented at this time the President has asked you to appropriate $141 million for the purpose of carrying on efficiently that construction down there in Tennessee that has done so much. I want to urge you to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], as well as the one offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Several times during this session of Congress the statement has been made that we on this side ought to go along with the President's program. Almost all of us have done so, even when conditions at times were such that as individuals we might have preferred to vote otherwise on particular items. We did go along because we thought we ought to support a total program of which these items were essential parts. I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee for introducing his amendment to restore the amount to what the President asked for TVA. This is not a waste of money. The budget has already been pared to the bone, and it seems to me the only fair and right thing for us to do on this issue, as in any other similar issue, is to support the President's program unless there is some deep difference of conviction based on principle or conscience. That is not involved in this case. I hope the gentleman's amendment will prevail.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman very much.

In the brief period of time at my disposal, I would like to make one other observation. The distinguished chairman of the full committee said there would be $300 million left of operating revenue. They will burn 15 million tons of coal. The average price down there now—it is low—is around $3.60 a ton, the average freight rate about $1.40, which is a total of $5 a ton. There goes $75 million of the operating revenue for coal alone, not counting any wages, not counting new construction, not counting on any construction.

The last point I would like to make is Oak Ridge and Alcoa.

Fifty percent of the power will be going to Oak Ridge, the atomic bomb plant, and other defense industries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a situation in which I think really we ought to take a lying down rest and sight right through the beam in order to try to determine where we are going, and I think that is exactly what the Bureau of the Budget under the direction of the President has done in this case. I am one who feels that the President was in earnest when he said he was in favor of operating the TVA at maximum efficiency for the benefit of the people whom it is intended to serve. I have defended that position in the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere. In making that statement, he did not infer that he intended or was in favor of extending the periphery of the TVA into new and widely scattered areas, but he did, with great emphasis, say to the people that he was in favor of operating this utility at maximum efficiency for the benefit of the people whom it is intended to serve. You cannot operate the utility if its operating capital is reduced below a safe minimum, and no one, I think, will stand here and say that less than $3 million is sufficient operating capital for an organization of this magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and if that is defeated, I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. It happens that he is my Congressman. I went down to his district one time. I

have 150 or 200 cousins there, and they thought by coming down there that I could beat the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and elect a Democrat. But, the district went as usual, and he has my very kindest regards and best wishes.

Mr. Chairman, there has grown up in this House a system that I tried to get somebody to object to when I was occupying the chair, but never did it. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not fair to the other Members of the House in time and all this, that, and the other, for Members to get up and claim time on an amendment for the sole purpose of yielding to someone else. Unless I change my mind hereafter, I am going to object to that kind of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted me to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some sentiments expressed on this floor this afternoon that have surprised me. Certainly it was contrary to my understanding of the responsibility of a Member of Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations. I thought when we came to Congress and took our respective oaths of office and were assigned to a committee, we were supposed to do the very best we could, following the dictates of our own conscience. I have great respect for the Bureau of the Budget. I think the Director and his staff are doing an excellent job. But even the Bureau of the Budget needs to be checked, or else we would just accept what the Bureau of the Budget thinks, and appropriate the money recommended by it. There would be no reason for an Appropriations Committee.

At least that is not my concept. The Budget Bureau has its function, and we have ours. I am merely undertaking to discharge my own responsibility and, I may say, following my own conscience.

Now let me point out that on page A-12 of the report of the TVA for 1953 a very interesting item appears. We discovered this in our committee. We have been told here this afternoon and yesterday and the day before about a prospective power shortage in Tennessee and about how the people are only with difficulty getting enough power to supply their homes and their factories and their shops and so forth. With that sort of a situation in mind, do you not think it is rather strange that TVA should have to spend about half a million dollars a year promoting the sale of power in the Tennessee Valley area? Referring to the balance sheet for 1953, the record shows that they spent $418,112 on promotion of the sale of power last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. JONAS of North Carolina.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I must remind the members of the committee that this is not the only point in the TVA budget where economies can be practiced.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Does the gentleman know that the declared purpose of the TVA specifically is that power shall be made available to the people for the widest possible use; that the declared purpose shall be to bring power to the people in the rural sections?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. The gentleman told us in the debate this year and last year, that 92 percent of all the people in Tennessee already have power. Therefore I see no reason for TVA to spend a half million a year persuading people to buy more.

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

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I yield to my distinguished and dear friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Does not my very dear friend recall that during the war there were carried on advertising campaigns by businesses that were engaged in war work exclusively, in behalf of the civilian products that were going to be manufactured subsequently?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Surely, But if it is said that the people are having difficulty getting power in Tennessee, I do not see any reason why TVA should have to spend half a million dollars of the taxpayers' money to promote the sale of power there, when they could apply that money to these other purposes.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I am glad to yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman from North Carolina clarify the figure of the contingency fund that TVA will have during the next fiscal year under the committee's recommendation?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Yes; and I thank the gentleman for asking me the question. I wanted to speak to that point, anyway. Several members of the committee this afternoon have made the statement that if this cut stands, the cut that our committee made, TVA will be reduced in operating capital to $3 million. That is just not in accordance with the facts.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has pointed out already, TVA will start off the new fiscal year with $309 million in the bank. Against that they will have several hundred million dollars of commitments. During the year TVA will take in from the sale of power alone over $200 million. All we have done is to say that out of that income of more than $200 million—in fact, it will be $227 million—they can well absorb $12,488,500 to repair transmission lines, do site improvement work, investigate future projects, and pay one-half of general facilities. Twenty-five million dollars is all we have undertaken to charge against the reserve. The rest of the cut is intended to come out of income.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken a single moment either yesterday, the day before, or today, on this question of TVA. One reason is that everybody knows that I am a "damyankee" and I suspect that perhaps I have talked enough about it in other years.

However, may I say to my very dear friends from the Tennessee Valley section, for whom I have high regard, that we are not unfriendly to TVA. Many of us in my section of this country are proud of TVA. I went down there myself with a subcommittee not along ago. No American can travel through that valley and see the workings of this great institution and not be proud of it. I want to say to them, however, that TVA needs friends. It needs the friendship of other sections of this country and, do you know, it is awfully hard for some of us to go back home and sell TVA to our people. Why? Let us be sensible. There are certain things they know. They know that they are borrowing money and paying interest on it to give it or lend it to TVA without interest. They know that the people of the Tennessee Valley are getting cheap electricity when our people are paying higher prices for it.

It is of no use for you to wrap the flag about you and say, "Oh, that is because we are furnishing power for the atomic bomb and for national defense." Raise your rates. Raise your rates to the Government agencies that are buying power for Government and defense purposes, and my people will pay their share willingly and gladly.

They know that power has been used lavishly in the Tennessee Valley, even to heat people's homes. It is no use to tell my folks, "This is all right because when it is all over you people are going to own an interest in this wonderful institution." You might just as well tell them they are going to own an interest in the White House, which they do, but they cannot live in it. They own an interest in TVA, but it does not light their houses, it does not run their plants.

It is no use to tell them that the Congress imposed TVA on the Tennessee Valley and then made it bloom like a garden. No, we cannot go home with that story. Now let me tell you another thing. It is not going to help TVA when we go home and tell our people that when this committee suggested to the House that the time had come for TVA to pay just the interest that the Government is paying on the money we lent TVA, our good friends rose to a man and said "No," and invoked the rules of the House, to stop it. These facts are self-evident and

they will not win goodwill for TVA. I say to my friends from the Southland, you are taking a poor way to "win friends and influence people," and I repeat TVA needs friends.

I want to suggest to you that we do want to see TVA prosper but we want to see it prosper on its own. It is a great plant. It can borrow its money, it can expand as any other utility does. It can charge reasonable rates.

One gentleman said, "If the price of coal should go up 5 percent we will not have working capital." You can increase your rates 5 percent and have ample working capital.

I want to go home and tell my people that TVA has at last come to the place where it is going to stand on its own feet and not keep coming back for more and more new money for them to pay interest on.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman on the very fine statement that he has made. I want to say to him and to my colleagues that the situation here today reminds me of that old saying out in Indiana, which involves us here who are from other sections of the country, that our friends from Tennessee should not ride a good horse to death.

Mr. COTTON. Exactly, and I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Is it your judgment that the basic TVA Act would have to be amended if rates were to be substantially increased because the basic TVA Act, when written, contemplated no profits and low-cost power and so states? I ask that question very seriously.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think the basic act, when passed, contemplated the great development of steam plants to the point where 50 percent or more of the power is now being generated by steam plants.

Mr. COTTON. I would also say to my friend that the reasonable working capital which he has been asking for here so convincingly is a part of the business operation and could hardly be regarded as profits. TVA can get its working capital from its customers instead of demanding it from the taxpayers of the entire Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing this debate on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I appeal to the House to sustain your committee and vote "no" on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. Our committee has tried to be fair to TVA but also to the rest of the United States. Someone has said the Tennessee River is unique in that it flows through 7 States and drains 48. That is hardly fair to TVA but it will be well for TVA as well as the whole country if it ceases to be a drain on other sections and stands on its own feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKER) there were—ayes 118, noes 158.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BAKER and Mr. PHILLIPS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including contract stenographic reporting services and not to exceed $45,000 for travel expenses, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment further on the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, who is the chairman of the Small Business Committee, in defense of the Small Business Administration and its able Administrator, Wendell B. Barnes, in response to remarks by members concerning the disbursement of loans.

Anyone familiar with banking and business operations knows that no prudent businessman takes down money until he needs it. Until such time it is pointless to incur interest charges. To my way of thinking, this would indicate that the number of loans disbursed by the Small Business Administration is not necessarily of consequence in determining whether that agency is doing a good job, since the time between the issuance of the loan authorization and disbursement ordinarily is within the control of the borrower, or at least not within the control of the Small Business Administration. I think that the agency's record will bear out the truth of my remarks. As of March 28, SBA authorized 150 loans totaling in excess of $8,900,000. Of these, 58 were direct loans totaling approximately $3,167,000, and 92 were bank-participation loans totaling approximately $5,762,000. I am happy to see that the greater number of loans by far have been made in participation with banks, for this is the best indication that banks are actively participating in and supporting SBA's lending program.

After the agency issues its formal loan authorization which prescribes the terms and conditions of the loan necessary to protect the Government's interest, and which are standard conditions which any prudent lender would require for term loans, the burden is then on the borrower and its counsel to meet the requirements contained in the loan authorization. This means that the loan can be closed when the borrower and its counsel are ready to close the loan. In the case of bank participation loans, bank attorneys close the loan, and in neither case is the time interval between the issuance of the final authorization and the closing or disbursement within the control of SBA. I also point out that this time interval is not always decisive, as I have noted, since in some cases, as in loans involving construction, no SBA disbursement is made prior to the completion of the project. In other cases the prudent borrower does not take down the loans and begin paying interest until actually needed. Thus in most cases the lapse of time between the issuance of the authorization and the first disbursement is a matter beyond the control of SBA.

SBA offers no competition with banks, since by statute each loan applicant is required to show that the loan is not available from the customary sources of private credit. In this connection I should point out that since most of the loans have been deferred participation loans, the banks have advanced the funds for such loans and the Government funds committed are not likely to be withdrawn from the Treasury. Further, the agency is empowered by statute to sell loans and the policy has been adopted that "seasoned" loans will be sold either to participating banks, which have options to purchase at any time under their agreements with the agency, or to other banks or financial institutions.

As the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee pointed out yesterday, the agency did not commence their lending program until October 1953. There was a very good reason for this. By statute the RFC was empowered to continue its lending functions, including the power to make small business loans, until September 28. Until the RFC ceased its lending activities, there was no point in having a complete duplication in the small loan field by SBA. I am happy to report that the agency is taking vigorous action to speed up the processing of loan applications but without impairing the Government's interest. At present, I am told that there are 1,000 loan applications "in the pipeline," representing a total of approximately $66 million.

You must also remember that the 525 employees of SBA are performing functions formerly performed by 2,300 persons—487 employees of the Small Defense Plants Administration and about 1,800 RFC employees who were engaged in business loan activities.

I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee for his insertion in yesterday's RECORD of the article on small business from the April issue of Nation's Business. I earnestly commend the careful reading of this article, which is an excellent study on the subject of small business today, to each of you. It proves that SBA programs are effectively geared to the principal problems facing small business, and I am confident that as the

agency gains experience it will render even greater service to the small firms of our country.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to move the previous question on this item we are discussing, the Tax Court item, and close debate on it after the gentleman from West Virginia has finished.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at that time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent to return to page 42.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. I have no intention of offering an amendment; I am not asking this privilege for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object, but if the gentleman wishes to speak out of order I will not object to his speaking out of order.

Mr. BAILEY. For the benefit of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Chairman, may I advise him that I am speaking to material in this bill on page 42 and not out of order.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the gentleman's privilege.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked unanimous consent to return to this section of the pending bill not for the purpose of offering an amendment but in order that I might make some pointed observations.

We are concerned here with the United States Tariff Commission and the administration of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

My colleagues will recall that on Tuesday we received a special message from President Eisenhower on proposed changes in our trade policies. It would appear from the contents of the message that the gentleman who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has swallowed the Randall Commission's report hook, line, and sinker.

I do not want to pose as a prophet, but it is my considered opinion that the Randall Commission's report is as dead as the proverbial door knob. The proposals submitted indicate a shockingly limited knowledge of a program that is laying waste vast sections of our own economy.

May I point to just one of numerous incidents where our trade policy, which the administration wants to further expand by added authority to lower import duties, has laid waste a once-prosperous industrial area by disrupting State and local economies and bringing more than 100,000 men, women, and children to the necessity of begging for "handouts" from Federal surplus foods.

Imports of residual fuel oil from Venezuela, of glass, pottery, and clothespins from Europe are rapidly destroying our basic industries, and in face of this great calamity they propose to further devastate sections of America in order to carry out the wishes of No. 10 Downing Street in London and our own State Department.

If this star-gazing idea of more trade and less aid is not halted now, it will not be long until anyone who has the temerity to suggest that we buy the products from our own farms and from our own factories will be branded as communistic.

Mr. Chairman, just to give you a little idea of how this program is being operated, let me call your attention to an incident that occurred in the glass industry.

In August 1953 the glass industry applied to the Tariff Commission under the "escape clause" to prove injury on certain categories of glassware that were being imported into this country. Now, get this history, please. In late September, after receiving this case in August, the Commission divided 3 to 3 and decided to certify the case to the President. They did not certify the case until late in November, some 6 weeks after making their own decision. There was furnished through the State Department to every country in which we have diplomatic representatives the details of that decision so that they could flood the President's office with objections on the thought that he might approve the lowering of some of the tariff schedules. Less than 10 days ago, Mr. Chairman, I called the Tariff Commission, and they said the President had asked them for additional information on which to make his decision. He asked them for that last November. To date the Tariff Commission has not furnished the President of the United States the additional information he asked. That situation is inexcusable.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

General operating expenses: For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; purchase of 15 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $6,000 for newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $2,690,000 for expenses of travel of employees; and not to exceed $43,700 for preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including purchase or rental of equipment; $163,922,300: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 15 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read to the House the following interesting editorial from this morning's issue of the New York Times:

CONGRESS AND PUBLIC HOUSING

To those who have seen at firsthand the fine accomplishments wrought in our large cities by slum-clearance public housing it is discouraging to see the opposition, even to the point of animus voiced against such housing in Congress, and especially in the House. One would expect House Members, being close to the people, to be aware of the importance of clean, decent housing in strengthening our democracy, in creating more wholesome conditions in which to rear children, in improving the moral climate. One would expect the House membership to be more sympathetic toward people of low income struggling to live with some dignity.

The large cities, and especially New York, are a special problem in housing. High land costs and other handicaps make home ownership out of the question for thousands of families. The House won't be helping these families, in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, by encouraging private enterprise on a $7,000 house. Nor can these families build little cottages for themselves after supper and on weekends, as so many do-it-yourself families do, all over the country, and more power to them.

We, in the large cities, are fighting a tough battle against slums, and in New York it seems at times to be a losing battle. Our New York problem is intensified by migration from the South and from Puerto Rico, and we do our best to make a home for new arrivals, as this gateway city has always done. A good argument could be made for special Federal aid, simply because New York is a focal point of such migration.

There is a city problem, just as there is a farm problem. One big city problem is the overcrowded, unwholesome slum, and we cannot believe that the Republicans will be so foolish politically, so short-sighted democratically, so lacking in human feeling as to abandon, or virtually destroy, public housing as a policy, this year, next year, or in the foreseeable future. Private enterprise cannot build at a rental these people can pay. A housing program that ignored these low-income families, and discriminated against the critical needs of the large cities, would be a bitter disappointment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note that in the appropriation bills coming to the floor of the House during the present Congress there is a trend toward reduction of Government spending.

This is a welcome trend after so many years of increased spending year by year.

Federal taxation is approaching the confiscatory stage. Because of this I have joined with other Members in organized efforts to cut down Federal spending and to reduce budget requests.

Last year those of us who worked for economy succeeded in cutting appropriations approximately $13 billion, and in the year before $8½ billion.

I felt that greater reductions could have been made, and tried to make them. But those of us working for Government spending reductions did not have enough votes to make deeper cuts.

It is obvious that we cannot have real tax relief until deeper cuts are made in Federal spending. I believe that at least $3 billion could be cut from the President's requested appropriations this year. I hope that such reductions will be made. I intend to vote for them as the various appropriation bills come up for action.

I have many times pointed out that there is ample room for spending reductions in many departments of Government. As an illustration of how Government spending has been pyramiding throughout the years, in 1935 there were 5,906 employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, one of the Federal agencies. By 1950, just 15 years later, the number of

employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs had jumped to 13,565, more than double. At that time, there were in the entire United States and Alaska only 421,600 Indians, including Eskimos. Why Eskimos should be counted as Indians, I do not know, but they were. But, with Eskimos included, there was 1 Federal employee for every 31 Indians.

I have been disappointed that the present administration has not exerted stronger efforts to reduce unnecessary spending. I think our foreign spending program could be reduced much more than the President has recommended. I hope that it will be so reduced. The last 6 months' report of the Mutual Security Administration recites such things as the spending of American tax money to rehabilitate India's railroad system. Twenty-five million dollars of a special fund of $57½ million was allocated for purchase of steel for India. Another $20 million to help finance the purchase of 100 new locomotives and 5,000 new freight cars in India.

Other millions were spent to buy fertilizer for India and to expand India's Sindri fertilizer plant, which is said to be the largest fertilizer plant in Asia.

Other millions have been spent for farming implements and agricultural machinery, and for drilling irrigation wells in India's farming areas. Our planners have set up a program of digging 2,000 deep irrigation wells in India, one on each 200 acres of farm land. Although we took this money out of the bill 2 years ago, the spenders have put it back again, and are trying to get Congress to appropriate tax money for this and similar expensive projects.

India is only one of many countries where this kind of unjustifiable spending is being carried on with American taxpayers' money, while Germany, our late enemy, has given tax relief to individuals up to 25 percent; Holland has given tax relief to her citizens; so has Canada, Great Britain, France, Israel, and Australia.

For my part I have for some years been trying to get the rest of the world off the backs of the American taxpayers, and I hope that this year the foreign spending program will be cut, not just a token cut, but real and substantial reductions, enough to bring relief to American taxpayers.

Sometimes the best way to stop extravagance is to cut off the money for the spenders, and I think that tax reductions in some of the tax bills will have a deterring effect on those who are planning the spending of taxpayers' money.

In my opinion, the disease calls for a drastic remedy. Since it is evident that the spenders in the Government are not going to voluntarily reduce that spending, Congress ought to cut off the money and apply pressure in that way to force cuts in spending.

I see no good reason why our Government should continue to scatter American taxpayers' money all over the face of the earth in amounts up to $6½ billion per annum, which was the figure for last year, and continue to tell the people at home they can have no relief. All these countries which I have named as giving tax relief to their citizens are getting money from the United States, taken from the pockets of these American taxpayers, to whom tax relief continues to be denied.

Not only can spending be cut abroad, it can also be cut here at home. In considering the independent offices appropriation bill which is before the House today for action, some startling testimony has been presented to the House which was brought out in the hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. R. F. Keller, an assistant to the Comptroller General, testified before that subcommittee on January 13 of this year that his investigation showed that a group of buildings in Philadelphia, Pa., then under lease to the Air Force, at a cost of $215,000 a year, had never been used by the Air Force. His statement said that the leasing decision had been made by Air Materiel Command of Dayton, Ohio, over the strong protests of the intended users that the facilities were not suitable and could not be used. He said the Air Force has since canceled the lease, but not before rental and maintenance costs totaling some $251,000 were incurred.

A witness from the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States in his testimony before the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee on that same day exposed the extravagance of a general who built a dog run and kennel with taxpayers' money. The testimony regarding that was as follows:

> The request for the work shows it was considered "in the best interest of the Government for security purposes." The construction consisted of a kennel, which was used to house a number of expensive dogs owned by the general, and a 90 by 60 fence-enclosed dog run. A wooden floor was installed in the kennel so the dogs would not lie on the bare earth. The cost charged to appropriated funds was about $1,200. The fence was later removed at a cost of $157.82, when, only 5 months after his arrival, the commanding general was replaced as post commander.
>
> While a small item of waste and extravagance, it is but typical of the myriad of such matters arising in our inspection.

The Comptroller General also on that day exposed in his testimony a transaction which is typical of the conduct of many people who spend Government money—that is, if they have any money left over on the last day of the fiscal year, they spend it for something, whether it is needed or not. They simply cannot bear to turn back any unspent money into the Federal Treasury. This transaction was a purchase of a million and a half dollars' worth of wire fencing on the last day of the fiscal year 1951 by the Air Force. This testimony was given by Mr. William L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations in the General Accounting Office, and is found on pages 360 to 364 of the testimony. The following is some of the testimony exposing this wasteful transaction:

> There is no doubt at all that fencing was bought in the last few days of the fiscal year when money was discovered to be available.
>
> After great effort justification was found for about 250,000 feet of fence, so the fence was ordered, but not 250,000 feet. What was ordered was 750,000 feet, or enough to stretch from here to Philadelphia.
>
> These pictures I have here, I showed them to Mr. KRUEGER, show that the fence is not a little barbed-wire fence, but a big 9-foot security fence which eventually may be very necessary. In fact I said if the Air Force had to throw away the money, at least they bought something they could keep for use in later years.
>
> Mr. PHILLIPS. You could keep it, if it is not allowed to lie around out in the weather.
>
> Mr. ELLIS. Some of it is still in the weather. They are hoping to get projects by this month to work up places where it can sometime be used, according to this letter. It was bought 2½ years ago. * * * One shipment of fencing went to the Elmira Airbase in New York. It got there ready to be delivered. The only trouble was there wasn't any such base. There never has been and there isn't today. * * *
>
> Mr. ELLIS. Most of it is still there now, at 27 different bases around this country. Piles of it. I wish you gentlemen had time to look at these pictures. It is incredible. The piles are bigger than this room, a pile, as big as a house, of fencing at 27 different bases in this country. Roughly, maybe a third has been used.
>
> What the Secretary now says is that by this month they will have firm plans for using it. They did use some of it on a swimming pool, nurseries to keep the babies from getting where they weren't supposed to be, 9-foot fencing.

This is just a part of much testimony showing that it is possible for economy to be practiced, for wasteful spending to be stopped, as a result of which substantial relief can be given to the American taxpayer.

It is not true that rigid economy is being practiced throughout our Government. On the contrary, instance after instance of wasteful spending, of complete disregard of the taxpayers' burdens, and of inexcusable extravagance, have been disclosed.

It is the duty of this Congress to appropriate only such funds as are needed to carry on the legitimate and necessary functions of government. The time to perform this duty is when the bills are before us for consideration, such as the bill we are now passing upon.

While we in Congress cannot fire any generals or colonels in the armed services, we can hold the appropriations down to sums that are actually needed for our military security, and it is our duty and obligation to do that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to obtain some information from the chairman of the subcommittee. Early this year I inserted in the daily RECORD a series of articles written by a reporter of a New York newspaper in which it was charged that veterans who needed outpatient psychiatric care were having difficult in obtaining it. It was pointed out that there were some veterans who were able to work at their profession or trade by going to the doctor in the evenings and getting psychiatric care. At that time it was indicated that the Director of the Budget had impounded $3 million, part of which was subsequently returned, so that the patients were having trouble obtaining this outpatient care, and when they came to the Veterans' office they were not told the truth that there were not sufficient funds but were told that their condition had so

improved they did not need this psychiatric care. I see in the present bill before us that the outpatient care appropriation this year is $76,744,000 as against ninety-two-million-odd dollars last year or a reduction of $16 million.

Now, the question I would like to have the answer to is this: Does this reduction in the amount of the appropriation mean that there will be a curtailment or elimination of the outpatient psychiatric care for these veterans? If it does mean that, then it might be possible that the veteran would be unable to hold his job, and I think that would be shortsighted economy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is talking on a subject of very great interest to the subcommittee. The reduction in money against last year's figure, is not in the type of cases to which the gentleman refers. We have gone further than that, and we have taken away the barrier, so that the money can be used for whichever category the patient needs. It is in the neuropsychiatric field that we have the greatest difficulty. We have not had the hospitals, we have not had the psychiatrists. I can only say that the Veterans' Administration is anxiously working toward doing something in that field to meet the situation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. What I wanted to find out specifically was, there are many veterans getting this care outside the Veterans' Administration. They went to private doctors who gave that care to them after business hours.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is, outpatient care.

Mr. DOLLINGER. That is correct. Is there anything in this program or in this appropriation which will make it impossible for them to get psychiatric treatment by going to a doctor in the evening?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Because the article I referred to indicated clearly that they could not get the care; that they were not told the truth that funds were not available and so the necessary treatment was unavailable.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is nothing in the bill of that nature. We gave them the total amount requested.

Mr. DOLLINGER. And I can treat that as an assurance that they can get all the outside care that is necessary?

Mr. PHILLIPS. From the standpoint of this committee. If the case arises again, I hope the gentleman will bring it to our attention.

Mr. DOLLINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that amendments to any section of the bill not yet read be in order at any place.

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

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would points of order still be in order against the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This does not have any effect on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order will be disposed of before amendments are offered.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against the language on page 47, line 11 through line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the language referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for out-patient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within one year after discharge or by July 27, 1954, whichever is later: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct out-patient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SUTTON. The point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It changes existing law. It is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAHAM). The Chair is prepared to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, this is legislation upon an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have another point of order with reference to the language on page 49, line 17, through line 18, on page 50. I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill and changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the language referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That under any contract between a State, or any political subdivision of a State, and the Veterans' Administration providing for the furnishing of instruction in a course of institutional on-farm or other training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended), liability authorized by this section by reason of payments of subsistence allowance which were illegal because of failure of the veteran or the course to comply with the applicable statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements shall not be applied to the contracting State, or political subdivision, unless the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, after investigation, finds that an employee or representative of such State, or political subdivision, conspired with the veteran by, or was guilty of fraud or gross negligence in, falsely reporting to the Veterans' Administration that the veteran was in a proper course of training, failing to report unauthorized or excessive absences from, or interruption or discontinuance of, his course of training, or not discovering the failure of the veteran to comply with the applicable statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements and not promptly terminating the course of training of the veteran. The provisions of this proviso shall be effective as of July 13, 1950, but shall not require repayment of any funds heretofore properly recovered by agreement of the parties to any such contract, and shall not be applicable to any other liabilities or agreements pursuant to such contract.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAHAM). This is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order with respect to the language on page 59, from the proviso in line 9 down to and including line 17, as being legislation on an appropriation bill and that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read the language referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized and directed prior to the conclusion of any sale of a mortgage at a discount to a financial institution to offer the mortgage to the mortgagor at the same discount, and that an offer shall be considered properly made when addressed by registered letter to the mortgagor, who may tender the purchase price, less discount, to the Federal National Mortgage Association within 2 weeks from date of receipt of such offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, Mr. Chairman. We concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAHAM). In the opinion of the Chair, this is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in substitution for that language.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further points of order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Is my amendment to the language that was just stricken from the appropriation bill in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying to dispose of all points of order before considering amendments. If there are no further points of order, the gentleman's amendment will be considered. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 59, line 9, after "$150,000" insert "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation or fund in this act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with any sale of mortgages owned by the Association at a price less than the par value thereof."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make certain that FNMA does not sell any of the mortgages in its portfolio at a figure less than par. Last year, when the appropriation bill was brought to the floor,

it included a provision in the bill authorizing the Administrator of FNMA to sell mortgages at a discount, within his discretion. At the time I objected, and that language was stricken from the bill. I called it a banker's bonus bill, which is exactly what it was as subsequent events disclosed.

The Housing Act that followed our appropriation bill contained the language stricken from the appropriation bill. It authorized the Administrator of FNMA to sell mortgages at a discount, and pursuant to that order the Administrator of FNMA last July offered for sale one-half billion dollars' of VA and FHA mortgages at discounts varying from 4 points for 4 percent mortgages to 2¼ points for 4½ percent mortgages.

As a result, good mortgages, mortgages worth par were sold at a loss to the taxpayers of this country of approximately $15 million. That same possibility exists today. At the present time the Administrator of FNMA can sell any of its motgages at any discount he thinks proper.

These mortgages are valuable assets of the people of the United States. They are as much resources of our people as our natural resources. The taxpayers of our country have spent their good money to buy the mortgages. Why should they now be sold at a loss? And only a privileged few were given the opportunity to board the gravy train, only qualified houses.

It will be argued that the sale at a discount was necessary in order to make room for new mortgages. Is it good, sound business to sell seasoned mortgages, mortgages that have stood the test of time, for new mortgages of unknown quality?

It will be argued further that the discount was necessary to make operative the 1-for-1 plan. The testimony before our committee, as shown by the hearings, would seem to brand the plan a failure. In the first place, there was no requirement that purchasers of the discounted mortgages be required to substitute a new mortgage of at least equal value. Secondly, as of the date of our hearings the amount of new mortgages FNMA had committed itself for was only $32,804,000. This is certainly a paltry sum to justify the sale of assets worth $500 million.

This was an agency that was making money for the taxpayers. Is it not less than discreet for it to sell mortgages at a discount, if that is so? And it was so.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that during the year 1953 the Federal National Mortgage Association made approximately $33 million for the Treasury of the United States. During fiscal 1952 it made approximately $29 million in profit for the taxpayers of the United States. Each of the years FNMA has operated, it made a profit.

The purpose of my amendment is to protect valuable assets of the Government, to make sure that FNMA does not sell any more mortgages at a price less than par.

Incidentally, under FNMA rules, the mortgages that were sold could be sold only to qualified institutions, to mortgage houses, to the big financial institutions of the country. A veteran who had signed one of those mortgages that was sold at a discount could not get that same discount from FNMA. The mortgage company could buy it for 4 points off the par value, but the veteran who was liable on the mortgage could not pay off his mortgage by offering the same sum of money. Is that fair treatment? The reason for the amendment in the appropriations bill was to make sure that a veteran who was liable on one of these mortgages could get the same deal as a mortgage house. When the point of order struck the language, it struck equal rights for the veterans at the same time.

I think my amendment is entirely in order. In view of the ruling of the Chair striking the language from the bill, I submit that FNMA should not sell these mortgages at any kind of discount. The only time it has ever done it in the entire history of FNMA was last year, and it cost the Government $15 million on the mortgages sold.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that debate may be limited to the 10 minutes which will have been consumed when I finish speaking on this amendment only.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, let me show you the difficulty of attempting to legislate upon a technical matter out of a clear sky.

The gentleman from Michigan by a point of order struck out the provision the committee had put in which stated that if a veteran had a mortgage and if the mortgage was to be resold at a discount, the mortgagor, the man who owed the money, should be given a period of perhaps 10 days or 2 weeks in which he should have a chance to buy it back. I think to a large extent it was a gesture, but it was a gesture that a few people here and there might have taken advantage of.

That was struck out, and we have no criticism of the motion. The provision was subject to a point of order.

Now the gentleman from Illinois asks that we put in a regulation prohibiting the Federal National Mortgage Association from selling at less than the par value. FNMA has bought many of these mortgages at a discount. We are asked to tell FNMA how to handle its business. We are going to say, "You cannot discount it even though you bought it at a discount, and sell it at a profit."

FNMA has made a profit from the very beginning by reason of a flexibility in handling these mortgages and being able to say to a bank, "We will sell you this mortgage at a discount and, in the future, if you have mortgages you have to place, we will take those mortgages on a 2-to-1 basis."

My recommendation is that we do not go into something which is so technical and which certainly should not be decided in a few minutes on the floor. Therefore, with no disparagement of my good friend from Illinois, whose intentions are excellent, I suggest that we vote "no" on the amendment.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was interested in the statement the gentleman from Illinois made that it cost the Treasury $15 million. That is not true. FNMA has been self-sustaining and has operated at a profit. In the bill which we will have before us tomorrow there is a provision that the users of FNMA will have to pay into the capital fund 3 percent, and there is controversy as to whether it is a discount or a fee. This probably would disrupt the Federal National Mortgage Association to the point where there would be no secondary market for those purposes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman joins in requesting a "no" vote, I take it?

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

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

Mr. YATES. Certainly the gentleman is not saying that what I did say was incorrect. FNMA did lose $15 million on the sale of a half a billion dollars worth of mortgages, as shown in the testimony of Mr. Baughman, who appeared before us in connection with the hearings on the Federal National Mortgage Association. I do not see how the gentleman can controvert that fact in view of the sale of those mortgages at a discount at a price lower than FNMA paid for the mortgages.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Treasury does not lose anything in these operations until it is called upon to restore the loss to the capital of FNMA and there have been no losses to date in the capital of FNMA.

Mr. YATES. The point I make is that the mortgages were sold at a loss of $15 million. That was the statement by Mr. Baughman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does this colloquy suggest that we should not attempt to legislate on the subject at this time? I again suggest a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 96, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to ask a question or two of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The Veterans' Administration Hospital at Long Beach, Calif., is a 1,600-bed hospital of which only 400 beds are in a permanent fireproof building. One thousand two hundred beds are in structures of a flimsy temporary nature, standing on cement foundations made out of old wood and plasterboard. They are a terrific fire hazard. This hospital is the only paraplegic center west of Denver. It serves over 100 quadraplegics in beds in the hospital, and hundreds of

paraplegics both in and outside of the hospital. I do not know whether the Veterans' Administration head, Mr. Higley, visited the hospital before or after the time that he prepared his testimony before the subcommittee, but he stated upon visiting the hospital that the situation was, indeed, bad and that money ought to be provided to remove these temporary structures and replace them with adequate buildings.

Except for the main building, the whole Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital is temporary construction. Also, it is only fair to note that among these flimsy, barnlike structures those of the paraplegia service are in the better of the temporary buildings.

This situation was brought about by an unfortunate and ill-advised series of events ordered by Washington in 1950. The permanent structure at Long Beach was then devoted to use as a modern, 400-bed United States naval hospital. The barnlike temporary structures erected during World War II were largely abandoned and allowed to deteriorate. The hospital was in great service to the large numbers of active duty naval personnel stationed in the area, their dependents, and the more thousands of dependents of men assigned to fleet ships whose families lived in the vicinity and the many more thousands of retired naval personnel who located their homes in the area because of the existence of the hospital facility.

In a "meat-ax" economy move in the spring of 1950, the Navy was ordered to abandon the hospital. It was followed up on June 1, 1950, by an even more heartless order to transfer the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital, located in Los Angeles to the abandoned Navy buildings. I characterize this as a heartless and cruel order because Birmingham was the West Coast center for treatment of paraplegics and quadraplegics. The Birmingham center was specially equipped to handle these men who sacrificed so much for their country. All necessary equipment for their therapy, even special swimming and treatment pools, so necessary to their well-being, were there at Birmingham.

The many hundreds of disabled veterans involved had purchased homes in the vicinity of the Birmingham center into which thousands of dollars had been invested to make them habitable to men confined to beds and wheelchairs for the remainder of their lives.

There was no equipment at the Long Beach Hospital in service to such men. There were no homes specially constructed for them—they had to go to that expense once more and, in most cases, their only incomes were the modest pensions they received from our Government for their total disability.

One of the supreme ironies of the transfer debacle of June 1, 1950, was that the Korean war broke out 25 days later. It was only a few months until the United States Navy needed another hospital so badly in the southern California area that they had to reopen Corona Naval.

In the ensuing 4 years there have been other ironies. The fact will never be forgotten that the Birmingham hospital was condemned as a "firetrap." But these wounded were promptly transferred from a good firetrap to a truly bad one.

At Birmingham they had level ground, concrete ramps, 32-bed 4-cubicled wards. The wards were less crowded. They were air-conditioned. They had an excellent recreation hall. They had a big outdoor pool. The PVA built an indoor pool, complete, with two small brine pools. The mess hall was close; they did not have to wheel a half a mile just to eat a meal. Birmingham was a wonderful firetrap by comparison.

At Long Beach they have steep inclines, wooden ramps, 42-bed 6-cubicled wards. The wards are crowded; there are no large side porches for storing equipment. There is no air-conditioning. The large wards are impossible to heat evenly, with the flimsy structure of the building. In the winter they freeze to death in the halls. In the summer they just plain roast, because there is no place to go to get away from the heat.

The wards, set on grotesque concrete pilings, are a truly dangerous fire hazard. The concrete pilings are like a grate in a fireplace, allowing plenty of air circulation to fan the flames.

Realizing the tremendous fire hazard, there are frequent fire drills in Long Beach. These are well-rehearsed affairs that usually occur precisely at 10 o'clock in the morning. There are more personnel available on the day shift. Many of the patients are off the ward. The word is passed and everything goes off strictly on schedule. The catch is: There is no fire. There is no smoke. There are two exits, cleared in advance for action. There is no panic and there is no confusion.

It is a common fallacy that people who die in fires primarily are burned to death. Few people die of burns in a building fire. They suffocate first; asphyxiated by smoke.

Imagine a good fire getting started on a 42-bed ward, having a majority of quadraplegics who cannot even get out of bed. Imagine plenty of smoke, plenty of confusion, and a minimum of personnel at 2 o'clock in the morning. A fire of any size would probably block one exit. Imagine getting 42 beds through 1 door and down a steep ramp to safety. It does not require much imagination. They would be lucky to get 10 patients out alive.

In 1946, the Veterans' Administration decided to establish the west coast paraplegia center at the Birmingham Army Hospital in Van Nuys. The logical thing would have been to make immediate plans to replace the temporary facility with permanent buildings, especially suitable for paraplegics.

Instead, the Democratic administration only confused the whole situation further by the 1950 transfer to Long Beach. They made a lot of rosy promises about new buildings, an indoor swimming pool, a bigger and better recreation hall, and all the trimmings. They were political promises. They were made because of the tremendous adverse publicity to the Democratic administration, and Harry S Truman in particular, because of the shortsightedness of the 1950 transfer.

To date, we Republicans have not done any better. I believe in economy, but you cannot economize on something that does not exist. Decent quarters for most of the hospitalized patients in the Long Beach VA hospital do not exist.

There is a fine medical staff there. There are an ever-increasing number of paraplegics requiring hospitalization in California. But the buildings in which they are hospitalized are a disgrace.

They are a disgrace to the Veterans' Administration. They are a disgrace to the Democratic administration that put these men there. They will be a disgrace to the Republican administration if we leave them there.

So my question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is directed to that portion of the bill providing for some $3,400,000 for major replacements and alterations. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is a possibility that the Long Beach situation can be cleaned up within the near future.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], who so ably represents the district in which the hospital is located, could have gone a step farther and reminded the Congress that these were men removed from the Birmingham Hospital, which had been specially constructed for paraplegics, with homes especially constructed for their use, and moved into the Long Beach hospital, with the statement that we would make the necessary alterations there, which have not been made.

The problem is to take it step by step, and it is my opinion and certainly that of the members of the committee, that this step is past due. I have no doubt that in the list of major alterations, which will come down next year, this hospital will be included, and I hope perhaps some means may be arrived at for doing something about it before the year rolls by.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 51, at the end of line 3, strike out "$39,000,000" and insert "$55,400,000."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that when I pass on to the Great Beyond there will not appear upon my tombstone: "Here Lies BROYHILL the Beggar." However, I do not feel apologetic at all in taking the floor to ask this Congress for something that is reasonably fair and something that they have recognized many times before is a just, legal, and moral obligation on the part of Congress.

My amendment provides for an appropriation of $16,400,000 for a 500-bed atomic-proof general medical and surgical veterans' hospital to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

It has been recognized for many years that the Washington area needed additional veterans' hospital facilities. In fact, a 750-bed veterans' hospital was

authorized as far back as October 1945. As yet no funds have been appropriated.

There have been a total of 64 new veterans' hospitals authorized since World War II, and two just before the close of World War II. That is 66 veterans' hospitals authorized. In addition to that, there have been 43 additions to veterans' hospitals authorized. Of that total of 66 hospitals authorized and 43 additions to existing hospitals, the money has been appropriated for all of them with the exception of one, and that is the one in the District of Columbia.

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

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

Mr. HYDE. I want to commend the gentleman on his amendment and join with him in a request that in view of the serious shortage in this area the funds requested are sorely needed.

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

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

Mr. SMALL. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I feel Congress and the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] have been very fair to the veterans of this country. As the gentleman pointed out the other day, I believe we have 127,000 beds for veterans in the country, as a whole. However, I believe this would give some ammunition to the advocates of home rule in the District of Columbia, when we find that the only hospital which has not been appropriated for is in the District of Columbia, which has no representation in Congress.

The national average of veterans to hospitals is 149. The figures in Washington, D. C., are 409 to 1. That is a higher number of veterans per bed than in any other State in the Union, other than Oklahoma, Utah, Nebraska, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire.

If we approve the construction of this 500-bed hospital, the ratio, the number of veterans to beds, would be 168 in Washington, which would still be above the national average of 149 to 1. We also have got to take into consideration that in this metropolitan Washington area there are around 2 million people and there is only 1 general medical and surgical veterans' hospital in the whole metropolitan area, Mount Alto, which is obsolete, out of date, and has only 335 beds. Several sites have been worked on around the area. The land is available out at Soldiers' Home, 44 acres, for the construction of this hospital. It has been requested time and time again by the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration, but each time it has been postponed by the Congress.

There are 820 veterans needing hospitalization in the Washington metropolitan area who are waiting for admittance. Therefore, an additional hospital of 500 beds is urgently and seriously needed. I urge this body to support the amendment.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, there is a compelling need for additional veterans' hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. Consider the fact that all we have is Mt. Alto Hospital with a total of 335 beds. The inadequacy of hospital facilities for veterans in the District of Columbia is emphasized by the fact that the Veterans' Administration is obliged to go outside to provide hospitalization under contract arrangements with private facilities. The ratio of veterans to beds in our National Capital City is 409 to 1, which compares very unfavorably with the national ratio of 149 to 1. It is noted that many of the States are much better equipped with hospitals to take care of veterans than is Washington, D. C.

The urgent need for additional hospital beds here was recognized by the Veterans' Administration in 1951, at which time it was pointed out that the veteran population in Washington warranted the construction of a 750-bed hospital. No one will deny that our veteran population has increased considerably during the past 3 years, which growth certainly would not lessen the need here. Plans were developed by the Veterans' Administration in 1949 for the construction of the veterans' hospital on acreage available on the Soldiers' Home grounds. It is pointed out that the Army declared surplus 130 acres on April 4, 1950, and 44 acres of this tract were made available then for a veterans' hospital facility. The availability of this site would obviate the necessity of acquiring real estate. The Veterans' Administration urged favorable action to meet the rising requirements for hospitalization, realizing that they were faced with an enormous problem of caring for the ever-increasing number of veterans needing medical service. Normal requirements now far exceed the ability of the Veterans' Administration to serve this area.

I therefore urge the House to approve plans for the construction of a veterans' hospital on Soldiers' Home grounds.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in technical opposition to the amendment. I wish to explain the situation. I think it is a very serious situation in the District. I wish to explain it to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SMALL], all of whom have called the attention of the subcommittee to this situation indicating a meritorious interest in the problem and understand what it really is. There is a need, Mr. Chairman, for this hospital. One of the problems is that of providing psychiatrists and a proper staff for such hospital. It has been necessary on the part of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget to build hospitals as money was available and as need for staff members could be supplied.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that it was desirable to rebuild the Topeka hospital where psychiatrists are trained, to rebuild the Cleveland hospital which is now in the course of being constructed. It was necessary to supply a hospital in southern California, there being none in that State, because of the great influx of veterans. Consequently I would hope that the gentleman from Virginia would not insist upon his amendment, but would withdraw it, because we have this very practical problem of building the hospitals as rapidly as they can be built, and where the need is the most urgent. Certainly the hospital to which he refers in his amendment is the only one remaining from the approved list and certainly is deservedly in line. I would hope that the matter might be left to work itself out as it is being worked out, which means we are building these facilities just as fast as money is available.

We are aware of the situation. I tell the gentleman with assurance that the subcommittee and, therefore, the full committee, is fully aware of the need, extremely sympathetic and in favor of the case he presents, and we are coming to it as quickly as it is humanly possible to get to it at the present time.

I am sure if the gentlemen from Virginia and Maryland will keep the subcommittee advised of the problem as it affects their respective districts, the committee and the Congress will be able to help them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that it was a national scandal that we have not in Washington any Veterans' Administration hospital except Mount Alto where men are dying in little rooms with other men seriously ill, rooms that are large enough only for 1 patient, yet they have 3 or 4. They have an excellent staff at Mount Alto. I am absolutely positive they could find psychiatrists and other doctors from other hopsitals in Washington to take care of these men in a larger hospital.

I do not like to say it, but I feel very sure that if the District of Columbia had representation in the Congress that hospital would have been built a long time ago.

I was very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that authority was taken away from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to select sites for veterans' hospitals. I think the Members would have been much better satisfied had the committee been able to select the sites; they would have been more fairly designated than they are at the present time.

I earnestly hope that the gentleman's amendment will be agreed to. It will take a long time to build the hospital and anyhow by that time I am perfectly sure we will have enough trained psychiatrists and other staff in the Veterans' Administration to man the hospital adequately without borrowing from other hospitals.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sympathetic with what the gentlewoman is

asking. I notice on page 44 of the report that under this item of hospitals and domiciliary facilities there seems to be $21 million more appropriated under this bill than last year; or am I in error on that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a consolidated figure. Three figures were put into one figure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That does not take care of the hospital here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is referring to construction funds, which amount to about $39 million.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very small amount and I am ashamed when people come to Washington and ask about the Veterans' Administration hospital here in Washington. It is a disgrace to all of us. The medical is excellent but overcrowding and undesirable conditions are intolerable. I am chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I feel angry and humilitated that I have been unable to do anything more toward having this hospital built.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], if it is true you have earmarked $800,000 specifically for prosthetic-appliance research?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The committee was very glad to do that. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has always been tremendously interested in this subject. The work is showing results in research for prosthetic appliances which does great credit to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has always been very interested in this matter. Do you plan a swimming pool for the paraplegics at Long Beach? I am interested in that proposition also.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am embarrassed to say I do not know whether we are setting up a swimming pool at Long Beach, and that is in my own State. I will ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], are we building a swimming pool for paraplegics in Long Beach?

Mr. HOSMER. No; there is no provision at this time for that. We hope that will be included in the early overall renovation of the hospital there.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is much more to the point. We do not need a swimming pool at Long Beach as much as we need wards that are fireproof, adequate, and a place for the paraplegics to exercise, and other permanent improvements.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We need all those things as much as a pool. I made a report on that hospital a long time ago, but the Veterans' Administration did not act.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate last year on the independent offices appropriation, which ultimately became Public Law 149, 1st session, 82d Congress, the Appropriations Committee reduced the item for compensation and pension by some $300 million. In this session we have had to pass a bill restoring $215 million of that amount, and I note in the current independent offices appropriation, H. R. 8583, another item of $100 million has been cut from the appropriation for compensation and pensions.

This item, as all Members know, is an obligation of the United States and is based upon statutory requirement. It seems to me to be rather poor procedure for the Appropriations Committee each year to cut this item, knowing full well that in most instances the Veterans' Administration will have to come back and ask for a supplemental appropriation. If the full amount is appropriated and is not used it reverts to the Treasury. It seems to me much more orderly, much better procedure, to vote the full amount requested by the Veterans' Administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget than to go through the costly procedure of having additional estimates, introduction, sponsorship of a new item, and a new appropriation bill when all this could be avoided.

In addition, this cut always produces worry, concern, and anxiety on the part of many veterans and their dependents throughout the country. Every time the Appropriations Committee cuts this item by such a figure as the one in this bill the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress generally are flooded with letters questioning whether or not their compensation or their pension is to be reduced. Of course, we know that it cannot be reduced unless substantive legislation is enacted, and I am sure that no Member wants to sponsor or vote for such a bill as that. I am not trying to tell the Appropriations Committee or its distinguished chairman how he or the members of that committee should conduct their affairs. Since this happened on 2 different occasions for the past 2 years, I thought I should call it to the attention of the House. There is no economy involved. To me, it is a very poor policy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two, but first, let me say that in the State of Oregon by congressional action was established some years ago a domiciliary home for veterans. It is a fact with reference to domiciliary homes that about one-third of the beds in such facilities are general medical beds. In this particular facility none of the beds provided are for that purpose, with the result that we have in the domiciliary hospital at Medford, Oreg., some 800 patients but no provision for general medical or surgical care.

The building occupied by this facility is a large hospital building of a semipermanent type constructed by the Army and rated as a very fine building. But only one-third of it is occupied.

The point I am leading up to is this: The Veterans' Administration could establish in the Medford, Oreg., facility of two or three hundred general medical beds or convalescent beds badly needed in that part of Oregon and northern California where no new construction has taken place since World War II. Those beds could be established without the expenditure of a single penny for construction and they could be maintained and operated without any additional administrative cost. In other words, two or three hundred additional general medical beds could be provided for the veterans in the west coast area with only the cost of care involved so far as money is concerned.

The question I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], is this:

I note in the bill, on page 47, that a total of 127,000 beds is anticipated as being provided for in this bill. Could the additional domiciliary beds I have mentioned, the medical and surgical beds, be installed at Camp White, since there is no construction involved and no additional administrative cost? Could those beds be provided under this appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield; the gentleman raises a point which I think will interest not only the gentleman from Oregon but all Members of the Congress. He gives me the chance to point out that this year we made still a further step forward in the accounting; that is, the handling of the veterans' funds. Last year we set up a line item in the budget for hospitalization and another for domiciliary and another for contract beds. This year we have included those three in one line item which makes it possible for the Veterans' Administration to do exactly the sort of thing which the gentleman from Oregon is talking about, to shift the flexibility back and forth between GM and S, NP, domiciliary, or even contract beds. The situation the gentleman is talking about is directly in line with what the Veterans' Administration wants to do and certainly what the Congress wants to do, which is to provide for the veterans in the institutions most favorable to them and perhaps to change them back and forth between a medical hospital and a domiciliary or to provide additional beds, as he is suggesting, in the domiciliary field, which can be used for that purpose.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Let me ask one further question. In view of the fact that the Veterans' Administration several years ago recognized the need of this program and set up as part of their construction program some $2 million for the building of a hospital in the same general area, a 200-bed hospital, would it not seem to the gentleman from California, chairman of the subcommittee, that if the same number of beds could be provided or even more beds could be provided without the expenditure of a single cent for construction, that the Veterans' Administration would be justified in taking advantage of such a situation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very definitely, and we hope they will.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 47, line 11, after "$76,744,000", insert "*Provided*, That no part of this appropria-

tion shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree where such condition or disability is not shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by July 27, 1954, whichever is later.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; furthermore, that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is strictly a limitation under the rules. It saves money.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, that is a matter of opinion. Furthermore, might I say that even if it were not a limitation on an appropriation, it imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is a limitation. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Let me state briefly, Mr. Chairman, the reason for doing this.

This refers, as you will see in the bill, to the section stricken out by the gentleman from Tennessee. The reason I am putting it back in the form of a limitation only is because there is involved a minimum of $20 million and because this is, again, a matter which should not be stricken out completely without some chance of discussion. Putting this much back in the bill sends it over to the Senate with a possibility given to the Senate committee to discuss it and then to do what is necessary in the particular phase of the Veterans' Administration obligation toward the dental patients.

We have an enormous number of dental patients, many of whom are deserving, some of whom are entitled to this and as to some of whom there is a question. The action of the gentleman by raising the point of order opens the door wide, which the Congress decided last year, by a very large vote, it did not want to do. This has been discussed and protested by the veterans' organizations and it is something which the Veterans' Administration itself would like to correct.

My desire in putting the wording back is not to close the door. My desire in putting the wording back is only to make it possible for something to be in the bill on the subject when it goes to the Senate.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment which has been offered here is a slap right in the face of the veteran.

We have a moral obligation of the Congress of the United States to the veterans and this has to do with service-connected dental disabilities. What is being done here is this: There are certain groups in this country who have been trying for years to put this exact amendment into Veterans' Administration appropriation bills.

When the bill came up I made the point of order against it, because I felt that the Congress was not living up to its obligation to the veterans of this country. This rider was placed on the appropriation bill last year with the effect that 247,000 veterans all nearly declared eligible for treatment were denied treatment. This rider completely cut out Spanish-American War veterans, and disabled veterans training under Public Law 16. Its sponsors said last year this was not their intention, yet they seek this year to perpetuate the injustice by extending the provision for another year.

Let me tell you what the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] will do. Any soldier who had his jaw shot out in service, if he did not go to the Veterans' Administration within 1 year and trouble developed after 1 year—in fact only 1 year and 1 day—he would not be entitled to have dental care. That is what the gentleman from California is doing; and I thought he was a friend of the veterans.

It is time that we stopped listening to those who would like to tear down the defenders of this country because of some political pressures. I think we should carry out the obligation that we owe to these men. I hope that this amendment will be defeated. This is a moral obligation that we have to the veterans. It is an obligation that we agreed to pay several years ago. This is no time to legislate on this bill. This is a matter for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to be studying. It is my information from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that it is under study now. I hope the amendment will be defeated. In fact the Veterans' Affairs Committee has reported out two bills in attempt to repair the damage done by a rider similar to this one which was placed on last year's appropriation bill. If changes are needed let the Veterans' Affairs Committee make them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that it is under study at the present time. The committee has had some difficulty in finding a way out of the dilemma that would be at all equitable. Some cases undoubtedly were cared for under former regulations of the Veterans' Administration. It is hard to know just how far to go. We have been studying the matter.

Mr. SUTTON. Does not the lady believe that we cannot legislate this at this time without further study?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in legislating on an appropriations bill, as the gentleman knows. I will say that I think the committee has tried harder this year to take care of the veterans, perhaps than they did last year. I think they have made more of a study, and they have gone along, I understand, with the recommendations of the Veterans' Administration. In that I think they are in the clear this year.

Mr. SUTTON. I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I should like to state to the members of this committee that I introduced on the 2d of February of this year H. R. 7653, which in effect would carry out, as permanent law, the intent of the language of the Committee on Appropriations which we are now discussing.

You will recall that we had a restriction of this same kind approved in the appropriation bill which was up in July of last year. At that time, as members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we did succeed in impressing on the Members of the House the necessity for putting a time limit in the bill, so that the restrictions on outpatient dental care were specifically authorized only through June 30, 1954. It was hoped that by that time our Committee on Veterans' Affairs could examine the problem closely, and consider permanent legislation. This has not been done, however. It is my feeling that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unquestionably should be discussing this problem. At the moment it has not done so. It is my understanding that hearings on this question will be held by the Hospitals Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee sometime after Easter recess.

I do think it should be called to the attention of the Committee, furthermore, that the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Harvey Higley, in a letter dated March 9, to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, described the effect we considered the bill H. R. 7653 would have. He pointed out that President Eisenhower in his budget message on January 21, specifically recommended that these restrictions on outpatient dental care of a noncompensable character be continued another year. Mr. Higley's letter concluded:

The subject of outpatient dental treatment has been given very careful consideration by the Veterans' Administration. The whole program has been reviewed in the light of administrative and professional developments and experience in this field, and it is believed that the provisions limiting outpatient dental care for noncompensable service-connected cases contained in the subject bill reflect, generally, a sound and proper reevaluation of the Government's dental program for veterans.

It is my feeling, therefore, that this provision, although a stopgap measure, should be approved. It is my feeling also, and I have contacted all the veterans' organizations, that there is no strong feeling on the part of anyone that damage is being done to veterans. There is no obligation, legal or moral, that we continue the dental treatment of these noncompensable cases unless the veterans apply within 1 year of discharge. There is an estimated saving of some $20 million if present restrictions are continued. Because these restrictions are reasonable, it is my conviction that permanent legislation to this effect eventually will be recommended by the Hospital Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs itself when we do finally consider this problem directly.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I am sure the gentleman does not want to affect service-connected veterans by this?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. These are the service-connected cases of noncompensable character that we are discussing right now.

Mr. SUTTON. Would you agree to add the word nonservice connected in your amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I certainly would not. It is service-connected cases of a noncompensable character that we are discussing.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. How does the gentleman define noncompensable service-connected dental disability? At what point does the service-connected disability become noncompensable?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The noncompensable cases would be the less serious ones. I should point out that we do provide that all cases, whether they are service connected or not, can be treated if the veteran patient applies within 1 year after discharge or 1 year after enactment of this legislation. After that time they cannot come back for continued dental treatment. This is a one-treatment arrangement.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Are you not making an invidious distinction between the man whose case became obvious earlier as against the man whose symptoms showed up later?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not think the distinction is invidious.

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

I rise only to add my humble word as a dentist to be helpful. An amendment was offered last year doing practically the same thing this one does but, at that time, no one else could offer an amendment.

The amendment, as passed last year, nullified the examinations and certificates for dental service of 3,200,000 soldiers who were service connected, costing the Government in the neighborhood of $70 million. We will have to spend an equal amount to service connect the same soldiers. It is not fair, after a man has been service connected and processed, to deny him the work he is entitled to have done. You cannot do things like this in a few minutes. You cannot come in here with an amendment like this and, in a few minutes, write into law something that will cost the Government millions of dollars. It takes time to go into a measure of this kind. You cannot come in here with an amendment dealing with a momentous question of this kind and argue it out in 4 or 5 minutes—considering a proposition, I repeat, costing into the millions of dollars. Listen to me, no man can receive dental service, unless he is in a hospital, that is not service connected. I think it is absolutely wrong to say to a man who has service-connected disability and who has fought in our wars and rendered service to his country that he cannot have work done that is service connected, limiting his time to 1 year. Let us consider matters of this kind before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Let us take time to consider the bill on its merits and then refer it back to the House for action. But this same thing, done in the same way last year, cost the Government and our soldiers millions of dollars. Let us defeat this amendment. If you want to pass a law of this kind, let it come through our committees and pass on it in the proper way.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana recalls that we discussed this same problem on the floor last year and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which you and I are both members have had 12 months to consider the problem. Of course, it would be better if the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had considered the problem and had recommended legislation, but so far as I know, there has been no objection of any kind from any organizations or individuals that this restriction is an unreasonable one. It is my feeling that as a temporary measure we should continue to include this language in the appropriation bill, and then if we come up with different conclusions from our Committee on Veterans' Affairs and report them out, it can then be considered on a permanent basis.

Mr. LONG. I understand that, but just let me say this to the gentleman. Why all the rush act each year with this kind of a proposition? No committee has had a chance to consider this proposition which involves millions of dollars and service-connected men who have served their country who need their teeth fixed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is quite obvious and it is that you and I and members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have failed in our responsibilities as members of the legislative committee to consider legislation such as this.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the logic of our friend was to be followed, we might just as well abolish all standing committees and let the Appropriations Committee legislate for the House of Representatives.

May I ask this further question: How many veterans were affected by the provisions which were enacted into law last year?

Mr. LONG. Approxmiately 3,200,000 men who have been service connected and certified, waiting to have their work done, woke up the next day to find out they were not service connected and they could not have their teeth fixed, although they had been examined and processed. Let me tell you a little about the examination and processing business. The dentists of this country, and I am one of them, received $20 for examining and X-raying patients' mouths preparatory to doing their dental work. Regardless of how much or little they are to have done, if it is a $4 filling and the mouth must be X-rayed and examined, they pay $20 for it. Then it takes $20 more to process the case to get ready and certified back to the dentist to have the man's work done. In other words, it costs the Federal Government to get a man ready to have his work done $40. Now, all of this work that had been done and paid for last year was for naught. Everyone who knows anything about it admits that it was a tremendous mistake that was made last year when we passed a similar amendment in a similar way—then why make the mistake this year?—is the question that I ask. Defeat the amendment. Let our soldiers have time to have their teeth fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House to let me speak to you a few minutes about a problem that means a great deal in the Eighth Congressional District in Florida. I feel I have the right to ask this indulgence because I have listened with great admiration and I have been very quiet, as a freshman is supposed to be, during the last 2 days, while we have been discussing this most important bill.

A few minutes ago we were talking about hospital needs for our veterans in this country. I listened with particular attention to the remarks of our able colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], but I think it should be pointed out to the House that one of the greatest needs for our veterans in the future will be more beds for our neuropsychiatric patients. I am particularly interested in this problem because in the great State of Florida, with 388,000 veterans as of October last year, we had only 116 beds for neuropsychiatric patients.

This past summer I visited three veterans' hospitals in Florida, and I was much pleased with the splendid work that was being done. I asked what was the biggest problem that they faced, and in one of those hospitals the manager without hesitation said, "We need an NP hospital for the State of Florida." He told me at that time that he had 150 non-service-connected NP cases waiting to be placed in hospitals in his particular area.

The State of Florida has this particular problem: If you will think for a moment, it is very unusual. I think no other State in the Union has this problem. It has a coastline, as you know, which is perhaps the biggest coastline of any other State in the Union. The only place the veterans in Florida can go for treatment, as you start from the bottom part of the State, is to go north. We are surrounded on one side by the Atlantic Ocean and on the other side by the Gulf of Mexico. From the Florida Keys to Pensacola is a distance of 1,000 miles, which you have to travel by automobile or by train or by bus.

In 1948 there was authorized an NP hospital in Gainesville, Fla., which happens to be in the Eighth Congressional District which I represent. That hospital was deleted from the building program along with other hospitals, but

through the years the hospital site has been retained.

Several weeks ago the Veterans' Administration declared that hospital site as excess to their immediate needs, but I am very grateful to our Committee on Veterans' Affairs who took many days to look into this problem. As a result of their discussion and their deliberations they decided unanimously to ask the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reserve that Gainesville, Fla., hospital site because they believed there would be needed an NP hospital in Florida. They felt there would be a wonderful opportunity to man that hospital because the University of Florida is beginning now a great medical center just a mile away from the city. It will be an area with from one-third to one-half million population that can be reached in a few hours by automobile from any part of the State.

I want to thank this subcommittee on appropriations, particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for permitting me to appear before his committee this past year and talk about this hospital.

I am not asking that the hospital be built now, Mr. Chairman, but I am going to be pleading and supplicating in the years to come, and I beg of you as we go on with this problem that we look at it objectively. I know that ultimately the hospital will be built if it is at all possible.

I thank you for letting me call this to your attention.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my appreciation, and that of the people—particularly of the veterans—of the 11th District of Ohio and of northeastern Ohio to the chairman of this subcommittee on Appropriations, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS of California and to the members of his subcommittee for their cooperation and understanding in working out the problem facing the city of Cleveland, and northeastern Ohio, in making it possible to get an adequate water supply at a site for the neuropsychiatric hospital to be located there.

The expansion in this whole area has placed such a burden upon the water system of the city of Cleveland—and upon its bonded indebtedness required to expand it—that it would have been impossible to obtain an adequate water supply at any available site in the area without the authority contained in this bill.

It is not alone the authority which is contained in this bill for which I wish to express my thanks, however, and those of the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, GEORGE BENDER, and WILLIAM AYRES. We are also most appreciative of the sincere consideration and patience and willingness to help work out this problem, so that the veteran may get the treatment he deserves, shown us by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and by his committee. He and they have our sincere thanks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority consistent with the demands of a great public service and of adequate national defense. The Authority has a large responsibility which has been placed upon it and which it cannot discharge if handicapped by curtailing appropriations. The great ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and others who have spoken in support of appropriations adequate for the legitimate purposes of TVA have presented arguments that are unanswerable.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has served well the Tennessee Valley and the people of the United States. It has served during 20 years of conflict with the myth that enterprise and good management are the exclusive possessions of private organizations. It has emerged from that conflict with a record of achievement that forever gives the lie to the myth that Government operations must be attended by graft, corruption, and inefficiency. The story of 20 years of achievement by TVA is thrillingly told by Gordon R. Clapp, who in 1946 became Chairman of the Board of TVA, succeeding David Lilienthal.

Mr. Clapp is well and favorably known in the Second District in Illinois, which I have the honor to represent. He is indeed one of that rare number of renowned educators, administrators, and scientists that has constituted an unparalleled contribution by the University of Chicago to the advancement and the security of the United States of America. After receiving his bachelor of arts degree from Lawrence College and spending 5 years on the administrative staff, Mr. Clapp came to the University of Chicago for work on his master's degree, which he completed in 1933. After that he went to work for the then brand new TVA as assistant to Floyd Reeves, who was on leave from the University of Chicago. Thirteen years later he became chairman of the board of directors on the resignation of David Lilienthal.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, how the University of Chicago has figured in all the great scientific and world-changing advancements of our times, including the development of the atomic bomb and the building of the unprecedented power of TVA.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend to my colleagues and to all Americans everywhere a careful reading of the thrilling story of TVA as told by Mr. Clapp in the April 1954 issue of the University of Chicago magazine, which follows:

DAMS, DEADLINES, AND PEOPLE

(By Gordon R. Clapp, M. A., 1933, Chairman of the Board, TVA)

Money, materials, machines, and men are the basic ingredients in building a dam. And the greatest of these is men. The TVA has built 20 dams in 20 years. These dams represent $760 million. One hundred and thirteen million cubic yards of concrete, rock, and earth fill, 12 times the bulk of the 7 great pyramids of Egypt, have been used to build these structures into the riverbed of the Tennessee and its tributaries. Almost 200,000 different men and women at one time or another have been employed by the TVA for a direct part of this colossal job.

Construction work in any season in any climate cannot put comfort above achievement. But if the planners, builders, and managers know and have faith in men, they will contrive to make the process of construction satisfying to those who do the work—a theater for the kind of creative experience in which men build themselves as they build a dam.

The TVA has built these 20 dams in 20 years with its own employees. Each structure was placed, designed, and built to serve a purpose peculiar to itself. Taken together, they form a unit for the control and productivity of a great river system. There is Fontana Dam—fourth largest and highest in the world—rising 480 feet above bedrock in a canyon of the North Carolina Mountains. There is Kentucky Dam, near the mouth of the Tennessee River as it flows into the Ohio near Paducah, more than a mile and a half long, with two-thirds of its concrete bulk invisible, reaching down a hundred feet through soft overburden to the solid limestone rock. Kentucky's foundations are especially designed to withstand earthquakes such as the one which occurred and changed the course of the Mississippi more than a hundred years ago. The shoreline of the 184-mile-long lake behind Kentucky Dam, if straightened out, would reach from Chicago to Los Angeles. This great reservoir can regulate the full flow of a flooded Tennessee River to reduce flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi.

There are more figures. One could illustrate the size of these operations by pointing out that the 22 million acre-feet of water which can be stored behind TVA's dams could cover the entire State of Illinois to a depth of 8 inches. But these dams were not built for the purpose of impressive statistics. They were built to carry out the purposes specified by the Congress of the United States in the TVA Act of 1933. They were built to control the devastating floods of a river whose annual discharge equals that of the Missouri, to provide a new inland waterway for the benefit of our national commerce. These dams were built to turn the potential electrical energy of the untamed river into the pushbuttons and motors of more than a million and a quarter homes and industries.

The construction of a dam involves a careful fit of a whole new landscape into the economy and mores of the surrounding area. In the process of building these dams and planting in the powerhouses the quiet hum of electric energy, 15,000 families were obliged to move from the backwater areas to be flooded. Flowage rights or full ownership had to be purchased covering 35,000 tracts of land comprising about a million acres. More than 19,000 graves were moved to new places of rest; 170,000 schoolhouses, 180 churches, and, in some instances, whole towns and villages were relocated or physically reorganized to make way for the lakes behind the dams.

HUMAN PERSUASION

Roads, railroads, and bridges were the subject of negotiation, an agreement, and equitable transaction, involving county courts, State and Federal agencies. Owners, congregations, nearest of kin, village councils, whoever and whatever had a right or a reason to be consulted or considered in making the new shoreline an accepted and acceptable part of the landscape, were involved in the result. For every cubic yard of concrete and every ton of steel now solidly fused into TVA dams there were dozens of transactions among people, involving family history, the future of communities, the plans of the local and State agencies, the future use of the new lakes, and the power to be extracted from these new waters by the magic of the dynamo.

Every one of these tens of thousands of transactions and agreements had to proceed under a schedule that was determined by the date the reservoir was scheduled to begin filling. While concrete was being placed at the dam site, land buyers, family relocation specialists, reservoir timber clearance crews, surveyors relocating railroad and highway lines, even technicians from the universities excavating the artifacts from ancient Indian mounds—all who had part in this complex task—were working under deadlines. They were deadlines dictated by water and weather, but determined by TVA engineers to make efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars.

Experienced engineers must schedule the tempo of a dam's construction to bring each major stage of the structure to the point where floods or winter rains cannot hinder the work or undo what has been done. It takes cost-conscious engineering to fit the separate construction operations together so that the new dam will be ready to hold back the seasonal floods and convert their force into use and revenue. If a dam is ready before the seasonal stream flow comes to fill the reservoir, months of idle investment add to the cost of the dam. If the gates of the dam are not ready to be closed when the heavy flows come, flood control is delayed and power revenues are lost. Weeks and days, according to seasons, count heavily in the economy of rebuilding a river.

And it takes a kind of skill in human persuasion, too. A family living in a mountain cove miles from the river, whose property was below the white-staked contour line set by a TVA survey party, might not believe that a lake would by a future definite date submerge their home. It was sometimes necessary to persuade them to visit a dam already built, show them the lake, and by map explain the inevitable course of water along a contour, set by the height of a dam many miles and ridges away.

If a single family remained within the contour lines the water would reach by a certain date, the time gained and the money saved by managerial and engineering skill at the site of the dam would be lost. A new, unfilled reservoir had to become a deserted land, a cleared land with buildings and debris removed, wired to the ground, or burned, with new roads and bridges built above the future shoreline. During the war the gates on a new dam were ready to be closed when the last remaining family, ready to move to a new farm location, was delayed. An aged grandfather suddenly became ill with pneumonia. To move him invited grave risk. For several days, while TVA and a host of other agencies stood by helpfully and hopefully, the closure of the dam was postponed.

These may seem to be small details, but I mention them for a special reason. They are, perhaps, illustrations of a special kind of accountability for a human result, going far beyond engineering precision, that recurs again and again in any fair recital of TVA's work. No greater testimony can be found to demonstrate the eschewment of autocratic methods by TVA, the sympathetic understanding, the high skill as a builder, the concern for human rights and dignity than this fact: The people of the Tennessee Valley came to cherish the TVA as an institution among them.

Certainly the story of how TVA rebuilt the Tennessee River does not support the too-often accepted myth that anything of Government is inefficient, corrupt, and wasteful. What I have described would find many parallels among many Government agencies within the States, within the cities, within the Federal Government. But these stories of achievement are seldom heard against the din of criticism.

Consider a recent chapter in the history of TVA—the story of the Shawnee steam plant at Paducah, Ky. Except for TVA's Kingston steam plant, the Shawnee steam plant will be the biggest in the world. During each 24-hour day its 10 giant units will consume nearly 14,000 tons of coal and can return each day to the alchemy of national defense and the growth of the Nation more than half as much electric energy as is used in Chicago. The Shawnee steam plant is but 1 of 7 TVA is building, but it has a special history.

In the fall of 1950 the Atomic Energy Commission asked TVA, on very short notice, to develop a proposal to supply one million kilowatts of power for a new gaseous diffusion plant the AEC was to build at Paducah.

The TVA submitted a plan and the Atomic Energy Commission accepted it early in November of 1950. Shortly thereafter, the Commission's representatives, followed by the TVA, appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations to support TVA's request for funds. Later in December, before the committee had acted upon the TVA's request for appropriations, the Atomic Energy Commission announced that it had accepted the proposal of a newly formed private utility company to supply half the required power for the AEC plant. The new company had been formed at the behest of a member of the Atomic Energy Commission as subsequently explained by the Commissioner in a very illuminating speech.

TVA did not object to this reversal of the Atomic Energy Commission's position and appeared again before the House Committee on Appropriations with an appropriation request, revised in accord with AEC's decision, to supply not all, but half of the power supply for the Paducah plant. The Atomic Energy Commission entered into a contract with the newly formed Electric Energy, Inc., to supply the other half. In both cases the construction of new steam plants was called for.

The announcement that the power supply for the AEC Paducah plant was to be divided between TVA and Electric Energy, Inc., was hailed by critics of the TVA as a contest between public and private enterprise, giving rise to such statements as the following, which appeared in an Illinois paper:

"Accordingly many companies pooled their ideas and their resources * * * for the expressed purpose of demonstrating to the Government that private enterprise could do the job much better for half the cost."

There was some reason for the optimism thus expressed by TVA's sideline critics, for when the construction of the two plants was started, the first unit of the private company's Joppa Steam Plant was scheduled for initial operation 3 months ahead of TVA's first unit. The schedules were set by agreement between AEC, national defense agencies in charge of allocating materials, the TVA, and EE Inc. Priorities on steel, copper, aluminum, and shop space for the manufacturing of turbogenerators were granted to the Joppa contractors on that basis. If this was to be a race, it was a handicap run by agreement.

SHAWNEE AHEAD

For many months the champions of private enterprise continued to point a gleeful finger at this rigged contest between the private power company and the TVA. Trade journals and some of the daily press heralded this race being run on opposite sides of the beautiful Ohio. After a while, the cries of the professional spectators died down. The reason was easy to discern. It began to be apparent that the wrong horse was coming in ahead. Both TVA and EE Inc. suffered from delayed deliveries from equipment manufacturers. Both encountered labor difficulties. Both projects missed the completion dates originally scheduled.

But on April 9, 1953, approximately 2 years and 3 months from the time construction was started, the first unit at TVA's Shawnee plant was placed in commercial operation while the Joppa smokestacks across the river were still clean and cold. TVA's second Shawnee unit went into operation June 21, 1953. Still no smoke from Joppa. Several weeks later the first unit in the Joppa plant was placed in operation. TVA's third Shawnee unit was placed in operation in October; its fourth unit on January 8, 1954. By this time two of the four Joppa units were running. Thus the original requirements promised the AEC by TVA were completed when the Joppa plant still had a long way to go. So much for the much publicized race between private and public enterprise.

There is more to the story. On the basis of figures filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the private company's Joppa plant will be substantially more expensive per unit of capacity than the Shawnee plant in contrast with the original estimates by which the contract was obtained from the AEC.

These figures show that the estimated cost of the private company Joppa steam plant of four original units has increased some 45 percent—from $81 million in May 1951 to $118 million in June 1953. The costs per kilowatt of capacity have increased over their original estimate of $126 to $184. Two more units at the Joppa plant being added to supply a smaller portion of AEC's expanded Paducah facilities show estimates even higher—$198 per kilowatt. The taxpayers bought this record, and they will have to pay for it; the private companies lose nothing because these increased costs are paid by the AEC.

In comparison, the TVA Shawnee plant of 4 units was originally estimated to cost $147.50 per kilowatt. TVA's actual cost experience to date, while building under the same physical conditions as the Joppa plant, shows that the total 10-unit Shawnee plant capable of producing 1,500,000 kilowatts will be completed by TVA at a capital cost well within our estimates.

Let me add a few footnotes and observations bearing upon the significance of the Shawnee-Joppa story in TVA's record in these past 20 years.

On July 31, 1953, EEInc announced it had cancelled its contract with its general contractor for the plant, "in order to permit reorganization of the construction project so that the station can be completed on a more efficient and economical basis." The reorganization was necessary, according to the President of EEInc, as reported in the Paducah Sun-Democrat, because of the lack of productivity and consequent increased costs characterizing the work so far.

The Wall Street Journal reported that construction progress at the big powerplant has been marked by successively rising cost estimates, blamed by Ebasco on the labor situation.

However, as the Paducah Sun-Democrat pointed out: "Shawnee steam plant is being built with the same kind of union labor that is building Joppa's plant."

The comment of the Paducah Sun-Democrat was correct in all respects but one. The TVA was building the Shawnee plant with the same kind of union labor that was building the Joppa plant, but the men on the TVA job were working for the TVA. For as one reporter, who surveyed the situation with great care, stated, "For some reason the men who work for TVA have faith in it." TVA does not consider its Shawnee record the brightest in its catalog of construction projects. We have built dams and steam plants on better schedule, with fewer difficulties, and at lower cost. But others invited the comparison between Shawnee and Joppa.

We have had work stoppages on the Shawnee plant, but not as many as they have had across the river at Joppa. We have drawn our labor forces from the same areas; we pay about the same wages; and we are both building steam plants. The design and

manufacture of boilers, turbines, and generators; the fabrication of steel; the erection of steel on the site; the operation of excavating equipment; and the placing of concrete are much the same types of operations whether at Shawnee or at Joppa. Both projects depended upon private manufacturers for boilers, turbogenerators, and the thousands of items of equipment which enter the maze of arrangements in a modern steam plant. Why, then, was TVA able to move out in front and keep its costs within its estimates as compared with the job across the river? The history of TVA provides the answer: the 20-year record of an organization skilled in management of men and materials and pledged to a practice of performance and accountability time after time.

The Shawnee story adds another chapter to record the achievement by a Government agency in conflict with the myth that enterprise and good management are the exclusive possessions of private organizations. The men who promoted the arrangement perhaps believed that the requirements of national security, in certainty of achievement to supply power when the Paducah AEC plant was ready, called for participation by private companies to hedge the possible failure of the TVA. Perhaps there was not time enough to examine the facts of TVA's past record. Perhaps the American taxpayer could have been saved the burden of the increased cost to the Government of this electrical energy had those who made the decision questioned the common myth too often honored, which holds that Government can never do a job as well or as economically as can private contractors. Had the facts been examined, one would have found a record of performance reassuring both as to TVA's ability to meet deadlines and as to the reliability of its estimates of cost. One would have found a history of hundreds of millions of man-hours with a safety record better than private industry averages for comparable types of work as shown by TVA's numerous awards from the National Safety Council. One would have found an engineering organization designing steam plants which were producing electricity more economically and with more efficient use of fuel than most—a significant point indeed when one realizes that in 2 or 3 years TVA will be burning some 18 million tons of coal per year. Above all, one would have found an organization of construction workers still as unafraid to tackle the biggest construction job on earth as in those first days—workers who override emergencies; if they do not have what they need, they invent a substitute way on the spot, and the job moves ahead. If this story has a moral, perhaps this is it: Enterprise is where you find it.

The record of TVA men and management in rebuilding a river will never completely be told, the results of this achievement can be put into words. Briefly: the flow of water in the river is now controlled. The devastation of floods has been reduced to manageable proportions. Already the savings from TVA's control of floods at one city alone—Chattanooga—have totaled more than one-fourth of the flood-control investment in the entire river system. Other regions benefit, too, for TVA dams reduce the crests of floods on the lower Ohio and the Mississippi by the 2 or 3 feet which make the difference between safety and community disaster. That much is done. Those benefits will grow while the expenditures diminish.

MEN AT WORK

Navigation locks in the dams and a stable channel have made possible a growing commerce on the river. More commerce means more jobs, new markets, and greater economic opportunities for the people of this region and the Mississippi Valley. In 1933, the year TVA began its work, about 33 million ton-miles of freight were shipped on the river, cargo, for the most part, of low value. Last year the rebuilt river carried 1 billion ton-miles, much of it of high value products—petroleum, automobiles, grain, coal, and fertilizer. More commerce will be carried every year. Greater savings to shippers and to consumers will be added each year.

The dams are here to stay. Concrete, earth fill, and rock make them a permanent part of a landscape more hospitable to human endeavor than it used to be. New kinds of enterprises find a climate for growth in this area because the river is controlled. For the dams that hold back the waters in time of floods, and fill the channel in time of drought, create beautiful lakes, a setting for the third largest and newest business of the area—recreation. And for good measure, these majestic dams provide the electric power which has changed the lives of people on their farms, in their homes, and in new industries throughout the region.

This is a record of men at work. There was no Aladdin's lamp available for TVA to use. Geologists and engineers, cartographers, and surveyors, accountants and land buyers, draftsmen and doctors, union leaders, ironworkers, carpenters—the hard-hat legions of TVA's construction crews—men of more than a score of professions and hundreds of occupations, have dedicated their talents to this job. In these 20 years, scores of thousands of Americans citizens have worked with TVA at one time or another up and down the Tennessee Valley, driving machines, moving mountains to build these great projects to serve mankind. Not, like the pyramids, as monuments to men of lofty station. Not for the glory of designers, engineers, or workmen. Not for the profit of a few. The purpose of the structures stands inscribed upon each one—"Build for the people of the United States."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, many Members have asked me whether there will be a motion to recommit this bill. There will be such a motion. I will present a motion to recommit with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the amendment I offered before with respect to FNMA. This is not a technical amendment as it was labeled by the gentleman from California. It is a very practical amendment, and it is a good amendment. It raises a question of values that every Member of this House should consider: Should good assets of the Federal Government be given away at less than their value?

Are mortgages any less worthy resources of the Federal Government than the timberlands that were the subject of a bill that the House defeated a few weeks ago? Of course not, and that is exactly what is involved in my amendment.

The second point that this House should consider is whether or not veterans who are liable on mortgages should be given the same rights as mortgage companies when FNMA decides it should sell the mortgages at a discount. Mortgage companies are now given the right to buy mortgages from FNMA at a discount, but veterans, who have signed those same mortgages are denied the same privilege by the Government that the companies have. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is that fair?

The committee thought that it was most unfair. That is why they put the language in the bill that was striken on the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

If a veteran is not given the same right as mortgage companies with reference to the mortgage he signed, should the mortgage be sold at a discount? I don't think so. These are good mortgages, these are seasoned mortgages, these are mortgages that were select, these are mortgages that were sold at less than their value to a privileged few companies.

Mr. Chairman, FNMA has been in existence for almost 15 years. Last year, the first year of a Republican administration, was the first time in its history that FNMA mortgages were sold at less than their par value. And they were sold to only a few companies; to companies that qualified under the FNMA regulations.

Read pages 2246 and 2248 of the hearings. If you will read the hearings you cannot escape the conclusion that the motion to recommit should be agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 65, line 11, after the colon and the words "(12 U. S. C. 1701)", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation or fund in this act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with the issuance of mortgage commitments under all titles of the National Housing Act, as amended, other than on the basis of the issuance of such mortgage commitments to all segments of the population, including those segments which are unable to obtain adequate housing under established home-financing programs, as nearly as possible on the basis of effective housing demand as determined by market analyses prepared by the Federal Housing Administration."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and requires additional duties of an agency.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears on its face it is an interference with executive discretion; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 65, line 11, after the colon and following the words "(12 U. S. C. 1701)", insert the following: "That no part of any appropriation or fund in this act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with the preparation of any housing market analyses which do not include a breakdown of the housing needs of the various segments of the population including those segments which are unable to obtain adequate housing

under established home-financing programs."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order that I did to the other amendment. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill and requires additional duties and responsibilities of an administrative agency.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in response to that, let me say this is certainly a proper limitation upon an appropriation. Funds are provided right now for the preparation of such housing market analyses. All this would do would be to limit the funds to certain types of housing market analyses and I submit, therefore, the amendment is proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Up to the word "analyses," in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is all right. Following that, the amendment is an infringement upon the duties of an executive and imposes additional duties. In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order should be sustained and is sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the key to effective slum clearance today is relocation of the people displaced by the slum clearance project. Some of those displaced have the funds with which to buy housing even at the high prices today, but cannot do so because of restrictions placed in their way. Out of 123 slum-clearance projects developed under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, nearly two-thirds of the families living in these areas are minority families who cannot find housing open to them at any price. The solution to their problem is in greatest measure, the solution of the most complicated obstacle facing slum clearance today. It is for this reason that I offer my amendment, to make sure that the facilities of the Federal Housing Administration are used to help solve the problem, not to hinder it. The purpose of my amendment is to assure that funds we appropriate in this bill are to be used for the solution of the housing problems of all Americans.

I recommend to you the March issue of the publication of the National Association of Home Builders called the Correlator. It is devoted to the subject of housing minority groups and I want to congratulate the National Association of Home Builders for its courage and good judgment in bringing the problem of minority housing out in the open for discussion and action.

The association recommends that its members attack the problem not only for the reason that it will help solve a very difficult social problem, but really for profit as well. Financing is, of course, the heart of the problem and FHA can render a tremendous service if it is so minded.

The Correlator shows a survey that was taken last December on general activity in minority housing. Fifty percent of the replies indicated there was some building for minority groups. The remaining 50 percent showed there was no building for such groups. Various reasons were given: a lack of mortgage financing; no local problem or need; a lack of suitable sites for development; the low income of minority groups. The survey indicated that there was a shortage of funds, not so much because of any drying up of the mortgage market, as because of the reluctance of lenders to accept loans on homes or rental units for minority groups. FHA can help correct this situation.

Lest the purposes of my amendment be misunderstood, let me say that this is a problem which particularly affects cities such as Chicago. Instances of discrimination against members of minority races who sought assistance have been called to my attention on several occasions. I have been told that FHA officials have gone so far as to suggest that builders might find it more advantageous to build homes in areas other than Negro neighborhoods, even though there is a tremendous market for minority housing in the city of Chicago. If we expect to clear slums and rebuild our metropolitan areas, the housing problems of minority families must be squarely faced and solved. FHA can be a powerful tool, not only in clearing slums but in preventing them, as well. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I seek this additional time is to make a brief statement. We from Tennessee have used most of the time today. In the 6 years I have had the honor of being a Member of this body the Tennessee Valley Authority has always been quite controversial. The bill we have had under discussion yesterday and today has not only been controversial from the TVA standpoint but also from the standpoint of housing and veterans as well.

I would like to say before we close debate on this, Mr. Chairman, that during the time I have been here and as controversial as this bill has been, I do not think we have ever had a Chairman who has been more fair than the Chairman who is presiding at this time. It is my opinion that LOUIS GRAHAM has been as efficient a Chairman as we have ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I speak briefly upon the motion to recommit which will shortly be made. The motion to recommit brings before us the same question which was defeated by the House when it was made as a separate motion. I submit to you now that we are in effect interfering with the proper administrative duties of the agency known as Fannie May. We are saying that it may buy these mortgages at a discount; that they may not sell them at a profit in order to keep them in circulation, to keep their portfolios at a proper level; that they may not do what we actually asked them to do, Mr. Chairman, in last year's bill, which was to dispose of these mortgages and get them out of the hands of the Federal Government so that we may apply the money against the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I think the same decision which was made when the motion was made on the floor is the proper vote on the motion to recommit. I hope it will be defeated.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, 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. 8583) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. YATES. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member unqualifiedly opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit?

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 59, line 9, after "$150,000", insert *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation or fund in this act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with any sale of mortgages owned by the Administration at a price less than the par value thereof."

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 214, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—180

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Barden
Barrett
Battle
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Condon
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Dies
Dodd
Dollinger
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gregory
Hagen, Calif.
Hagen, Minn.
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Heller
Holifield
Holtzman
Howell
Ikard
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McMillan
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Kans.
Mills
Mollohan
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray
Natcher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Reams
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Sutton
Teague
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Walter
Wheeler
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Winstead
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—214

Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bates
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonin
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burleson
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Campbell
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Coon
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fenton
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McVey
Mailliard
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Meader
Merrill
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morrison
Mumma
Neal
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
Oakman
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stauffer
Stringfellow
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Bender
Bentley
Boykin
Bramblett
Carlyle
Chatham
Chiperfield
Clardy
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Green
Hale
Hoffman, Mich.
Jensen
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Lucas
Lyle
McGregor
McIntire
Mack, Wash.
Miller, Calif.
Nelson
Patten
Pillion
Rayburn
Regan
Richards
Rivers
Roberts
Seely-Brown
Short
Sieminski
Tuck
Velde
Vinson
Weichel
Wilson, Tex.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Hale against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Bramblett against.

Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. Bentley against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Rayburn for, with Mr. Mack of Washington against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bender with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Vinson

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. Jones of Missouri.

Mr. Jensen with Mr. Carlyle.

Mr. Pillion with Mr. Wilson of Texas.

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION AND LABOR AND INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Education and Labor and Interstate and Foreign Commerce may meet during general debate tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTIONS 3185 AND 3186 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. HALLECK, for Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 488, Rept. No. 1456), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2556) to amend section 3185 of title 18, United States Code, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the appropriation bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate with reference to appropriations for TVA, quite a bit of information, as well as misinformation, has been brought out. Some have made charges that some Members of this body want to wreck TVA, and some who have defended

the $38 million reduction below the budget request have been charged with wanting to strangle it to death.

I think I am safe in saying that probably no Member in this House wants to destroy TVA and no Member in this House wants to strangle it to the point where it cannot adequately fulfill the purpose contemplated when the Congress set up this quasi-independent organization in the Tennessee Valley for the purpose largely of flood control which has later developed into the important business of generating electric power. I am willing to agree that every one appreciates the great contribution it has made even though it has been subsidized constantly by the taxpayers of the Federal Government generally. I think most will agree that up to date it has been a splendid investment, has generally been well managed and has made a tremendous contribution during past wars and through the electric power it has generated it has made a great contribution to national defense in that most of its power generated during wartime has been used by the Government and a great deal of its electrical energy has contributed to the development of all the atomic bombs.

The act setting up the Tennessee Valley Authority, of course, at that time confined its operations almost exclusively to the Tennessee Valley. Some of the objection on the part of many Members is the constant attempt to extend its operation far beyond the Tennessee Valley, 100 miles or more, in some instances. Some of the objection offered in this debate is raised due to the fact that industrial and business organizations throughout the valley are given a much lower power rate, thereby encouraging industries to leave other sections of the country and locate in or near the Tennessee Valley in order to take the opportunity of reducing their cost of operation at the expense of the taxpayers all over the Nation, where business organizations are compelled to include as a part of the cost of their operations the rate they have to pay for borrowing money, while the Tennessee Valley Authority pays no interest on the money borrowed from the Government for the building and extension of their power output in the Tennessee Valley.

They naturally feel that when they have paid their taxes and paid their interest on borrowed capital that they shouldn't be taxed in addition for the money borrowed from the Government, which is loaned to the Tennessee Valley Authority to build and extend their powerplants without any interest being paid. This is one of the debatable questions that has come up in the consideration of this legislation today.

Another question is raised by the amendment offered by Congressman BAKER to write back into this bill today $38 million which was requested by the Bureau of the Budget and the President. The President, through his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, recommended to the Congress a total appropriation of new money to TVA of approximately $142 million. The Committee on Appropriations has reduced this sum by $38 million. The President apparently feels, after going over this matter with his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, that the total sum requested is necessary to do the job properly the next year by the TVA.

Since the Government, during the coming year, will probably purchase 50 percent of the electric energy generated by the entire TVA I feel that this question should be resolved by the approval of the amendment of Congressman BAKER, of Tennessee, restoring the $38 million to the budget. Time may prove that they may very well get along without it and again the months ahead may prove that this $38 million is necessary. At any rate, this organization is controlled by the President and the Congress and if we appropriate a little too much in this instance I cannot see where the Government would lose as the excess would carry over into the coming year.

I think the best answer to those who charge that the Members of Congress are trying to strangle TVA is the fact that even without writing the $38 million back into the appropriation bill the TVA will have in cash to operate this tremendous utility beginning the first of next July $309 million. Of course, this operation is so large that it may need all of this money. In fact, the committee estimates that at the end of fiscal year 1955 if the $38 million is not restored by the pending amendment, TVA would have left over unspent $46 million and perhaps more. On the other hand, those who favor writing this amount back into the bill claim that unless it is done that the fund balance for operation and expansion would be whittled down to about $3 million which they contend is an insufficient balance to operate this great public utility.

I would rather be on the safe side in this particular instance and restore to the bill the $38 million reduction made by the committee.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7306 and to file its 12th intermediate report on budget justifications for procurement of overcoats.

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

There was no objection.

THE GLORY OF GREECE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Greek Independence Day I proudly hail the stalwart glorious Greek nation and its gallant people.

The glories of Greece would take volumes to recite, but one does not have to look to the past to find glories because they exist in the Greece of the very present hour. No nation in history has ever given a more inspiring example of determination to preserve its freedom than the Greek nation has given within the past few years.

Greece has been split and divided by the designs of diabolical communism into conflicting segments. War, and the aftermath of war, left a trail of sorrow, suffering, and privation through practically every community in the land. Fierce political agitation and social unrest promoted by the Communists spread internecine strife among the people; the economy was shot through with disorganization and debilitating influences. The fires of internal insurrection swept across the country. The hour was dark, the prospect dismal; heavy shadows spread over the land. Want, need, and bloodshed stalked through the streets of many places. But the gallant Greeks never lost heart and by their indomitable example they have revived the glories of ancient Greece in our modern day as never before in history.

It is true that our own Nation rendered substantial assistance in this great, inspiring fight against Communists so courageously waged by the Greek people. There is no question but that this wholehearted aid played a substantial part in rehabilitating their country and strengthening their purpose to fight internal Communist infiltration and to stand boldly against Communist aggression. But one fact stands out above all other in this situation; namely, that the Greek people themselves never lost heart, never lost their superb courage. Their will to preserve their precious freedom was predominant in their minds and was translated into their national consciousness.

Thus Greece has been stabilized by the invincible spirit of its people. It has taken its proud place by the side of those who are battling for democratic survival against Communist conspiracy—a battle that will continue until tyranny disappears and peace is again enthroned in the world.

There are still great issues to be resolved affecting Greek unity and autonomy. The nation is working desperately to invigorate its economic life and sustain its free way. Beset by vestiges of imperialism, it is both natural and commendable that the Greeks should seek to incorporate historically and traditionally Greek Cyprus into the national governmental structure. With these aims of self-determination, autonomy, and unity it behooves the liberty-loving peoples of the world to join, and it is particularly fitting that we of America from our great, strong bastion of freedom should lend our sympathy, encouragement, and assistance. May Greece under the benign Master endure throughout the centuries in freedom and peace.

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Congress is encouraged by the

clear, firm statements of Secretary of State Dulles before the Overseas Press Club of America on Monday night when he announced that our Government has no intention of recognizing Red China or acquiescing in that country's admission to the United Nations. This attitude of Mr. Dulles is especially liked by those of us who, in recent days, have been expressing the sentiments of this body with reference to the issue.

Secretary Dulles very courageously and effectively made out the case against Communist China as a disturber of the peace, and as an aggressor in Korea and Indochina. He cited the record to relate instance after instance of Communist violation of pacts and agreements. He made the indictment that, since the armistice in Korea, the Chinese have violated the terms of the agreement at least 40 times; and he indicated that the violations are probably much greater inasmuch as there is no way of actually determining them, because Swedish and Swiss members of the Supervisory Commission are prevented free access to North Korea to detect Communist violations. With reference to the fighting in Indochina, Mr. Dulles referred to the great strategic value of that area, and the fact that Communist control of Indochina would only precede attempts by the Communists to dominate all of southeast Asia. He referred to President Eisenhower's appraisal of the problem a week ago today when the President said that the area is of transcendent importance. The Secretary of State said that "the imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally would be a grave threat to the whole free community." He went on to say, "The United States feels that that possibility should not be passively accepted, but should be met by united action"—action which "might involve serious risks." It remains to be revealed what Mr. Dulles meant by "united action," but certainly there can be ready agreement with his postion that free peoples need to give notice to the Communists that action aimed at enslaving Asia will be met surely and decisively.

It is later than we think. The Red pressure is being put on Indochina to tidy that war theater for use as a Geneva showpiece. According to Anne O'Hare McCormick's writing on the editorial page of the New York Times on March 24:

> It is clear as print that the Communists launched their powerful offensive last week with the object of gaining a smashing victory on the eve of the Geneva Conference. The Communist game is to intensify the pressure to make France more amenable at Geneva.

This vividly illustrates how the master minds of the Communist conspiracy in Moscow and Peiping use aggression to further their inimical aims.

Communist diplomacy takes its cue from the words of its late master, Stalin.

> Words—
>
> Stalin said—
>
> must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing—actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water on wooden iron.

Certainly, the Communists are giving ample evidence that they are following Stalin's words to the letter.

The effort to extend the Communist domain goes on unendingly, day and night; not only in the aggressive search for territory and raw materials, but also for the souls and minds of mankind.

This reality we must have ever before us if we, in our day, are to do our duty in preserving liberty and passing on the institutions of free, democratic Western society to those who will come after us. We are in a time of historic challenge, and much depends on how we conduct ourselves.

In view of recent developments, Mr. Speaker, it would be time well spent, not wasted, to retrace the events of former years and briefly review the record.

It is a well established fact, of course, that, when Mussolini sent his legions into Ethiopia and the powers of Europe countenanced that outrageous aggression, it spelled the end of collective security in that day. The lesson of the major European powers' backdown in that instant was not lost on an obscure Austrian who had power-crazed dreams of his own, and it was not long before Hitler was summoning Chamberlain to Munich and shaming the British Lion before the world. Despite all the heroic efforts of the appeasement press to sugar-coat that bitter pill, it was only too apparent that the sellout at Munich had not guaranteed the peace, but had, in reality, insured World War II.

Now we have before us the possibility of a Munich for Asia, and that may take place at the forthcoming Geneva Conference; but I must not get ahead of my story.

Is our memory so short or our conscience so dulled that we have already forgotten Korea? Perhaps we had better refresh our recollections.

For 18 months prior to the attack of the North Koreans upon their brothers in the Republic of Korea, the Reds had been massed in strength on the north side of the 38th parallel. This had all been carefully planned by Moscow, in concert with the Chinese Reds. There had been a number of border incidents, prior to June 25, involving several thousand troops. This was all a buildup to the decisive thrust which gave the invaders the invaluable element of surprise in the big push. It is well to bear in mind that the Republic of Korea, created and established under the sponsorship of the United Nations, and having no aims of aggression, had only such arms and trained manpower as were required for internal security.

To destroy this national infant of the United Nations' creation was a prize of real worth to the Communist world, for apart from what it would give them in the way of another captive state, think what it would have meant in the way of destroying the prestige of the United Nations.

Despite the fact that ROK forces had only a minimum of arms necessary to preserve internal security, and in the face of overwhelming odds, the defenders of the Republic of Korea fought bravely and won the time necessary for aid to arrive, and eventually, with American aid, turned back the invader.

We all know the marvelous accomplishments of our soldiery in Korea, and how we really defeated the enemy; so, too, do we know that when we were getting on to the point where the conflict could have been terminated in victory, a new and greater problem was created by the Chinese Reds who poured their troops into the fight by the hundreds of thousands. This accounted for high American and Allied casualties and ultimately for the stalemate that cheated our fighting men of a victory that was rightly theirs.

This is the same Red China that propaganda artists are trying to paint wings on, the same Red China that some Western powers are literally breaking their necks trying to do business with. This is the same Red China that has thrown several hundred American citizens in jail without due process of law, the same Red China that cannot account for more than 7,000 American military personnel who are conveniently listed as missing.

At this point, let us be reminded that no less a figure than former Gen. Mark Clark only a few weeks ago made the statement that the Chinese Communists are holding 3,000 war prisoners, at least 1,000 of whom are Americans. Yet, these same Chinese Reds are the international blackmailers with whom we are sitting at Geneva in the near future; these are the warmakers who would bludgeon their way into the United Nations on the pretense of reforming that organization.

How right is Dr. Syngman Rhee when he declares, in warning the Free World anew on the dangers of communism:

> We should deal with communism as we would a contagious disease. It is the most dangerous epidemic man has ever known. The only way to combat it effectively is to isolate and confine it and then eventually eradicate it.

These are strong and pointed words, Mr. Speaker, spoken by a man who knows whereof he speaks. And, regarding this danger, President Rhee has these additional observations:

> We are dealing with a vigilant and insidious enemy that is thoroughly conversant with the arts of infiltration and subversion. One third of the world's population now stands in the Communist camp, and the enemy is gaining. None of us can afford to forget, even for a moment, that their ultimate objective is to defeat and destroy democratic, imperialistic, and capitalistic America. As the Red revolution proceeds, we must watch carefully for such precursors as riots, strikes, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare. These are part and parcel of a global conspiracy to bring about a single Communist world.

Let us keep these words in mind, Mr. Speaker, when we hear specious pleas to recognize Red China, trade with Red China, and admit Red China to the United Nations.

As a course of sound national action, before we even sit down in formal session with the Chinese Reds at Geneva—a development which can only increase their prestige throughout Asia—we should insist that they release all war

prisoners who are being held, and that they also give freedom to all of the Americans and other nationals being kept in jail. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Reds are going to attempt to use these prisoners, war and civilian, as hostages as they bargain to better their position, politically and economically. This will be blackmail of the first order, and, for us to submit to it, is comparable to the American citizen and the community paying racketeers for protection on the homefront.

I respectfully urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Defense purify lists of all the missing from the American armed services who were summoned to fight in the Korean war, and that those purified lists be given to the Secretary of State, and that Mr. Dulles, in turn, present the lists to the Reds at Geneva with the demand that the hostages be freed. This is the very minimum course which our morality and honor demand, Mr. Speaker. America must not be craven before this crowd of international gangsters and murderers. Heaven forbid that the day should ever arrive when, from any false consideration of expediency, diplomatic advantage, or "smart" trading, we lack the moral courage and the stamina to give full and meaningful protection to our nationals. If we be so lacking, then this mighty Nation is on the way to ruin and degradation. No, let our Government match the courage and intrepidity of the brave American fighting men who are resting today under a forest of white crosses in Korea. It is late, Mr. Speaker, very late, but thank God, not too late for us as a people and as a Nation to assert the strong, virile, moral leadership that the people of the world are entitled to receive from America.

I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that trial balloons are being sent up daily on the twin proposition of recognition and admission. A foot-in-the-door opener is considered to have been made by having Red China sit in on the Geneva Conference on April 26. This ought to be a storm signal to us. The Republican leadership in the other body is duly concerned about it. The GOP leaders there are disquieted about the forthcoming conference. It is well that they should be. America must be aroused so that this forthcoming conference will not be used as a bargaining place for subsequent recognition of Red China by the United States, or for the Mao regime's entrance into the United Nations.

It is to be hoped that, despite all the primed efforts to bring about a conditioned climate favorable to Red China's admission to the U. N., commonsense and international decency will prevail and the issue will never be dignified by formally coming before that body.

Yet we must not overlook the recent development in the U. N., Mr. Speaker, in which the British representative, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, took up the cudgels for Red China. His position, no matter how uncomfortable it may be personally, is understandable officially, for Great Britain has already recognized the Red China regime and is agreeable to her admission to the U. N. May I just add parenthetically that Red China has not responded in kind, and Britain, for rushing in with recognition, has been left hanging high and dry.

Sir Gladwyn offered an interesting thesis for Red China's admission at a future date when he suggested, in effect, that the Mao regime should become eligible for admission to the United Nations when Red China has purged herself of aggression. This is an interesting basis for consideration, to say the least. Thus far, as the New York Times pointed out on March 20, in an editorial entitled "Red China and the U. N.," the Red China regime "has not even admitted to the fact of its aggression, much less shown any inclination to abandon it. Peiping has not deviated in the slightest from the charge that it is the United Nations that is the aggressor, and therefore any genuine purge of aggression seems improbable."

Concluding the editorial, the Times advised the French Government that "there is neither logic nor profit in paying a bribe to the Communists to get their worthless promise not to do again what they had no business doing in the first place."

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this body may have the benefit of this cogent, well-reasoned editorial, I have asked that it be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It is an encouraging sign to have a journal of the prestige and influence of the New York Times give us this penetrating analysis on such an important international question.

Mr. Lodge's recent firm stand at Lake Success with respect to the question of Red China's admission to the U. N. assumes great importance in view of the forthcoming Geneva Conference. We may as well be candid and admit that Russia has, in effect, achieved a diplomatic triumph in getting Red China admitted to this conference. Mr. Molotov made certain that nothing of any moment was accomplished at the recent Berlin Conference. He had no intention of agreeing to anything constructive there, and it was plainly to be seen by anyone willing to look a fact in the eye that he had no desire to reach any kind of an agreement on European security, a unified Germany, or a free Austria. Molotov played all of his cards toward achieving the one supreme objective—getting Red China invited to the Geneva Conference, the first step in Russia's nefarious program of endeavoring to eventually get Red China into the U. N.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that before the Berlin conference, Secretary of State Dulles was most articulate in stating that he would not agree to a five-power meeting with Communist China. Well, that meeting is set and agreed upon and is only a short time away.

What the West has to guard against, and the United States in particular, is that the Geneva conference will not be used for a settlement with Red China that will constitute a sell-out. If Mao's representatives come away from Geneva with a diplomatic victory on the Indochina war, then the cause of democracy in Asia will have suffered a severe setback. Mr. Dulles' Monday night talk is all the more welcome against this background of events.

The fact remains, however, and I say this with the greatest respect for the good intentions of Mr. Dulles, that we can take nothing for granted on this matter. Just the other day, on March 24 to be exact, the Secretary General of the United Nations, according to the New York Times, emphasized the importance of timing in connection with any moves to admit Communist China to the United Nations.

This matter is so important that I am going to quote it here and now, giving the brief article in full:

U. N. LEADER FAVORS TALKS WITH PEIPING

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 24.—Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold emphasized today the importance of "timing" in connection with any moves to admit Communist China to the United Nations.

Some Western countries have been reported as favoring Communist China's entry if the Geneva Conference on Far Eastern problems showed that Peiping would abandon aggressive plans.

Mr. Hammarskjold did not go into details, but commented at a press conference: "If you want to negotiate with somebody, it is rather useful to have them at the table."

He also revealed that practical arrangements were being discussed for dealing with the controversy over the presence of United States military observers in Kashmir. India has asked for their removal on the ground that they could not be considered neutral. But Mr. Hammerskjold repeated his stand that all United Nations agents had to be presumed to be neutral in the conduct of United Nations business.

He said he had sounded out Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina as to whether they would accept former war prisoners now in Korea. About 50 have expressed a desire to go to these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to the essential clue in the foregoing story. It is, in the Secretary General's words:

If you want to negotiate with somebody, it is rather useful to have them at the table.

Well, as Shakespeare so well said in King Richard III, "Wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch," and we will be at the table at Geneva. Russia will be there, and Red China will be there. Let us keep all of this in mind in the days when we sit down with those whose voice is as Jacob's voice but whose hands are the hands of Esau—all of which points to the fact that we are approaching a most crucial event in the world of diplomacy and international affairs.

The forthcoming Geneva Conference draws an invisible line across the path of the nations of the Free World. Much hangs in the balance. With courage, firmness, determination, faith in our own strength and in the favor of God, we can stand for principles that will ultimately redeem the world to freedom. But, if we vacillate and barter and temporize and compromise—if we yield to the expediency of the moment, we, as a nation, will have reached the zenith of power and influence, and forevermore this Nation's greatness and prestige will recede as the rays of the dying sun. Make no mistake about it, this is one of the great moral issues of the ages; it summons America to greatness. We will falter at our own peril.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to summarize my argument by adducing the statement of the case against Red China as enunciated by Free-

man Magazine in its issue of March 8. These are 10 good reasons why we should neither recognize Communist China diplomatically nor countenance its admission to the United Nations.

1. Either of these steps would be a stunning blow to our anti-Communist friends in Asia and a stimulus to Communist expansion.

2. Red China is an unrepentant and partially successful aggressor in Korea.

3. The Chinese Communist regime is keeping alive the war in Indochina and stirring up as much trouble as possible throughout Asia.

4. This regime has made a practice of insulting and maltreating American diplomats and other American citizens within its power.

5. The torture and maltreatment of U. N. war prisoners by the Red Chinese and North Koreans is a major international scandal.

6. The Red Chinese government shows no sign of abating its terrific "Hate America" propaganda, including lying charges of germ warfare.

7. This Chinese government has engaged in huge extortion rackets against foreign business firms still stuck in China, and against Chinese abroad.

8. Anything that enhanced international prestige of Red China would expose the large Chinese communities in southeast Asia to Communist pressure, infiltration, and coercion.

9. The unfortunate British experiment of recognizing Red China has proved a pitiful fiasco, morally, politically, and economically.

10. Among other unsavory activities, the Communist gang in control of China has gone in for illegal narcotics trade and for piracy against Japanese and other foreign vessels.

I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that the foregoing indictment against Red China is well drawn.

Mr. Speaker, with an evil tyranny abroad in the world, and while jungle law prevails in many areas as the strong devour the weak, we should remember this fact: None but the whole world will suffice to consummate the Communist dream of world conquest. Alerted to the danger of this Communist international conspiracy, we can cope with it. The recognition of a problem is 50 percent of its solution. At long last, painfully long, we are beginning to recognize the Communist International threat for what it is—the planned, purposeful malignant domination of the free world, and the destruction of all liberty.

We know, too, that, to be safe, we must be strong; strong in purpose, strong in actuality; strong, not only in armament, but also in moral and spiritual faith. We know that peace-loving peoples, at every turn, must labor indefatigably to foil the false prophets of totalitarianism, to overcome wrong ideas with right ones, and to be prepared, if necessary, to conquer force with greater force. There is no room for weakness and indecision, no place for political immorality in foreign policy.

We must match a militancy of the democratic spirit with an efficient and all-powerful military organization, and, especially, we must marshal and build a greater moral and spiritual strength; only then can the world be free of terror, aggression, and the spiritual casualties of police stateism.

The world—the world worth saving, the democratic world wherein men may walk upright in real security and simple dignity—looks to us. There can be no deals with evil, no embracing infamy, no sell-outs of principle for expediency. If we trade principles for profits, we are inviting our own ruin. Our guiding policy in the days ahead, at Geneva and beyond, must be the preservation of the moral base that is the foundation of our Western society. True to his sense of origin from the hand of God, man, endowed with inalienable rights by his Creator, can achieve for civilization whatever is necessary for its survival and flourishing progress. Let the panderers of dollar diplomacy beware. American honor and integrity are not for sale. Geneva please take notice.

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity, with all its fears.
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

We know what Master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope;
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!

Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave, and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, Nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee!

Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1954]

RED CHINA AND THE U. N.

Obviously increasing pressure from several quarters for further consideration of the early admission of Communist China to the United Nations has impelled the chief of our delegation to assert that he would not shrink from the use of the veto to prevent that admission, but that he does not believe this course will be necessary. There is ample reason to believe that if he did have to use the veto he would be hailed throughout this country as reflecting accurately the sentiments of the American people.

The latest additions to the discussion of this issue came from the Pilgrim's Dinner in London. There Sir Gladwyn Jebb expressed the belief that once Red China purged itself of its aggression it should be admitted to the world organization. In this view he appears to have been supported by the Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, who held that "all the representatives of the main centers of power must be there" when the nations meet around the conference table. In some ways the latter view is the more troubling of the two.

Sir Gladwyn has at least put a vital reservation and condition upon his recommendations. He suggests, in effect, that Red China would not be eligible until this "purge" of aggression had taken place. On the record, thus far, this seems an unlikely contingency at any time in the near future. Thus far Red China has not even admitted to the fact of its aggression, much less shown any inclination to abandon it. Peiping has not deviated in the slightest from the charge that it is the United Nations that is the aggressor, and therefore any genuine "purge" of aggression seems improbable.

If the Chinese Reds go to Geneva with ironclad guaranties that their soldiers will get out and stay out of Korea and that their military supplies will positively not be furnished for the killing of one more Vietnamese or Frenchman, Sir Gladwyn will have a case that can be made persuasive. There is no reason to suspect such a Communist volte-face.

On the other argument, that "all centers of power" ought to be represented in international councils, it should be observed that much depends on what the power is and for what it is used. In this case a "center of power" that has been named by the United Nations as an aggressor is demanding a place in the councils of a body whose purpose is to oppose aggression.

The preliminary maneuvers in Moscow and Peiping strongly suggest that the Chinese Communists will make some "concessions," especially to the French, in return for recognition of their claim to a seat on the Security Council. How good such concessions would prove to be can be judged only by the past. We believe that the French will be well advised to realize, and that the United States will continue sternly to insist, that there is neither logic nor profit in paying a bribe to the Communists to get their worthless promise not to do again what they had no business doing in the first place.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia for his very splendid expression of sound, moral principles.

After hearing your able and informative speech I would immediately presume that the gentleman from West Virginia did not favor the morally bankrupt policy of containment which certain misguided careerists in the Government tried to foist upon the Democratic Party and are now attempting to have the Eisenhower administration embrace. I should like to remind the Members of the House that the Democratic Party denied any responsibility for the containment policy during the 1952 elections. I am also aware that the Republican Party also denied the policy of containment and pledged the American people a policy of liberation in order to avoid the certain prospects of all-out war. It is clear, therefore, that neither of the two great political parties of the United States want anything to do with the morally bankrupt policy of containment.

It is refreshing to hear such a fine speech made by the gentleman from West Virginia, particularly since it comes at a time immediately after the author of containment, George Kennan, has made another speech again attempting to mislead and confuse the American people.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman, and I do not hesitate to agree.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from West Virginia has made one of the ablest addresses that I have heard in this Chamber. It is very evident from the gentleman's remarks, that he has given the subject much deep thought, and has expressed to his colleagues in the most effective and interpretive and analytical way the world situation as it exists today with relation to Indochina, and more particularly with reference to the coming Geneva Conference. On the floor of the House a few weeks ago, I had something to say about the danger of the coming Geneva Conference, not

in criticism, but in the nature of a warning. The gentleman from West Virginia has done the same thing.

The remarks made by the distinguished gentleman in his first term in this body are outstanding and are on a high statesmanship level. I want to congratulate him, and, in turn, congratulate the people of his district for having as their Representative in this body the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I am humbly grateful for those kind remarks, spoken as they have been by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I should like to add my congratulations to those who have preceded me. I hope the gentleman will strive to have his address put in small pamphlet form. I think it would be widely read if duly captioned. I congratulate the gentleman from West Virgina.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished gentleman, my colleague from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CANFIELD]. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means will begin hearings tomorrow on President Eisenhower's recommendations for extending and improving social security. President Eisenhower's proposals have been embodied in a bill, H. R. 7199, introduced by the distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. REED.

I am supporting Mr. REED's bill wholeheartedly. It is an excellent bill. It should command the support of every Member who wishes to improve our social-security program.

There are about 200 bills affecting social security pending in the Ways and Means Committee. Some of these bills would change the social-security program in a very fundamental way involving large sums of money and would call for weeks upon weeks of protracted and controversial hearings. It is impossible in the time remaining in this session to consider all these complex proposals. We must, therefore, not waste time and energy on proposals which have no chance of adoption but must concentrate our energy in getting Mr. REED's bill reported out promptly and passed by the House.

I have pledged the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] my full support in getting his bill passed. I have introduced a companion bill, H. R. 8629, identical to his carrying out the President's recommendations.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

What are the main provisions of our bill?

First, it extends coverage under OASI to some 10½ million additional persons. Among those covered would be farmers, the professional self-employed groups, many additional farmhands and domestic workers, and certain State and local governmental employees and clergymen on a voluntary-group basis.

Second, the bill increases benefits for those retiring in the future and will also increase the average benefits of persons already retired by about $6 to $7 a month. Dependents and survivors of insured workers would receive proportionate increases.

Third, the maximum-wage base on which contributions and benefits are computed is increased from $3,600 to $4,200 a year.

Fourth, a waiver-of-premium provision is added to protect the OASI rights of persons who become permanently and totally disabled.

Fifth, the retirement test is liberalized substantially. The exempt amount is increased from $75 a month to $1,000 a year. Thereafter each $80 of earnings in excess of $1,000 would result in deduction of 1 month's benefit.

Sixth, up to 4 years of low or no earnings would be eliminated in computing an individual's average wage upon which benefits are based.

I want to comment on each of these important improvements in the program.

EXTENDED COVERAGE

One of the most important recommendations made by the President is the extension of coverage to 10½ million additional people.

Included in this extension is OASI coverage for about 3 million self-employed farmers. Many farmers are in the older age groups and, therefore, would receive benefits under the program within a few years. As a matter of fact, many older farmers, farmers who have worked from time to time in industrial jobs covered under the insurance system, would be able to count these past earnings toward their eligibility for social-security benefits. For instance, a farmer now age 65, who had four quarters of coverage from work in a war plant during 1944, would be eligible to draw retirement benefits after 1 year of farm coverage under the bill.

The social-security amendments of 1950 extended coverage to millions of self-employed persons in large cities, in towns, and small villages throughout the country. The experience under these provisions has been very successful. Nearly 5 million self-employed persons have been covered by OASI since 1951. Three years of experience have indicated that the forms are reasonably simple to understand and fill out. There are no complicated additional records which have to be kept. The same general forms for farmers would be equally applicable and equally simple.

As an additional simplification for farmers the bill provides for a method by which a small-farm operator can determine his net income from farming for social-security purposes without keeping any special records. Farmers with gross incomes from farming of less than $1,800 a year can just report one-half of their gross income as their net income for social-security purposes. This is certainly simple and a convenient method to obtain social-security coverage.

The bill would extend the protection of the insurance program to many farm and household workers now excluded by removing the requirement that these individuals must work a specified number of days for one employer. The bill retains the provision that a worker's wages from any one employer must be $50 to be sufficient to give him a quarter of coverage. Besides bringing in many household workers who need coverage badly, these changes will have the additional advantage of making it easier and simpler for an employer to determine when his workers are included in the social-security program.

Many of the persons who are not protected today have worked in employment covered by social security from time to time and have paid contributions. Unless their earnings from their present employments are also credited to their social-security record the protection gained from past employment may be lost entirely.

The extension of coverage will result in higher benefits to the worker upon retirement and to his widow and dependent children. Persons who shift in and out of covered employment generally suffer a reduction in their benefit payments because not all their earnings can be counted in the computation of their benefits. Under a broader coverage system, the chances are greatly reduced that a shift in occupation will adversely affect a person's insurance benefits.

COVERAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill will enable many additional employees of States and localities to be covered by social security.

At present most State and local employees are not able to take advantage of social security because the law specifically prohibits OASI coverage for persons who are in positions covered under a retirement system on the date an agreement is made between the Federal Government and the State or locality.

This specific provision was written into the law in 1950 at the request of many State and local employee groups. However, there seems to have been a very important shift in attitude since 1950 among these employee groups. Practically all of them, with the possible exception of policemen and firemen, now wish to have the Social Security Act changed.

I believe that the law should be changed to permit those who wish to obtain coverage to do so. This is only fair and proper.

There are many State and local employees in my own State of New Jersey who wish to come under OASI but cannot obtain coverage. This is because due to age or other factors they are not members of a retirement system but still are technically in positions covered by a retirement system. This situation exists in my own county of Essex. The law should be changed to remedy this defect. I am sure the Ways and Means Commit-

tee will take prompt and effective action to make this change.

There are also groups such as teachers in my State who wish to be covered under OASI and then revise their retirement system to supplement OASI. In this way, they can have an improved retirement and survivorship program, but the present law prohibits them from accomplishing the purpose they have in mind. The bill would change the present law so that they could have old-age and survivors insurance coverage if they want it.

COVERAGE OF MILITARY SERVICE

While the draft is in existence, certainly there should be no gap in a worker's social-security record while he is in the military service. As it seems probable that the draft, or at least some form of military service, may continue indefinitely, we should give consideration as to whether it would not be wise to cover military service under OASI on a permanent basis.

This would not only improve the benefits for such persons but would strengthen the actuarial status of the OASI system.

INCREASED BENEFITS

The bill provides for an increase in insurance benefits to the aged and to widows and children.

There is no questioning the fact that benefits under the present law are inadequate. The average benefit for a retired person is only about $50 a month at present. Some beneficiaries receive as much as $85 a month but others, with low earnings or with only short periods of coverage prior to 1951, receive as little as $25 a month. Most aged beneficiaries have very little regular income outside of what they receive from the insurance program. When sickness strikes they have very meager financial resources to meet their medical bills. An increasing number of insurance beneficiaries have had to apply for public assistance because of the inadequacy of their insurance benefits. This trend will contine and increase unless we take steps now to raise insurance benefits.

The level of insurance benefits was first established in the law as enacted in 1935. In 1939, the law was changed to increase benefits in the early years but to decrease benefits in the later years. In 1950, benefits were raised to reflect the rapid increase in the cost of living which occurred between 1939 and 1950. In 1952, benefits were increased to reflect the increase in wages which occurred during 1950–51. All of these changes did not basically alter the fact that the benefits were too low when the law was originally enacted.

We have now had 14 years of experience with the payment of OASI benefits. As President Eisenhower has stated:

> For OASI to fulfill its purpose of helping to combat destitution, these benefits are too low.

The benefits now being received by retired workers would be increased under the bill by an average of about $6 to $7 a month. Dependents and survivors would receive proportionate increases. Increases would also be provided for persons retiring in the future, and for those who become eligible for benefits as widows or orphans. The minimum payment to a retired person would be increased from $25 to $30 a month. The maximum benefit would be raised from $168.75 to $190.

There is one proposal which has been introduced in the Congress and which is pending before the Ways and Means Committee which increases the insurance benefits only at the minimum level. I believe that it is important to increase the minimum benefit. But I am opposed to ignoring those who receive more than the minimum. Our insurance program is a wage-related program. We must retain a reasonable relationship between wages and benefits all along the line. We should raise the minimum and maximum benefits; we must increase the maximum wage base; we must increase benefits all along the line so that we maintain a wage-related benefit program with significant differentials for persons who have contributed on higher wages.

I believe we must be very careful not to adopt any proposals which, as attractive as they may sound at first blush, would undermine the contributory and wage-related principles underlying our present program.

INCREASE IN THE WAGE BASE

The bill increases the maximum wage base on which contributions and benefits are based from $3,600 to $4,200 a year. This is an important and essential improvement in the program.

As I have already pointed out, it is vital that we retain and strengthen the wage-related principle in the insurance program. But if the wage base is not increased, a larger and larger proportion of the benefits will fail to reflect the increased wage levels of the great majority of persons contributing to the system. If a larger and larger proportion of persons receive the same benefit, the system will tend to become more and more a uniform benefit program. This would be undesirable because of the great differentials in wages which exist in this country.

Wage and benefit differentials assure us that we will preserve and improve the incentive elements in our social-security system and in our economy. That is why I advocate both the benefit and wage-base increases in the bill. And that is why I shall vigorously oppose those proposals which fail to take these important factors into account.

I should particularly like to point out that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have endorsed the principle of an increase in the maximum wage base even though they clearly recognize that it means the employees affected will have to pay higher contributions. All of the railroad labor groups are supporting an increase from $3,600 to $4,200 in the Railroad Retirement Act. This overwhelming support of labor for this important principle is a recognition of the fact that they too believe in the importance of this change in the bill.

PRESERVATION OF INSURANCE RIGHTS OF DISABLED

President Eisenhower's recommendation for a waiver of premium provision for the disabled is particularly gratifying to me. I originally sponsored this proposal in 1952 and in 1953. I am again urging its adoption now.

And I should like to repeat what I said on the floor of the House on June 16, 1952, when I urged passage of such a provision:

> The important issue, in my mind, is shall this inequity continue by which those who become totally and permanently disabled or blind after having regularly and faithfully paid their tax toward their retirement benefits now find themselves, when they reach the age of 65, receiving much lower social-security benefits owing to their misfortune?

The waiver of premium provision in the bill would eliminate the reduction in old-age and survivors insurance benefits now suffered by individuals who become permanently and totally disabled.

Under the existing law, if a worker should find himself totally and permanently disabled while still of working age he may lose his rights entirely or his ultimate benefit upon reaching retirement age may be sharply cut.

The reason for this inequity is that social-security benefits are based on the average wage received in covered employment—employment under which one contributes to social security—from the time a worker is first employed until he retires at 65 or over.

Under the present law, let us suppose that a worker aged 35 becomes permanently and totally disabled after having worked 10 years in covered employment at a yearly average wage of $2,400. By the time he reaches retirement age—65—his total wages spread over a period of 30 years—20 of them without any earnings—will yield an average of $800 rather than $2,400 per year, and his old-age insurance benefit under the present law would be about $33 a month.

This is manifestly unfair and the bill, among its provisions, would provide that the equity the worker built up before becoming permanently and totally disabled should be protected by freezing his wage record.

In the example I have cited my proposal would make $2,400 his average wage so that under this provision and the increased benefits in the bill he will receive a benefit of $78.50 a month when he reaches the retirement age instead of the $33 which he would receive under present law.

LIBERALIZING THE RETIREMENT TEST

A very important part of the bill is the section which improves, liberalizes, and simplifies the retirement test. Under the present law an OASI beneficiary who earns wages of more than $75 a month, loses his benefit for such month.

The bill exempts the first $1,000 of annual earnings under the retirement test, and for amounts earned above $1,000 a year only 1 month's benefit is deducted for each additional $80 earned.

The great liberalization which would result from this new test can be best understood from two illustrations. Under the present law a beneficiary drawing

$100 a month for himself and his wife would, if he worked throughout the year at $90 a month, lose all 12 months of benefits. But under the bill he would lose only 1 month's benefit—a gain of $1,100 a year.

A beneficiary receiving a benefit of $120 a month for himself and his wife who takes a $200-a-month job under the present law for 5 months loses 5 months' benefits—a loss of $600. Under the bill he would receive benefits for all 12 months in the year—a gain of 5 months' benefits or $600 a year.

There are some people who advocate complete repeal of the retirement test. I do not favor this proposal. It would increase the cost of the insurance program by about 1 percent of payroll. This would mean increasing the payroll tax on employers another one-half of 1 percent and on employees one-half of 1 percent. It would mean increasing the tax on the self-employed another three-quarters of 1 percent.

Social-security benefits were never envisioned as an annuity to be paid to all workers upon reaching the age of 65. It is a system by which benefits are to be paid only upon virtual retirement.

The revised retirement test contained in the bill eliminates some of the major inequities in the retirement provisions in the present law. It is an important step forward. After we have had some experience with it, perhaps we can liberalize it still further. But increasing the exempt amount in the retirement test from $1,000 to $1,200 and from $80 to $100 would increase the level-premium costs of the program an additional eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. This is a matter which deserves continued attention.

DROPPING OUT THE LOWEST 4 YEARS

Since the level of OASI benefits is related to the average of a worker's past earnings, periods of abnormally low earnings, or no earnings at all, are averaged in with periods of normal earnings, thereby reducing the benefits received by the retired worker. In many instances, a worker may earn little or nothing for a number of months or several years because of illness or other personal adversity beyond his power of prevention or remedy. Thus, the level of benefits is reduced below its true relation to the earning capabilities of the employee. Moreover, if the additional millions of persons recommended for inclusion under OASI are brought into the program in 1955 without modification of present law, their average earnings will be sharply lowered by the necessity of including as a period of no earnings the period from 1951 to 1955 when they were not in the program. The bill provides, therefore, that in the computation of a worker's average monthly wage, the 4 lowest years of earnings be eliminated.

FINANCING THE IMPROVEMENTS

These six changes in the insurance program will greatly improve the benefits, increase the number eligible for benefits, and strengthen the entire program. But improvements cost money. How will they be paid for?

The bill provides for an increase in the contribution schedule approximately equal to the net additional cost of the improvements. The insurance program is thus retained on a self-supporting basis without any subsidy from the Federal Treasury.

It should be remembered that the extension of coverage and the increase in the wage base from $3,600 to $4,200 a year result in increased income to the insurance system. These two changes offset to some extent the cost of the other benefit improvements. The net effect, after taking into account both these factors, is to increase the level-premium cost of the program about six-tenths of 1 percent of payroll. For the sake of simplicity and ease of making computations for employers and employees, the ultimate payroll contributions have been increased one-half of 1 percent to be shared equally between employers and employees.

To fully finance the entire net cost of the improvements the contribution rates would have had to be increased about six-tenths of 1 percent. However, this would have resulted in complex computation provisions for employers and employees. It was thought best to retain the rates in multiples of one-half of 1 percent on both parties. If subsequent actuarial evaluations indicate the need for upward or downward adjustment of these rates they can easily be made in sufficient time. The law already provides for the Board of Trustees of the OASI Trust Fund to report to the Congress each year on the actuarial status of the system.

The important point is that the bill makes reasonably adequate provision for financing the cost of the improvements. I believe that we must always take into account the long-run costs of improvements in the program. We must assure ourselves that any changes preserve and safeguard the financial integrity of the program. We must assure the contributors to the system that we have set up a fair and equitable financial arrangement for meeting future benefits and future costs.

The bill, in my opinion, accomplishes all these purposes. It improves the program. It maintains the financial soundness of the system. It makes changes in the areas which require immediate attention. It puts first things first. It is a balanced and sound program.

I have pointed out a number of times that a very important feature of our present insurance program is that benefits should be paid as an earned right without regard to a means test. I strongly believe that payments to individuals should come to them as a matter of right. The law specifically provides that persons have legally enforceable rights in very plain terms.

Section 205 (g) of the Social Security Act expressly provides that anyone who is denied benefits may go into court to enforce them. This provision was put into the law by Congress in 1939, and since that time there have been many cases decided by the courts. One case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, which decided that benefits should be paid in a situation where the administrative agency had thought they were not payable. There are many such cases which have been handled by the lower courts. So this provision of the law is anything but a dead letter, and it is used frequently.

We have today a contributory insurance system, with benefits assured by law and enforceable in court. There are those who have attacked the system claiming that it is not insurance because it is not contractual, and at the same time criticizing the system because it makes commitments to pay specific amounts indefinitely into the future. I submit that it is utterly impractical and would be grossly unfair to maintain a contributory system unless we are prepared also to maintain the commitment to pay benefits in the future, and to go on paying them as a matter of legal right.

By all means let us continue to study ways to better the system. But let us not be diverted from the real problem by semantics as to whether it was proper for Congress to refer to the system as an insurance program. Let those who do not believe in contributory insurance say so frankly, but let the rest of us accept the fact that the contributors to the system have, and are entitled to have, solid legal assurance that their benefits will be paid when due.

INCREASED INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS

A most important result of passage of the bill which has not been widely publicized is the increased insurance benefits for widows and orphans.

Most people know that social security provides insurance benefits to older persons when they retire. But many people do not realize that social security also provides monthly insurance benefits when the breadwinner dies and leaves a widow and dependent children. Of the 6 million persons drawing social-security benefits each month at the present time, over 1 million are children and 250,000 are widows caring for these children. In addition, there are over 500,000 widows age 65 and over and nearly 25,000 aged parents drawing benefits.

In my own State of New Jersey there are over 62,000 survivors drawing insurance benefits at the present time. Of this number 29,000 are children, over 8,000 are mothers caring for these children, 25,000 are widows age 65 or over, and 850 are parents age 65 and over.

Every one of the improvements in the bill will increase the insurance benefits for survivors as well as for the aged. The extension of coverage will extend the survivors protection to the families of the newly covered groups. Many a person in these groups such as a farmer, a farmhand, or a domestic worker has little or no private insurance at all to protect his widow and children. The bill will give them much needed protection. Many State and local governmental employees who are covered under a retirement plan have little or no survivors insurance protection in the event of their death. Many professional self-employed persons have very little survivors protec-

tion when they first begin to practice and while their family and financial responsibilities are increasing.

The increased insurance benefits will also help widows and orphans who are now drawing benefits or who will become eligible for benefits in the future. The maximum monthly benefit, for instance, to a widow and two young children will be increased from $168.75 to $190. Certainly $190 a month is not excessive in these times for a mother to feed, clothe, and educate children where the deceased father had been earning $300 a month or more. A widow with 2 children eligible for $140 a month under the present law would be increased to $157. A widow with 1 child now eligible for $93.80 would have her benefits increased to $120 a month. Survivors' families already drawing benefits would also have their benefits increased.

The waiver of premium provision would also be of substantial help to widows and orphans. Under the present law, the longer a disabled man lives, the greater is the possibility that when he dies his family will not get any survivors' insurance benefits whatsoever. This is due to the fact that the disability which prevents him from working and earning also prevents him from contributing to the social-security program. By preserving his insurance rights when he is disabled, thousands of widows and children will receive benefits where benefits would be lost under the present law. In other cases benefits will be increased by dropping out the period of disability in computing the individual's average wage for benefit purposes.

The liberalization of the retirement test will liberalize the provisions for mothers as well as aged persons. Likewise the 4-year dropout in the computation of the average wage will help to increase survivors' benefits.

The importance of the survivors' insurance benefits in the program—and the improvements made by the bill—cannot be overemphasized. These benefits help to keep families together. They enable children where fathers have died to have a fair chance for a healthy, happy life and an education. These family benefits are one of the most valuable and constructive parts of the whole social-security program.

I supported the improvements in the family benefits which were made to the insurance program in 1950 and 1952. The 1954 improvements are another step in the process of helping to preserve family life. I shall continue to urge strengthening and improvement of this essential aspect of the program.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

In this connection I would like to discuss the implications of one proposal pending before the Ways and Means Committee which amends the Social Security Act by repealing the Federal grants to the States for aid to dependent children—title IV of the Social Security Act. This is part of a bill which would blanket all over 65 and widows and children into OASI, whether or not they had made contributions to the system. I gather the author of the amendment believed that if coverage was broader the OASI survivors benefits would take care of the problem, but this is not so. I wish to make it clear that I do not favor any such amendment. I believe it would be a backward step.

Repealing these provisions would result in very serious hardships on the States and on thousands of mothers and dependent children. In New Jersey, we have 12,700 children on the ADC rolls. They are receiving $31.80 a month per child. I do not want to see these children lose their assistance or have it reduced in any way. I am sure I speak for the citizens of New Jersey and many other States on this matter.

Today there are 2 million individuals receiving aid to dependent children in the United States. About 1,500,000 are children and 500,000 are mothers or the adult caretakers of the children. Less than 20 percent of the dependent children are on the rolls because of the death of the father. Over 80 percent of the children are on the rolls because of the disability or absence of a parent from the home.

It can be seen from these figures that the largest number of the children are on the rolls because of the separation or divorce of the parents or desertion of the father. Divorce and separation are not risks which can be handled by the insurance program. Consequently, improvements in the insurance program will not reduce these causes for States granting aid to dependent children. Divorce, separation, and disability are very serious social and family problems which require the careful consideration in each individual community. But I do not believe that children should suffer by any sweeping changes in the Federal law which would deny them the financial aid they need to grow up into healthy and productive American citizens.

The factors which bring about family separation and the refusal of a parent to support his children are complex. Desertion and nonsupport are symptoms of trouble with causes partly in the individual and in some instances also arising from social factors in the community. Some of these factors can be eliminated or their effects lessened. More help to troubled individuals and families before breakdown occurs would often prevent later disaster. Many private and public agencies provide such constructive social services in many parts of the country. It is hoped that experience in implementing the requirement notice to law-enforcement officials where a parent deserts a child, which the Congress placed in the Social Security Act in 1950 will lead to exploration of factors that might be eliminated or alleviated by concerted effort in each individual community. It is hoped that the notice provision will also help in discovering opportunities to help strengthen family and community responsibility. But in the meantime we should not make innocent children suffer for the sins of their parents and their community.

CONCLUSION

President Eisenhower in his constructive and progressive social-security message of January 14 stated that the OASI system "is not intended as a substitute for private savings, pension plans, and insurance protection." He pointed out in simple but effective terms that the system "is rather intended as the foundation upon which these other forms of protection can be soundly built. Thus the individual's own work, his planning, and his thrift will bring him a higher standard of living upon his retirement, or his family a higher standard of living in the event of his death, than would otherwise be the case. Hence, the system both encourages thrift and self-reliance and helps to prevent destitution in our national life." In other words, the program is consistent with and strengthens our free competitive economic system.

President Eisenhower specifically recommended preserving the two basic principles underlying the OASI program. These are, he said, that first, OASI is a contributory system, with both the worker and his employer making payments during the years of active work; and, second, the benefits received are related in part to the individual's earnings.

I am in complete accord with these principles. I believe they are sound and merit the support of all the American people.

There are some people in our country who fear that the improvement and extension of social security is but another step in the march toward the welfare state. There are others in our country who offer a package of amendments to social security under such attractive labels as "blanketing-in all the aged," and "repealing all Federal grants to the States for old-age assistance," but which would wreck the fundamental principles upon which the system has been built. The Eisenhower program is a middle of the road approach which recognizes the dangers of both extremes. The Eisenhower program rejects these extreme views and aims instead at constructively and soundly preserving and improving our social-security structure for the welfare of the entire Nation.

The Eisenhower program, for improving OASI is a humanitarian and at the same time a financially sound program. It is practical; it is feasible; it is necessary. It is essential for Congress to enact it into law at this session.

DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a particularly flagrant case of discrimination against the Negro race now existing in Memphis, Tenn. It involves 90 Negro employees of Malone & Hyde Grocery there.

These men had satisfactory work records with Malone & Hyde for periods ranging up to 24 years. Now they are refused the opportunity of keeping their jobs.

The story of this gross violation of civil rights began early this year when drivers and warehouse workers of Malone & Hyde voted in a National Labor Relations Board election to affiliate with Local Union 984 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. The vote was almost 3 to 1 for affiliation. In attempting to carry out the normal process of collective bargaining with the employer, the union found itself faced with stony resistance.

Malone & Hyde refused any wage increase and, after several weeks of fruitless negotiation, the men decided to strike against the company.

In all, 92 men struck—of which 90 were Negroes. Their abnormally low wage scale ranged from 92 cents to $1.17 an hour.

The strike began February 16. The very next day, on February 17, Malone & Hyde had filled the strikers' jobs with strikebreaking labor. Of these, only 5 were Negroes.

It is plain that the company used the excuse of the strike to discharge its Negro employees and establish a discriminatory job policy.

It has been unwilling to consider any union proposal that specified that their regular employees be returned to their jobs. As recently as the 20th of March—at a meeting called by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—Teamsters Local 984 offered to end the strike and accept the company's meager wage offer of 3 cents an hour increase if Malone & Hyde would not discriminate against their regular employees. The union further proposed that a disinterested outsider would be called in to settle the wage and hour items in dispute.

This eminently fair offer was unequivocally refused by the company, which ignored minimum standards of justice and moral decency by cynically pretending it could not agree to put their old employees back to work.

Incensed by this callous disregard for the needs and rights of these Negro workers, the officers of Teamsters Local 984; Teamsters Joint Council 87, and the Southern Conference of Teamsters have thrown their full resources behind the cause of these beleaguered men.

Their attorneys are examining the possibility of legal action to restore the rights of these employees.

Although the union has not asked for any fees or dues from the 90 victims of this gross act of discrimination, it has used a considerable amount of its treasury to provide them their barest essentials of life. In addition to several doctors' bills, the local has provided $2,000 worth of groceries and paid rent, gas, and electric bills totaling $1,700. These men—with families to support and obligations to meet—have been without salary for 42 days. Apparently Malone & Hyde is indifferent to their dire plight and is willing to ignore their fate. The company's attitude is made all the more callous by the fact that about 65 percent of its business is made possible by the patronage of Negro citizens in Memphis.

I call this particularly vicious situation to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in order to offer an example of how provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act can be used to further un-American ends.

Under the act, economic strikers are denied protection of their jobs. In times of economic distress—such as these—unscrupulous and racist employers can use the excuse of a company-inspired strike to replace its Negro employees with whites.

In this case, apparently Malone & Hyde had hired their Negro employees during periods of labor shortage when their absurdly low wage scales were unacceptable to white workers. Now, seeing the labor market considerably loosened, they have seized the opportunity to discard, without feeling, their loyal Negro employees and replace them with men of a more acceptable color. We can expect that if Malone & Hyde succeed in their scheme, the practice will be taken up by other anti-Negro employers.

I call upon all liberty-loving people of Memphis to boycott all Malone & Hyde stores. Let not 1 Negro spend 1 cent as long as this injustice continues.

Follow the leadership of the LeMoyne College NAACP who say:

> We of the LeMoyne College chapter of the NAACP are interested in the strike because of our contention that the worker's rights as free and equal human beings are being violated. The most powerful weapon of the NAACP is public opinion and public support, therefore we feel it our duty to remind you that 65 percent of Malone & Hyde business is in predominantly Negro neighborhoods. The major outlet for their products are Easyway, Leadway, Big Star Stores, National Brand and Bet-R-Valu stores, the most popular of their products being, Jack Sprat canned foods and Libby's frozen foods; therefore we are enabling them, through our trade, to stay in business and replace striking Negro workers with white workers.

WITNESSES WHO INVOKED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT DURING 1953 IN TESTIMONY BEFORE COMMITTEES OR SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE CONGRESS INVESTIGATING SUBVERSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always an occasion of special solemnity to me when the House has under consideration legislation affecting the hard-earned civil rights of Americans. These rights have been won for us through the struggles and with the blood of men down through the ages of human development. Those of us who, since birth, have enjoyed the rights and privileges of free men are sometimes prone to forget the intensity of the struggles and the extent of the sacrifices which have nurtured these rights into the vital, living factors they are today.

Immunity from self-incrimination is part of our heritage of rights, and we must protect it to the utmost limits consistent with the preservation of national security.

When we think of the issue of self-incrimination, our minds must inevitably conjure up the vision of torture chambers, of inquisitions, of trials by combat or ordeal—of all the sanguine brutalities of the past and the refined cruelties of the present—which have been used to extort confessions.

We want no part of those.

We want no suggestion of them.

We, as individuals and as a Nation, are dedicated to the preservation of the privilege against self-incrimination.

Fundamentally, the development of the protection against self-incrimination in our own legal system started in the days of Charles I of England. His brutal autocratic treatment of nonconformists—when innocent people in large numbers were tortured to make them confess to crimes they did not commit—made Englishmen give voice to the demand that the practice of forcing compulsory testimony be abolished. Within a few years, the privilege against self-incrimination was a well-established part of English common law.

The settlers of America brought this principle with them to our shores. They successfully resisted attempts of colonial governors to make use of compulsory testimony, with the result that the privilege against self-incrimination became a firm segment of our own common law. The protection against self-incrimination was included in the first amendments to the Constitution—our own Bill of Rights—and is now a portion of the constitutions of 46 of our States. In Iowa and New Jersey, where the constitutions do not include the privilege, that right is fixed firmly in the common law.

The United States Supreme Court has held that the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination is essentially a personal one, applying only to natural individuals; that it grows out of the high sentiment and regard for our jurisprudence for conducting criminal trials and investigatory proceedings upon a plane of dignity, humanity, and impartiality, and that it is designed to prevent the use of legal process to force from the lips of the accused individual the evidence necessary to convict him or to force him to produce and authenticate any personal documents or effects that might incriminate him.

At the same time, the Court declared that, though this constitutional privilege is subject to abuse and misuse, it is, nevertheless, firmly embedded in our constitutional and legal framework as a bulwark against iniquitous methods of prosecution.

Since the establishment of the American Constitution, there have been a number of attempts made to provide measures for obtaining information without destroying the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. What we are undertaking now is neither

new nor unusual. The Congress has recognized in the past that there is need for this kind of legislation to protect the supreme interests of the Nation.

The 20th century has brought with it a new factor for destruction in internatianal and national affairs: the tactics of Marxist communism. Although the world and our Nation have been forced to deal with subversive conspiracies in the past, never before in history has conspiracy reached such a world-wide scale, such efficiency of organization, and, above all, such a strong central domination, as has the conspiracy of Soviet-sponsored communism in its program for world revolution.

Never before have free nations faced the danger of such wholesale extinction. They must take every measure possible for their self-protection. The keystone in that structure of self-protection is full knowledge of the nature of the conspiracy, its lifelines, and its participants.

It is for this important purpose that the Congress has established committees to investigate subversive activities. These committees have made such major contributions to our national security that anything which impedes their work must be corrected at once.

The history of the past few years has shown clearly that the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination has become a device in the hands of the conspirators to frustrate the legitimate activities of congressional committees.

To be legally entitled to this constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, one must honestly believe that his answer would incriminate him or that it would furnish a link in the chain of evidence needed to prosecute.

The fifth-amendment Communists have become legion. The oft-repeated phrase, "I refuse to answer on the ground that I might incriminate myself," is known to virtually every American.

The Smith Act was passed in 1940. Membership in, adherence to, or belief in the principles of, the Communist Party could not have justified a plea against self-incrimination prior to the passage of that act.

A casual review of the hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities will show that witnesses have invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer simple questions regarding the date and place of birth, educational background, and history of employment; when they well knew that a truthful answer could not possibly have incriminated them.

It is because of the abuses and misuses of this constitutional privilege that we have before us legislation to grant immunity from prosecution when the privilege against self-incrimination is invoked.

There is pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 6899, which was introduced by Representative KEATING of New York in language proposed by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States. If enacted into law, this bill would go a long way toward preventing the abuse of our constitutional privileges by those who would destroy our Constitution.

Let us examine the magnitude of the problem.

During the first year of the Republican administration, a total of 305 witnesses before congressional committees hid behind the privilege against self-incrimination in their refusal to answer pertinent questions. It is important to point out that the number of such witnesses last year is higher than in any previous year. This gives a clear picture of the accelerated fight against the Communist conspiracy that has been waged under the leadership of the Republican Party.

Of these witnesses, 169 were before committees of the Senate and 148 before committees of the House. The apparent discrepancy in numbers is because of the fact that 12 witnesses appeared before 2 committees. The distribution of such witnesses by committees is as follows:

Summary of witnesses by congressional committees

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations of the U. S. Senate	67
Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U. S. Senate	102
Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives	144
Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives	3
Special Subcommittees of the House Committees on Government Operations and Education and Labor	1
Total	317

One of the most startling aspects of this report is the large number of such witnesses who have been connected with government and with institutions of education—both of which are areas of great sensitivity to our national security and survival. The record shows that 85 of these witnesses were employed at one time by the Federal Government, while 7 were employed by 1 State government. Those in the elementary or secondary education fields numbered 40, and those in higher education 57, making a total of 97.

Other fields, in which Communists are afforded an opportunity to influence public opinions, shows the following: 26 were in the arts and entertainment; 28 were in the category of authors, editors, and literary critics; 13 in the fields of newspapers, printing, and publishing.

The actual distribution by occupations is as follows—and again may I point out that the discrepancy in totals results from the fact that some of these people have been active in more than one field:

Summary of occupations

International organizations	11
Federal Government	85
State of New York	7
Colleges and universities	57
Elementary and secondary schools	40
Arts and entertainment	26
Professions	27
Authors, editors, and literary critics	28

Summary of occupations—Continued

Newspapers, printers, publishers	13
Industry and small business	34
Service trades	17
Labor union officials and employees	23
Self-employed	11
Housewives	6
Clerical and secretarial	4
Unemployed	5
Other	18
Information lacking	15

Mr. Speaker, in order to show the real significance of the refusals to answer congressional committees in the past year, I believe it is necessary for the record to give the full facts and details. Here are the actual details, listing every witness who hid behind the fifth amendment, the committee before which he appeared, and other pertinent data. In addition, I am presenting summaries of the information for the guidance of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe this is the most comprehensive study of this subject that has ever been made.

The record—Mr. Speaker, the frightening record—speaks for itself. I strongly urge the Members of this body to study the material which is presented here. Having done so, they must inevitably agree with me that H. R. 6899 must be passed.

For the tremendous task of compiling the necessary data which is contained in this important report, I desire to give credit to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and to express my appreciation of the valuable assistance provided. Without their aid, I would not have been able to make such a detailed report.

It would be practically impossible to assemble so much data without some slight errors. I shall sincerely appreciate it if the Members will call to my attention any corrections, omissions, or additions which, in their judgment, should be made.

The following list of 305 persons who invoked the fifth amendment should be sufficient evidence to convince anyone that such a law should be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Committee on Un-American Activities will use this list of names, together with the other data, as an official document. I should also like to suggest that similar data be compiled for past years, and that the information be kept current from year to year.

The fact that 305 people invoked the fifth amendment before congressional committees in the calendar year of 1953, alone is proof that something must be done to correct this situation. Instead of it being a case of just one person identifying an individual as a Communist; under such a law, a congressional committee might be able to get the facts in the case from as many as 3 or 4 witnesses. This could leave little doubt that the guilt of such a Communist could be established when he is brought to trial. I believe that the proposed legislation providing authority to grant immunity to witnesses should be passed.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate during 1953

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Allen, James S.	Author of World Monopoly and Peace and of World Cooperation and Postwar Prosperity.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 24, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 3 ff.[1]
Aptheker, Herbert	Author, Essays in the History of the American Negro.	do	May 6, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 374 ff.
Archdeacon, Henry Canning	237 Talbott Ave., Boston, Mass.; employed by the General Electric Co. in Lynn, Mass., for the past 14 years.	do	Nov. 19, 1953	Subversion and Espionage in Defense Installations and Industry, p. 11 ff. (galley).
Aronson, Allan James	Address unknown; newspaperman	Office of War Information (1945); press control officer, War Department in Germany to mid-1946.	May 14, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 397 ff.
Belfrage, Cedric Henning	Resident alien since 1937	Press control officer, Germany	do	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 408 ff.
Berke, Sylvia, Miss	1545 Leland Ave., Bronx, New York, N. Y.; school clerk, Public School 50, Bronx, New York, N. Y.	Last Federal Government employment: Signal Corps, Fort Monmouth, N. J., December 1942 to September 1943.	Dec. 14, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 25 ff. (galley).
Bortz, Louis	Butler, Pa., R. D. 6; unemployed at present.	No Federal employment listed	June 18, 1953	Communist Party Activities, Western Pennsylvania, p. 7 ff.
Boyer, Richard O.	Author, The Dark Ship	do	July 1, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 424 ff.
Brand, Millen	Editor and writer (fiction editor, Crown Publishers).	do	May 6, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 358 ff.
Browder, Earl Russell	Author of Communism in the United States; until 1945, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.	do	Mar. 24, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 17 ff.
Burgum, Edwin Berry	Author and literary critic; until Mar. 30, 1953, a professor at New York University for 28 years.	do	July 1, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 433 ff.
Coe, V. Frank	Secretary of the International Monetary Fund until December 1952.	Last Federal Government employment: Director of Monetary Research, P-8, $9,800 per annum, Treasury Department, Division of Monetary Research, until June 17, 1946.	June 5, 1953 and June 8, 1953 Oct. 20, 1953	Austrian Incident, p. 20 ff. Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase, p. 21 ff.
Cooke, Marvel J., Mrs.	Born in Minnesota: 46 years of age: worked for Peoples Voice, 1943–47, as assistant managing editor.	No Federal employment listed	Sept. 8, 1953	Communist Infiltration Among Army Civilian Workers, p. 4 ff.
D'Usseau, Arnaud	Professional writer: author, Deep Are the Roots.	No Federal employment listed	July 7, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 464 ff.
Evans, Gertrude, Mrs.	Washington, D. C.: executive secretary of the Progressive Party of the District of Columbia.	Clerk, Veterans' Administration 1918–1943, for which she draws $129 a month retirement.	Aug. 18, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 1, p. 73 ff.
Fast, Howard	Author of Citizen Tom Paine	Employed by the Office of War Information, December 1942–January 1944.	Feb. 18, 1953	Voice of America, pt. 2, p. 98 ff.[2]
Foner, Philip S.	Author and teacher; formerly taught at the College of the City of New York.	No Federal employment listed	May 6, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 386 ff.
Freedman, David M.	11 Park Pl.; New York, lawyer; member of Unger, Freedman & Fleischer.	do	Sept. 18, 1953	Security—United Nations, p. 31 ff.
Gelfan, Harriet Moore, Mrs.	Bronxville, N. Y., author of an article on the physical geography of Russia.	do	Sept. 28, 1953	Communist Infiltration in the Army, p. 30 ff.
Gift, Charles	Presently in the laundry business	Machinist, 1st class, Washington Naval Gun Factory, 1934–48.	Aug. 20, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 2, p. 107 ff.
Glasser, Harold	Economist	Last Federal Government employment: Assistant Director, P-8, $10,000 per annum, Treasury Department, Office of International Finance, until Dec. 31, 1947.	Oct. 20, 1953	Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase, p. 19 ff.
Glassman, Sidney	4721 215th St., New York, N. Y.; present occupation not specified; previously employed in the Economic Division of the Secretariat, United Nations, 1946 to December 1952.	No Federal employment listed	Dec. 16, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 77 ff. (galley).
Goldfrank, Helen, Mrs.	Thornwood, N. Y.	do	Mar. 26, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 90 ff.
Gropper, William	Painted a map entitled "America, Its Folk Lore, a Pictorial Map"; an artist by profession.	Painted a mural for the new Interior Bldg. in 1936 or 1937.	May 6, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 6, p. 388 ff.
Grundfest, Harry	4 East 9th St., New York, N. Y.; associate professor of neurology, Columbia University, since 1945.	Last Federal Government employment: Senior physiologist, Climatic Research Unit, Army Signal Corps, at Squier Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N. J.	Nov. 25, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 27 ff. (galley).
Hammett, Samuel Dashiell	Author of detective stories	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 26, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 84 ff.
Henderson, Donald	211–19 38th Ave., Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; up to July 1, 1953, secretary-treasurer of Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers, when he resigned.	Never employed by the Federal Government.	Mar. 5, 1953	Voice of America, pt. 7, pp. 473 ff.
Heyman, Ezekiel	255–22 74th Ave., Queens, N. Y.; present occupation not specified; previously employed by Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, 1943–47.	No Federal employment listed	Dec. 17, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 96 (galley).
Hlavaty, Julius H.	Chairman, department of mathematics, Bronx High School of Science, New York, N. Y.	Participated in a Voice of America broadcast on May 29, 1952.	Mar. 13, 1953	Voice of America, pt. 9, p. 678 ff.
Hutner, Eleanor Glassman, Mrs. (Mrs. Eugene Hutner).	144 Henry St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; until October 1953, school social worker, bureau of child guidance, New York City schools, September 1949–May 1950; February 1952–October 1953.	Last Federal Government employment: Junior professional assistant, Signal Corps, Fort Monmouth, N. J., June 1942–December 1943.	Dec. 15, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 29 ff. (galley).
Hyman, Harry A.	719 East 9th St., New York, N. Y.; present occupation not specified; until Oct. 31, 1951, employed by Federal Telecommunications Laboratory at Nutley, N. J., working on Army Signal Corps work.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 25, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 20 ff. (galley).
			Dec. 17, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 2 ff. (galley).

[1] For the sake of brevity, "Information Centers" has been used in this report, instead of "State Department Information Program—Information Centers."
[2] The full title is State Department Information Program—Voice of America. For the sake of brevity, Voice of America will be used in this report as a title.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Ullmann, William Ludwig	Harvey Cedars, N. J.	Last Federal Government employment: Economic analyst, P-7, $8,179.50 per annum, Treasury Department, Division of Monetary Research, until Mar. 21, 1947.	Oct. 21, 1953	Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase, p. 40 ff.
Weltfish, Gene, Miss	Author Races of Mankind, In Henry's Back Yard; lecturer, Columbia University.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 27, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 2, p. 119 ff.
Wilkerson, Doxey A	New York, N. Y.; author Special Problems of Negro Education.	Last Federal Government employment: Either education specialist, Education Division, Office of Price Administration, 1942-43, or member of the faculty, Howard University (Federal Security Agency), Washington, D. C., 1935-43.	July 2, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 445 ff.
Wilkerson, Doxey A	Teacher, Jefferson School of Social Science, New York, N. Y.	Education specialist, Education Division, Office of Price Administration, 1942-43.	Sept. 8, 1953	Communist Infiltration Among Army Civilian Workers, p. 23 ff.
Wolman, Diana Molderber, Mrs. (Mrs. Benjamin Wolman).	505 Alabama Ave., New York, N. Y.; teacher, Thomas Jefferson High School, New York, N. Y., 1946 to date, apparently an instructor in Soviet literature and Russian, Jefferson School of Social Sciences, 1945, apparently chief of the export department, Four Continent Book Corp., 1943, born in Russia, became a United States citizen through the naturalization of her father.	Last Federal Government employment: Junior engineering aid, Army Signal Corps, Kearny, N. J., and New York, N. Y., 1942-43.	Dec. 15, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 43 ff. (galley).
Zucker, Jack	Philadelphia, Pa.	No Federal employment listed	Aug. 20, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 2, p. 100 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate during 1953

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Abernethy, Milton A	Chapel Hill, N. C.; merchant	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 6, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 24 ff.
Abernethy, Minna, Mrs. (Mrs. Milton A. Abernethy).	305 North Columbia St., Chapel Hill, N. C.; until 1950, coowner with her husband of the Intimate Book Shop.	do	do	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 3 ff.
Abt, John	444 Central Park West, New York, N. Y.; attorney.	Last Federal Government employment: Special Assistant to the Attorney General, $8,500 per annum, until Oct. 17, 1938.	May 26, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 10, p. 643 ff.
Anthony, Robenia F., Miss	312 Union St., Springfield, Mass.; retired teacher; taught 43 years in Springfield.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 26, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 685 ff.
Aron, Paul Harvey	12 Fisher Dr., Mount Vernon, N. Y.; teacher at Sarah Lawrence College for 5 years.	do	Mar. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 5, p. 625 ff.
Austin, Richard H	50 Cambridge Rd., Great Neck, Long Island, N. Y.; employed in the registrar's office, College of the City of New York.	do	Feb. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 450 ff.
Bancroft, Frank C	6534 167th St., Flushing, N. Y.; an editor; inactive minister on the rolls of the Protestant Episcopal Church's Diocese of Southern Ohio; previously employed in the Secretariat of the United Nations until 1952.	do	Sept. 25, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 4, p. 630 ff.
Barker, Elizabeth, Mrs. (Mrs. Guy Barker).	435 West 123d St., New York, N. Y.; apparently a housewife.	do	June 4, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1053 ff.
Barrows, Alice Prentice, Miss	East Blue Hill, Maine; retired Federal employee engaged in writing.	Last Federal Government employment: Educationist (specialist in school buildings) P-5, $4,800 per annum, Office of Education until Aug. 31, 1942.	June 23, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 831 ff.
Bazer, Julia Older, Mrs	601 East 20th St., New York, N. Y.; an editor, presently unemployed; until Sept. 15, 1953, employed by Herschaft Products, Inc., New York, N. Y.; previously employed by the United Nations.	Last Federal Government employment: Office of War Information until 1943.	Sept. 25, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 4, p. 584 ff.
Berman, Louise Rosenberg Bransten, Mrs.	New York, N. Y.; housewife	No Federal employment listed	Oct. 28, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 15, p. 1034 ff.
Blau, Harold Raymond	309 East 4th St., New York 9, N. Y.; teacher at Brooklyn Technical High School, New York, N. Y.	do	May 28, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1017.
Bressler, Joseph	15 Ludlum Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; assistant professor of health and physical education, Brooklyn College, for 26 or 27 years.	do	Feb. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 434 ff.
Cameron, Angus	Upper Jay, N. Y.; book publisher, editor in chief, and vice president, Little, Brown, Publishing Co., 1943-51; currently with Cameron & Kahn, New York, N. Y.	do	May 7, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 9, p. 885 ff.
Carson, Saul	New York, N. Y.; radio-television critic.	Office of War Information during World War II as a script editor.	June 16, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 793 ff.
Coe, Charles J. (Robert)	Brooklyn, N. Y.; writer and researcher; brother of V. Frank Coe: apparently associated with Farmer Research, Inc., 39 Cortlandt St. (Brooklyn?).	Last Federal Government employment: Code analyst, grade 12, $3,600 per annum; National Recovery Administration, Apr. 2, 1934-Nov. 24, 1934.	June 11, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 11, p. 707 ff.
Cohen, Morris U	2028 Mermaid Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.; self-employed chemist; on the faculty of the College of the City of New York, 1930-41.	No Federal employment listed	May 19, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 10, p. 995 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Kaplan, Louis	120 Taylor Ave., Neptune, N. J.; egg salesman, apparently for New Jersey Federated Egg Producers' Cooperative Association, Inc.	Last Federal Government employment: Signal Corps, Standards Agency, Eatontown, N. J., 1943-47.	Dec. 17, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 92 ff. (galley).
Kent, Rockwell	Author	No Federal employment listed	July 1, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 419 ff.
Lewis, Helen, Mrs. (Mrs. Naphtali Lewis).	245 West 101st St., New York, N. Y.	do	June 10, 1953	State Department—Student-Teacher Exchange Program, p. 7 ff.
Levine, Ruth, Mrs	155 West 20th St., New York, N. Y.; until Dec. 14, 1953, employed by Federal Telecommunications Laboratory since July 1943.	do	Dec. 16, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 86 ff. (galley).
Levitsky, Joseph	65 Rutgers Pl., River Edge, N. J.; until Feb. 1953, employed at Federal Telecommunications Laboratories in Nutley, N. J.	Last Federal Government employment: Employed by the Army Signal Corps from 1940 to 1943.	Nov. 24, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 14 ff. (galley).
Linfield, David La Porte	1475 Townsend Ave., New York, N. Y.; private, U. S. Army, stationed at Murphy Army Hospital; previously employed by Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, 1952.	No Federal employment listed	Dec. 16, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 64 ff. (galley).
Lundmark, Carl J	See next column	Hand compositor, U. S. Government Printing Office since about 1941.	Aug. 29, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 2, p. 129 ff.
Mandell, William Marx	Author of Soviet Far East and Central Asia; employed as copywriter by L. W. Frohlich & Co., 76 East 52d St., New York, N. Y.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 24, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 25 ff.
Mins, Leonard E	Employed by Walker Doran Teague (a firm), 1943-46. Present employment not specified.	Last Federal Government employment: Office of Strategic Services during World War II.	Dec. 14, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 18 ff. (galley).
Morrill, Donald Herbert	11 Seaside Terrace, Lynn, Mass.; employed at the River Works of the General Electric Co., Lynn, Mass., for 12½ years.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 19, 1953	Subversion and Espionage in Defense Installations and Industry, p. 13 (galley).
Pataki, Ernest	343 East 8th St., New York, N. Y.; instructor of engineering, Cooper Union; employed by Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, June 1944-August 1950; became a naturalized citizen in 1944.	do	Dec. 15, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 38 ff. (galley).
Percoff, Joseph H	Home: 1840 Phaelen Pl., New York, N. Y.; business: 274 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.; an attorney.	Last Federal Government employment: Signal Corps, Fort Monmouth, N. J., until 1945.	Dec. 11, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 98 ff. (galley).
Piekarski, Witulad W	Employed at the River Works of the General Electric Co., Lynn, Mass., since February 1941.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 19, 1953	Subversion and Espionage in Defense Installations and Industry, p. 15 ff. (galley).
Powell, Doris Walters, Mrs	Previously employed by the Peoples Voice, a New York newspaper, 1945-47.	Employed by the U. S. Army Quartermaster Corps in New York when served with a subpena.	Sept. 8, 1953	Communist Infiltration Among Army Civilian Workers, p. 16.
Reiss, Julius	741 Westminster Rd, Brooklyn, N. Y. Employed by the Polish delegation to the United Nations since September 1950.	No Federal employment listed	Sept. 17, 1953	Security—United Nations, p. 5 ff.
Robeson, Eslanda Cardoza Goode, Mrs. (Mrs. Paul Robeson).	Author, African Journey, and biography, Paul Robeson (her husband).	do	July 7, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 7, p. 473 ff.
Rosinger, Lawrence K	Author of China's Wartime Politics, India and the United States, Restless India, State of Asia, China's Crisis, and Forging a New China.	Last Federal Government employment: Consultant (without compensation), Department of State, Office of Public Affairs, Oct. 6-8, 1949.	Mar. 25, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 1, p. 62 ff.
Rothschild, Edward M	See next column	Employed by U. S. Government Printing Office.	Aug. 18, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 1, p. 62 ff.
Rothschild, Esther, Mrs	Wife of Edward M. Rothschild	No Federal employment listed	Aug. 19, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 2, p. 73 ff.
Sarant, Louise, Mrs. (formerly Mrs. Al Sarant).		do	Dec. 11, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 6 ff. (galley).
Savitt, Morris	8515 66th Ave., Queens, New York, N. Y.; an electrical engineer employed by Slocum & Fuller, previously employed by the New York State Department of Public Works, Apr. 1947-June 1953.	Last Federal Government employment: Corps of Engineers, December 1939-March 1941; Brooklyn Navy Yard, March 1941-July 1945, June 1946-April 1947.	Dec. 14, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 14 ff. (galley).
Schappes, Morris U	94 Hamilton Pl., New York 31, N. Y.; self-employed, author of A Documentary History of the Jews in the United States.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 2, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 2, p. 140 ff.
Sholket, Henry N	1337 55th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; employed by Lawson Machinery Corp., 426 West 33d St., New York, N. Y., previously employed by the Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle plant 3.	Last Federal Government employment: Engineer, Navy Department, Brooklyn Navy Yard, 1941-43, and at Mare Island, 1943-47.	Dec. 10, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 90 ff. (galley).
Sillers, Frederick, Jr	Rolla, Mo.; previously resided in Washington, D. C., being employed in several Government agencies.	U. S. Bureau of Mines until February 1953.	Aug. 17, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 1, p. 56 ff.
Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory	Self-employed	Last Federal Government employment: Economist, P-8, $10,000 per annum, War Assets Administration, Economic and Market Research, until Nov. 30, 1946.	Oct. 21, 1953	Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates—Espionage Phase, p. 35 ff.
Snyder, Samuel Joseph	2141 34th Ave., Long Island City, N. Y.; patent attorney since 1932.	Last Federal Government employment: Army Signal Corps, 1949-52.	Dec. 16, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 70 ff. (galley).
Socol, Albert	419 West End Ave., Long Branch, N. J.; present employment not specified.	Last Federal Government employment: Evans Signal Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N. J., 1942-47.	Dec. 14, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 10 ff. (galley).
Stern, Bernhard J	Professor of sociology, Columbia University.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 27, 1953	Information Centers, pt. 2, p. 101 ff.
Stolberg, Sidney	27 North Rockdale Ave., Roseville, N. J.; manager, New Jersey Federated Egg Producers' Cooperative Association, Inc.	do	Dec. 16, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 80 ff. (galley).
Taylor, William C	Los Angeles, Calif.	do	Aug. 22, 1953	Security—Government Printing Office, pt. 2, p. 118 ff.
Ullmann, Marcel		Employed by the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth, N. J., December 1941 to 1947.	Dec. 10, 1953	Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage, p. 83 ff. (galley).

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Collins, Henry H., Jr.	Bronxville, N. Y.; writer	Last Federal Government employment: Administrative Assistant, grade 19A, $10,000 per annum, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, until Jan. 24, 1947.	Apr. 10, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 1, p. 4 ff.
Davin, Thomas	325 East 33d St., New York, N. Y.; presently unemployed; previously managing editor of the publications of the American Diabetes Association.	No Federal employment listed	June 2, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1050 ff.
Davis, Horace Bancroft	Kansas City, Mo.; associate professor of economics, University of Kansas City.	do	June 9, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1116 ff.
Einhorn, Nathan	1900 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.; 68 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; newspaperman, public relations man, publicity man; employed by the Embassy of Poland since 1951 in the press office.	do	Mar. 31, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 193 ff.
Fajans, Irving	New York, N. Y.; writer, coauthor of Heart of Spain with Alvah Vessie.	Assigned to the Office of Strategic Services while an infantry soldier and officer in the 42d and 3d Divisions.	June 16, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 788 ff.
Faxon, George R.	480 Center St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.; teacher at Boston Latin School in the Boston public school system.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 26, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 683 ff.
Fitzgerald, Edward J.	New York, N. Y.; free-lance writer	Last Federal Government employment: Social science analyst, P-7, $8,179.50 per annum, Department of Commerce, until Sept. 19, 1947.	May 1, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 5, p. 245 ff.
Flato, Charles Sidney	Wellfleet, Mass.; presently unemployed.	Last Federal Government employment: Special assistant, $6,500 per annum, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Surplus Property Board, until June 30, 1945.	May 19, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 8, p. 488 ff.
Frauenglass, William	17 Stoddard Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; teacher at James Madison High School, Brooklyn.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 838 ff.
Friedman, Samuel	Palos Park, Ill.; truckdriver for the University of Chicago Press.	do	June 8, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1087.
Glaser, Mrs. Eda Habinsky	250 West 22d St., New York, N. Y.; born in Manchuria, became a citizen of the United States in 1932, clerk in the Reference Library, United Nations Security Council, with U. N. since 1947.	do	Feb. 19, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 2, p. 443 ff.
Glasser, Harold	8 Sheffield Rd., Great Neck, N. Y.; economist employed with the Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, 165 West 46th St., New York, N. Y.	Last Federal Government employment: Assistant Director, P-8, $10,000 per annum, Treasury Department, Office of International Finance, until Dec. 31, 1947.	Apr. 14, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 2, p. 54 ff.
Gold, Hyman	2801 141st St., Flushing, N. Y.; registrar's assistant, College of the City of New York for approximately 20 years.	No Federal employment listed	Feb. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 440 ff.
Grauman, Jacob	20 Tuckerman St., NW., Washington, D. C.; until March 27, 1953, employed as an engineer by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, born in Austria, entered the United States in 1921, became a citizen of the United States by virtue of his father's citizenship.	Last Federal Government employment: Statistician, P-6, $6,440 per annum, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, up to February 1947.	Apr. 27, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 2, p. 473 ff.
Gruen, Sonia, Mrs.	250 West 22d St., New York, N. Y.; employed as a librarian by the United Nations doing general reference work, at a salary of $6,270 since 1947.	No Federal employment listed	Feb. 19, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 2, p. 441 ff.
Guarnaccia, Elizabeth, Miss	18 Day St., Somerville, Mass.; teacher at Somerville High School.	do	Mar. 27, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 706 ff.
Gustafson, Elton	139 Hoyt St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; instructor in health and physical education, Brooklyn College, since 1931.	do	Feb. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 473 ff.
Halperin, Maurice	194 Kelton St., Boston, Mass.; chairman, regional studies department, Boston University since 1949. Previously observer and consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations under the employ of the American Jewish Conference and later the American Jewish Committee, 1946–49.	Last Federal Government employment: Chief, P-8, $8,750 per annum, State Department, research and analysis, Latin America, until May 31, 1946.	Mar. 26, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 667 ff
Harris, Lement U.	2865 Faber Ter., Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.; self-employed doing research in agriculture previously resided in Chappagua, N. Y., apparently a research worker for Farm Research, Inc., at one time.	No Federal employment listed	Oct. 28, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 15, p. 1035 ff.
Hiskey, Clarence F.	Grace Courts, Brooklyn, N. Y.; chemist, formerly a professor at Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute.	Last Federal Government employment: Tennessee Valley Authority (sometime between 1939 and 1943).	do	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 15, p. 1030 ff.
Hoch, Myron L.	145 Henry St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; teacher at the College of the City of New York since 1931, with a break during World War II, 1941–47.	Last Federal Government employment: War Assets Administration, 1946–47.	Apr. 23, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 818 ff.
Hurlinger, Iven	1535 Walton Ave., New York, N. Y.; physicist for Physical Research Laboratories.	Apparently no Federal employment as such, though he worked on Federal contracts.	May 13, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 10, p. 965 ff.
Hyams, Jacob Shalom	Washington, D. C.; secretary-treasurer and operator, Superior Press.	Last Federal Government employment: Offset cameraman or plateman, War Department, $1,620 per annum, 1940–42.	Mar. 13, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 101 ff.
Isenberg, Irvin	5112 South Ingleside Ave., Chicago, Ill.; teacher and researcher at the University of Chicago since 1949.	No Federal employment listed	June 9, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1109 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Jerome, Mrs. Alice (Mrs. V. J. Jerome).	320 2d Ave., New York, N. Y.; director of the Park Nursery School, 318 2d Ave., New York, N. Y.; wife of V. J. Jerome.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 7, p. 785 ff.
Joseph, Julius J	108 West 76th St., New York, N. Y.; economist presently unemployed.	Last Federal Government employment: Senior administrative officer, CAF-12, $4,600 per annum, Labor Department, War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Program Requirements, until June 7, 1943. Detailed to Office of Strategic Services during World War II.	May 26, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 10, p. 607 ff.
Josephson, Leon	160 West 16th St., New York, N. Y.; at present, in the restaurant business with his brother Warren Josephson; formerly a practicing attorney in New Jersey.	No Federal employment listed	Oct. 28, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 15, p. 1032 ff.
Kamin, Leon J	42 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass.; employed part time as a teaching fellow at Harvard University since September 1951.	do	Mar. 26, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 677 ff.
King, Harold	625 East 14th St., New York, N. Y.; teacher at Straubenmuller Textile High School.	do	June 4, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1068 ff.
Kipnis, Ira Aaron	1352 East 48th St., Chicago, Ill.; full-time student at the University of Chicago Law School; previously a university instructor.	do	June 8, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1089 ff.
Knowles, Mary, Mrs	159 Cottage St., Norwood, Mass.; librarian of South Norwood Branch Library, Norwood, Mass., for 5 years.	do	May 21, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 10, p. 1002 ff.
Kramer, Charles	83 Grand St., Croton, N. Y.; economist and research worker for the Progressive Party at 17 West 45th St., New York, N. Y.; his name up to 1935 was Charles Krivitsky.	Last Federal Government employment: Head economist, P-7, $6,500 per annum, Office of Price Administration, Office of the Administrator, until Nov. 23, 1944.	May 6, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 6, p. 328 ff.
Lubell, David Gabriel	53 Wendell St., Cambridge, Mass.; student at Harvard Law School; twin brother of Jonathan William Lubell.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 27, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 700 ff.
Lubell, Jonathan William	53 Wendell St., Cambridge, Mass.; student at Harvard Law School; twin brother of David Gabriel Lubell.	do	do	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 694 ff.
Magdoff, Harry	6862 136th St., Flushing, N. Y.; research economist; self-employed.	Last Federal Government employment: Program planning officer, P-8, $9,975 per annum, Department of Commerce, Office of Small Business, until Dec. 27, 1946.	May 1, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 5, p. 286 ff.
Markham, Helen Wendler Dean, Mrs. (Mrs. George F. Markham).	387 Harvard St., Cambridge, Mass.; assistant professor, department of anatomy, Harvard Medical School.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 27, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 691 ff.
Martineau, Paul Victor	Williamstown, Mass.; junior librarian at Williams College since July 1, 1952.	Last Federal Government employment: Airport engineer (disposal), P-4, $4,902 per annum, Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, until July 22, 1946; intelligence officer in OSS during World War II.	May 8, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 9, p. 923 ff.
Marzani, Carl Aldo	111 West 88th St., New York, N. Y.; employed by United Electrical Workers in general publicity work.	Last Federal Government employment: Assistant Chief, Presentation Division, CAF-14, $8,179.50 per annum, State Department, until Dec. 20, 1946.	June 18, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 800 ff.
Mins, Leonard E	130 West 57th St., New York 19, N. Y.; playwright and translator.	Last Federal Government employment: Apparently research analyst on Soviet Union for Office of Strategic Services during World War II.	June 11, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 11, p. 680 ff.
Norton, Robert	2033 McGraw St., New York 62, N. Y.; employed by the news service of the American Chemical Society.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 824 ff.
Novikoff, Alex Benjamin	Burlington, Vt.; professor of experimental pathology and associate professor of biochemistry, University of Vermont College of Medicine; born in Russia; entered the United States in 1913; derivative citizenship through his father's naturalization in 1918.	do	Apr. 23, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 804 ff.
Ober, Harry	7609 16th Ave., Takoma Park, Md.; economist; born in Poland; entered the United States in 1921. Became a citizen of the United States in 1927.	Last Federal Government employment: Labor economist, $9,600 per annum, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, until Oct. 22, 1952.	Apr. 22, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 4, p. 204 ff.
Oberwager, Jerome A	The Westover Hotel, West 72d St., New York, N. Y.; until Jan. 1953, employed as a teacher of film scripts by UNESCO.	No Federal employment listed	Feb. 19, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed in the United Nations, pt. 2, p. 451 ff.
Olson, William	6574 Saunders St., Rego Park, Queens, N. Y.; teacher, New York University.	do	May 5, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 8, p. 871 ff.
Perlo, Victor	Flushing, N. Y.; economic consultant in New York and author.	Last Federal Government employment: Economic analyst, P-7, $8,778 per annum, Treasury Department, Division of Monetary Research, until Mar. 27, 1947.	May 12, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 7, p. 384 ff.
Porter, Margaret B. Bennett, Mrs.	515 Ridgewood Lane, Pasadena, Calif.; housewife.	Last Federal Government employment: office attorney, P-3, $3,400 per annum, National Labor Relations Board, until Mar. 4, 1941.	June 12, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 741 ff.
Rein, David	711 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.; an attorney, member of the law firm Forer & Rein.	Last Federal Government employment: Attorney, National Labor Relations Board, 1945-46.	Mar. 6, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda p. 23.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Selsam, Howard	501 West 138th St., New York, N. Y., apparently director of the Jefferson School of Social Science, New York, N. Y.; previously taught at the American University of Beirut, Syria to 1927; at Columbia University to 1931; and at Brooklyn College to 1941.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 7, p. 772 ff.
Shaftel, Oscar H	3915 45th St., Queens, N. Y.; assistant professor, Queens College, N. Y.	do	Feb. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 416 ff.
Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory	Harvey Cedars, N. J.; builder in partnership with William L. Ullmann; born in Russia; entered the United States in 1915; became a citizen of the United States in 1927.	Last Federal Government employment: Chief economist (Director), P-8, $10,000 per annum, War Assets Administration, Economic and Market Research, until Nov. 30, 1946.	Apr. 16, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 3 p. 102 ff.
Siporin, Mary R., Mrs	6060 South Kimbark St., Chicago, Ill.; until May 29, 1953, office manager, radio office at the University of Chicago.	No Federal employment listed	June 9, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1112, ff.
Smith, Edwin Seymour	107 State St., Brooklyn, N. Y.: operator of two news photograph agencies and a literary and music agency.	Last Federal Government employment: Member of Board, $10,000 per annum, National Labor Relations Board, by Presidential appointment, 1935-41.	May 21, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 9, p. 546 ff.
Socolar, Sidney J	6153 South Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.; instructor in physical sciences in the College of the University of Chicago.	No Federal employment listed	June 9, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1096 ff.
Solomon, Benjamin	825 East Drexel Sq., Chicago, Ill.; research associate in economics, University of Chicago.	do	do	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1105 ff.
Spitzer, Ralph	5200 Brookside Blvd., Kansas City, Mo.: associate professor, University of Kansas City.	do	do	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1125 ff.
Steigman, Joseph	141 Joralemon St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; assistant professor of chemistry at Polytechnical Institute of Brooklyn.	do	May 21, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 10, p. 1005 ff.
Stuart, John (also known as Harry Vinegar, Harry Winegar, Harry Vinacur, and Harry Vinacuar).	20 Sidney Pl., Brooklyn 1, N. Y.; 2460-16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.; journalist-editor by occupation.	do	Mar. 31, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 210 ff.
Studenberg, Irving	1509 Quinnwood St., Hyattsville, Md.; linotype operator, Progressive Printing Co., 219 H St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Last Federal Government employment: Linotype section, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1935-43.	Mar. 13, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 154 ff.
Tenney, Helen B., Miss	2 Horatio St., New York, N. Y., present occupation not listed.	Last Federal Government employment: Editorial analyst (chief of section), P-3, $4,275 per annum, War Department, Strategic Services Unit, until July 19, 1946.	June 16, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 772 ff.
Trinkhaus, Charles	30 Schermerhorn St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; teacher, Sarah Lawrence College.	No Federal employment listed	June 4, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1066.
Vincent, Craig S	San Cristobal, New Mexico; in conjunction with his wife, operates the San Cristobal Valley Ranch.	Last Federal Government employment: Chief of section, Domestic Division, War Shipping Administration, 1942-45.	June 12, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 752 ff.
Weber, Frederick Palmer	418 West 118th St., New York, N. Y.; research economist working for fees.	Last Federal Government employment: Head business adviser (War Mobilization) CAF-14, $6,500 per annum, War Production Board, Division of Personnel Management, until Jan. 28, 1944.	Apr. 21, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 4, p. 178 ff.
Wilkerson, Doxey A	New York, N. Y.; teacher, Jefferson School of Social Science, New York, N. Y.	Last Federal Government employment: member of the faculty, Howard University (Federal Security Agency), Washington, D. C., 1935-43.	Mar. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 5, p. 641 ff.
Witt, Nathan	160 West 77th St., New York, N. Y., attorney.	Last Federal Government employment: Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, CAF-14, $7,500 per annum, until Jan. 17, 1941.	Apr. 26, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 10, p. 623 ff.
Wolff, Milton	49 West 28th St., New York, N. Y., painter or artist, presently unemployed; national commander, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.	During his service in the U. S. Army, assigned to the Office of Strategic Services and stationed in Italy.	June 16, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 12, p. 767 ff.
Wortis, Joseph	152 Hicks St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; physician, psychiatrist, and author; teacher at Jefferson School of Social Science.	Veterans' Administration in Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 2, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 11, p. 1037 ff.
Wuchinich, George S	12 Clarkson St., Malverne, N. Y.; employment not specified.	While in the U. S. Army, detailed to the Office of Strategic Services and assigned to Yugoslavia.	June 11, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 11, p. 702 ff.
Young, Murray	27 Grace Court, Brooklyn, N. Y.; instructor, Brooklyn College.	No Federal employment listed	Feb. 24, 1953	Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 2, p. 476 ff.
Zelitan, Elizabeth Aiken, Mrs. (also known as Miss Elizabeth Aiken).	30 West 105th St., New York, N. Y.; born in Russia; became a citizen of the United States in 1928.	do	June 11, 1953	Communist Underground Printing Facilities and Illegal Propaganda, p. 308 ff.
ADDENDUM				
Bliss, Willard	3709 Main St., Erie, Pa.; newspaper editor; edits the Union News, published by the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, local 506, since mid-1949.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 177 ff.
Briney, Harold K	322 Roup Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.; an employee of the Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; president of local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America since 1948.	do	Nov. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 87 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate during 1953—Continued

ADDENDUM—continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Elveson, Leon	2802 Olinville Ave., Bronx, New York, N. Y.; present employment not specified; previously employed by the United Nations.	No Federal employment listed	Oct. 29, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 5, p. 665 ff.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas J	915 Ramsey St., Wilkinsburg, Pa.; employed for 30 years and more by the Westinghouse Electric Co. in East Pittsburgh; president of district 6, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 1946–47.	do	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 151 ff.
Flanagan, Thomas	409 Johnson Rd., Pittsburgh, 35, Pa.; international representative of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America since 1948.	do	Nov. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 112 ff.
Glaser, Eda Habinsky, Mrs	250 West 22d St., New York, N. Y.; presently unemployed; previously employed by the United Nations, 1947–52; UNRRA, 1946–47; Soviet Government Purchasing Commission, 1944–45.	do	Dec. 22, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 5, p. 693.
Harris, Jack Sargent	Prior to 1939, his family name was Herscovitz; apparently was known as Russell Sumner during 1931–35; presently employed by Herrschaft Products, Inc., New York, N. Y.; previously employed as Political Affairs Officer, Division of Trusteeship, United Nations, 1947–52.	Last Federal Government employment: Office of Strategic Services, 1942–45.	Oct. 2, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 5, p. 649 ff.
Kirkwood, Robert C	Rural Delivery 3, Greensburg, Pa.; business agent, local 610, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America since early 1948.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 98 ff.
Loney, Stanley L	81 Thomas Ave., Crafton, Pa.; presently unemployed; formerly president of District 6, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America from 1948 through October 1953.	do	do	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 68 ff.
McNeil, Allan D	7936 Takoma St., Pittsburgh, Pa.; district representative of District 6, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, in western Pennsylvania; apparently born in Calcutta, India; left India in 1918; currently under deportation proceedings pursuant to the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act.	do	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 137 ff.
Nelson, John W	2110 East 10th St., Erie, Pa.; a setup man for the General Electric Co.; president of Local 506, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, for approximately 10 years.	do	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 130 ff.
Panzino, Frank	20-A Caruthers Dr., Turtle Creek, Pa.; employed as a bender at the Westinghouse Electric Co.; member of IUE-CIO.	do	Nov. 10, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 109 ff.
Quinn, Thomas J	1418 Wall Ave., Pitcairn, Pa.; welder at Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa.; president of Local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, East Pittsburgh, Pa.	do	do	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 93 ff.
Stabor, Alexander	2802 Cascade St., Erie, Pa.; a grinder at the General Electric Co. since December 1950; steward in Local 506, District 6, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.	do	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 157 ff.
Svenchansky, Alexander	144–58 Village Rd., Jamaica, N. Y.; also known as Shura Swan; born in Theodosia (formerly Kaffa) in the Crimea, Russia; arrived in the United States on Sept. 1, 1923; became a citizen of the United States on May 29, 1929, by virtue of the naturalization of his father; present employment not specified; previous employment: United Nations as a radio broadcaster, 1946–52; Soviet Purchasing Commission, 1942; Amtorg Trading Corp., New York, N. Y., 1932–42; All Russian Textile Syndicate, 1928–31.	do	Oct. 29, 1953	Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, pt. 5, p. 670 ff.
Ullmann, William Ludwig	Harvey Cedars, N. J	Last Federal Government employment: Economic analyst, P-7, $8,179.50 per annum, Treasury Department, Division of Monetary Research, until Mar. 21, 1947.	Dec. 2, 1953	Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 16, p. 1191 ff.
Vuletich, Mike	R. D. 1, Box 56, Trafford, Pa.; a pipefitter employed by Fisher Body, General Motors, Dravosburg, Pa.; born in Poloy(?), a village in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in 1908; entered the United States in 1921.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 12, 1953	Subversive Influence in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Pittsburgh and Erie, Pa., p. 187 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities during 1953

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Albert, Sam	Los Angeles, Calif.; a violinist	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 791 ff.
Andren, Carl	523 East 14th St., New York, N. Y.; a vice president of district 65, CIO.	do	July 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York Area, pt. 5, p. 1982 ff.
Anton, Benjamin David	4336 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa.; born in Russia; principal of the Baldwin Public School for 21 years.	do	Nov. 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2998 ff.
Atkinson, Sadie T., Mrs	2203 North 7th St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher, Clara Barton Elementary School; 1st grade teacher since 1943.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2988.
Attarian, Aram	24622 Traynor Court, Hayward, Calif.; apparently employed by Perry's Studio, 9334 East 14th St., Oakland, Calif.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 10 ff (galley).
Austin, Kenneth Craig	535 Columbus Ave., San Francisco, Calif., apartment 33; present occupation, longshoreman.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 69 ff (galley).
Bailey, William J	Presently unemployed	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 37 (galley).
Barnes, Carroll	1027 9th St., Oakland, Calif.; presently unemployed.	do	Dec. 4, 1943	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 8 (galley).
Bellan, Herman Aaron	7641 Thouron Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher in Grants High School.	do	Nov. 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 3014 ff.
Belfrage, Cedric Henning	310 West 99th St., New York, N. Y.; born in London, and a subject of Great Britain; a writer for motion-picture magazines.	Apparently a member of the Psychological Warfare Division of SHAEF.	May 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1273 ff.
Belinky, Sidney	Albany, N. Y., laundry worker	No Federal employment listed	July 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2539 ff.
Benet, James Walker, II	2121 Vallejo St., San Francisco, Calif.; employed at the San Francisco Chronicle; previously engaged in journalism while living in New York, 1935–46.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 16 ff. (galley).
Black, Robert	1218 34th Ave., Oakland, Calif.; born in Dundee, Scotland; became a citizen through his father's naturalization in either 1930 or 1931; apparently employed as a printer by the Oakland Tribune.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 11 ff. (galley).
Bowen, Mildred, Miss	604 28th St., Oakland, Calif.; presently unemployed.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 100 (galley).
Burke, Libby, Miss	Professional dancer	do	Mar. 30, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 3, p. 662 ff.
Byrne, Norman	Los Angeles, Calif.; member of the staff, Los Angeles City College, 1929–42; plumber since 1947.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 751 ff.
Chown, Paul	Field organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America for 3 years; previously employed by the Joint Action Committee of Northern California Local Unions in 1950.	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 28 ff. (galley).
Darling, Barbara Ann, Mrs. (Mrs. Byron Thorwell Darling).	59 West 9th Ave., Columbus, Ohio; secretary, department of romance languages, Ohio State University.	do	June 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Columbus, Ohio, Area, p. 1789 ff.
Darling, Byron Thorwell	1870 North 4th St., Columbus, Ohio; theoretical physicist, Ohio State University.	do	Mar. 13, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 2, p. 130 ff.
Do	59 West 9th Ave., Columbus, Ohio; professor physics at Ohio State University.	do	June 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Columbus, Ohio, Area, p. 1801 ff.
Deacon, Thomas	1931 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.; counselor, Sulzberger Junior High School; teacher since 1929.	do	Nov. 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 3019.
Delgado, John	Truck driver	do	Dec. 3, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 98 (galley).
Dodd, Rena, Miss	Albany, N. Y.; up to July 3, 1953, employee of the New York State Health Department, Division of Laboratories.	do	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2523 ff.
Douglas, Dorothy W., Mrs	54 Prospect St., Northampton, Mass.; formerly professor at Smith College; presently unemployed.	do	Mar. 13, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 2, p. 155 ff.
Duarte, Charles Alfred	1005 102d Ave., Oakland, Calif., president, local 6, ILWU.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 23 ff. (galley).
Dunham, Barrows	127 Bentley Ave., Cynwyd, Pa	do	Feb. 27, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 1, p. 118 ff.
D'Usseau, Arnaud	New York, N. Y.; playwright; author of Deep Are the Roots, Tomorrow the World, and Legend of Sarah.	do	May 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1306 ff.
Eagle, Eugene	1324 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.; an optometrist.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 67 ff. (galley).
Eastman, Philip Dey	Los Angeles, Calif.; artist and writer—freelance.	do	Mar. 23, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 1, p. 322 ff.
Elfont, Sophie, Miss	425 South Carlisle St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at Stetson Junior High School since January 1944.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2982 ff.
Fagerhaugh, Ole	2285 East 19th St., Oakland, Calif.; born in Tromso, Norway; became a citizen by virtue of his father's naturalization in 1912; a warehouseman, apparently at the Illinois Glass Co., 601 36th Ave., Oakland, Calif.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 6 ff. (galley).

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Faragoh, Francis Edward	Los Angeles, Calif.; born in Hungary; entered the United States in 1909; became a citizen of the United States in 1935.	No Federal employment listed	Mar. 24, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 1, p. 363 ff.
Fine, Daniel	721 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.; physician, Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston, Mass.	do	Apr. 14, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 2, p. 227 ff.
Flacks, David	1444 Carroll St., New York, N. Y.; teacher for 26 years.	do	May 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1248 ff.
Flacks, Mildred, Mrs. (Mrs. David Flacks).	1444 Carroll St., New York, N. Y.; teacher for 20 years until dismissed in 1952.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1250 ff.
Flynn, Hulda Rees, Mrs	4831 St. Elmo Ave., Bethesda, Md.; housewife; formerly taught psychology at Smith College.	do	Mar. 17, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 2, p. 163 ff.
Frederick, George Van	2011 Bridgeway, Sausalito, Calif.; employed as a draftsman with Bechtel Corp. until the day he was served with a subpena.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 62 ff. (galley).
Fruit, Harry	7134 Horrocks St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher in Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa.	do	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2911 ff.
Furry, Wendell Hinkle	Associate professor of physics, Harvard University.	do	Feb. 26, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 1, p. 66 ff.
Gelbart, Abe	108 Carlton Dr., Syracuse, N. Y.; associate professor of mathematics, Syracuse University.	Member of the staff, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, December 1942 to July 1, 1943.	May 28, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 5, p. 1568 ff.
Geller, Louis	Albany, N. Y.; electrician in the city of Albany.	No Federal employment listed	July 14, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 1, p. 2462 ff.
George, Harrison	1923 East 4th St., Los Angeles 33, Calif.; employed in a clerical capacity in a commercial enterprise owned by a doctor in Los Angeles.	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 27 ff. (galley).
Gerber, Serrill	Los Angeles, Calif.; teacher of the 6th grade, Evergreen Ave., Los Angeles city schools, since 1946.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 759 ff.
Gilbert, Jody, Miss	1325½ North Bronson, Los Angeles, Calif.; actress in the theater and motion pictures.	do	Mar. 26, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles area, pt. 2, p. 468.
Glasser, Abraham	37 Washington St., Newark, N. J. (mailing address); 59 Morton St., New York, N. Y. (home address); lawyer.	Special attorney for research, Department of Justice, December 1935 to October 1941, Enforcement Litigation Division, OPA.	Mar. 18, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 2, p. 195 ff.
Gold, Irving	Albany, N. Y.; on the staff, New York State Department of Civil Service until June 30, 1953, as an associate personnel technician.	No Federal employment listed	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., area, pt. 2, p. 2521 ff.
Goldstein, Evelyn, Mrs	Albany, N. Y.; bookkeeper for business establishments.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., area, pt. 2, p. 2534 ff.
Goldstein, Theodora Mitzberg, Mrs.	Boston, Mass.; employed as an attorney's secretary.	do	Apr. 23, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 4, p. 1109 ff.
Gorney, Jay	Born in Poland and came to the United States in 1906; songwriter by profession.	do	May 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 3, p. 1375 ff.
Greenstein, William	New York, N. Y.; secretary of the brewery workers joint board since 1948.	do	July 20, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Government-Labor), pt. 2, p. 1958 ff.
Grier, Mary Catherine, Miss	2123 I St. NW., Washington, D. C.; bibliographer and indexer, Geological Society of America.	U. S. Hydrographic Office of the Navy, 1943–47.	Apr. 17, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Government-Labor) pt. 1, p. 1593 ff.
Haas, Solomon	5432 Sansom St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at the Hunter Elementary Public School, 6A and 5B grades.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 3011 ff.
Halling, Bjorne	596 Page St., San Francisco, Calif.; born in Norway; became a naturalized citizen in 1937; employed as a longshoreman.	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 31 (galley).
Harap, Louis	83 Horatio St., New York, N. Y.; writer and editor since 1939.	do	June 29, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 6, p. 1898 ff.
Hee, Kathleen Griffith, Mrs	2464 Prince St., Berkeley, Calif.; born in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada; became an American citizen through the naturalization of her father in 1940; a waitress at the Clairmont Hotel.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 99 (galley).
Hudson, Roy	San Francisco, Calif.; presently unemployed; regular occupation, house painter since about 1930.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 36 ff. (galley).
Huebsch, Edward	Los Angeles, Calif.; screen writer since 1946.	do	Mar. 25, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 1, p. 375 ff.
Hurvich, Leo M	Rochester, N. Y.; experimental psychologist employed by the Eastman Kodak Co.	In the Ordnance Division, Frankford Arsenal, November 1943–May or June 1944 (6 months).	Apr. 21, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 3, p. 981 ff.
Itskowitz, Harry Gordon (also known as Harry Gordon).	Salesman	Communicator with the Civil Aeronautics Administration until 1947.	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2 p. 2532 ff.
Ivens, Louis	5314 Lebanon Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher in Stetson Junior High School.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2915 ff.
Jacobs, Florence H., Mrs. (Mrs. Julius G. Jacobs).	729 East 49th St., Brooklyn, 3, N. Y.; teacher 11 or 12 years.	do	May 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1258 ff.
Jacobs, Julius G	729 East 49th St., Brooklyn 3, N. Y.; teacher since 1932.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1253 ff.
Kaplan, Samuel Meyer	1402 60th St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at John Bartram High School.	WPA in late 1930's	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2937 ff.
Kaplan, Sol	Los Angeles, Calif.; musician and composer.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 832.
Kaufman, Sarah Schwartzman, Mrs.	Albany, N. Y.; born in Copenhagen, Denmark; became a citizen in June 1924.	do	July 14, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 1, p. 2460 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Laros, Betty, Miss	1026 New Scotland Rd., Albany, N. Y.; until July 1, 1953, research for New York State Health Department, since 1937.	No Federal employment listed	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2525 ff.
Lazarus, Simon M	Monrovia, Calif.; born in Russia; entered the United States in 1914; became a citizen of the United States in 1924; motion-picture exhibitor since 1917; until Mar. 19, 1953, president of Independent Productions Corp.	do	Mar. 26, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 2, p. 482 ff.
Lehman, Lloyd	Present occupation not specified	do	Dec. 3, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 92 ff. (galley).
Levy, Arthur L	44-B Schuyler Heights, Menands, N. Y.; member of the staff, chemistry department, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, since 1948.	do	Apr. 23, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 4, p. 1125 ff.
Lewis, Matilda, Mrs	Laguna Beach, Calif.; principal Park Avenue School.	do	Apr. 13, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 5, p. 865.
Looschen, John	Malibu area, Los Angeles County; general building contractor.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 788.
Lowenfels, Lillian, Mrs	4510 Regent St., Philadelphia, Pa.; formerly a teacher in the Philadelphia school system.	do	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2933 ff.
Lubin, Louis J	Albany, N. Y.; profession is dentistry	do	July 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2538 ff.
Lusher, Bernard	Union organizer since 1941	do	Mar. 28, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 2, p. 593 ff.
Lynden, Richard	255 9th St., San Francisco, Calif.; secretary of the Warehouse Union, Local 6.	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 32 (galley).
McCombe, Dan	Los Angeles County; barber	do	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 838.
McGrath, Thomas Matthew	Los Angeles County; assistant professor at Los Angeles State College for 3½ years.	do	Apr. 13, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 5, p. 863 ff.
Maddow, Ben	Los Angeles, Calif.; screen writer since 1945.	do	Mar. 28, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 2, p. 601.
Mah, Dan Kew	San Francisco, Calif.; present occupation not specified.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 68 ff. (galley).
Margolis, Adele Pollock, Mrs. (Mrs. Nathan Walter Margolis).	840 Asbury Ter., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher in Philadelphia schools, 1930–48.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2991 ff.
Margolis, Nathan Walter	840 Asbury Ter., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at John Bartram High School.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2978 ff.
Markham, George F	Cambridge, Mass.; educational director in New England, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, since February 1947.	do	June 24, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 6, p. 1879 ff.
Mass, John W	Walnut Creek, Calif.; teacher at the City College of San Francisco, 1947 to date.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 43 ff. (galley).
Melia, Joseph	1617 Parker St., Berkeley, Calif.; present occupation not specified.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 1 ff. (galley).
Michelson, William	110–56 63d Dr., Forest Hills, N. Y.; organizational director of District 65, CIO.	do	July 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 5, pp. 1971 ff.
Minkus, Abraham	Los Angeles, Calif.; teacher in the Los Angeles city schools, 1937 to date.	do	Mar. 27, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 2, pp. 544 ff and pt. 3, p. 613 ff.
Mullen, Virginia, Mrs	Los Angeles, Calif.; character actress in motion pictures.	do	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, pp. 809 ff.
Naboisek, Herbert	837 San Luis Rd., Berkeley, Calif.; employed in research work in the department of psychology, University of California.	do	Dec. 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 33 ff. (galley).
Nixon, Russell Arthur	11 East 51st St., New York, N. Y.; Washington legislative representative of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.	Research on manpower problems, Economic Research Division, WPA, 1941.	June 9, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Government-Labor), pt. 1, p. 1654 ff.
Offner, Mortimer	Television producer and director	No Federal employment listed	May 5, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in New York City Area, pt. 2, p. 1263 ff.
Oliver, William E	Born in England; entered the United States in 1910; became a citizen of the United States in 1920; newspaper writer with the Evening Herald-Express since 1926.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 775 ff.
Osman, Arthur	2272 East 28th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	do	July 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 5, p. 2005.
Page, Charles Albert	In the publishing business, 1921–25 or 1926; secretarial positions, 1934–41; currently no occupation.	Secretary in the U. S. Foreign Service, 1927–33; the auxiliary Foreign Service, 1941–46.	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 763 ff.
Paley, Jack	20 Cherry Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y.	No Federal employment listed	July 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 5, p. 2006.
Parry, William T	144 Englewood Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.; teacher of philosophy, University of Buffalo.	Writer's project, WPA, 1938–39	May 19, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 5, p. 1513 ff.
Perloff, Caroline Kramer, Mrs. (Mrs. David Perloff).	7024 Cedar Park Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at Ferguson School.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2993.
Perloff, David	7024 Cedar Park Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at Abraham Lincoln High School.	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2986 ff.
Pieper, Mary, Mrs	2940 Encinal Dr., Walnut Creek, Calif.; present employment not specified.	do	Dec. 3, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 93 (galley).

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Polumbaum, Theodore S.	123 Norwood Ave., Newtonville, Mass.; television script writer, Boston Bureau of the United Press since July 1950.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 21, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 3, p. 990 ff.
Posell, Rose, Mrs.	Los Angeles, Calif.; elementary school teacher, Los Angeles city schools since 1937.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 786.
Rappaport, Arpad David	Albany, N. Y.; born in Hungary; naturalized by derivation through his mother; employee of the State of New York.	do	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2512 ff.
Reivich, Isadore	2038 North 52d St., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at West Philadelphia High School since 1946.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2963 ff.
Reynolds, John Henry	Teacher at the University of Florida	do	Apr. 27, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 4, p. 1132 ff.
Roberson, Doris Brin Walker, Mrs.	1268 Clayton St., San Francisco, Calif.; an attorney.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 14 ff. (galley).
Robeson, Naomi, Mrs.	Los Angeles, Calif.; formerly an actress; currently a housewife.	do	Mar. 30, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 3, p. 673 ff.
Robinson, Jerome	North Hollywood, Calif.; commercial photographer.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 800; pt. 5, p. 858.
Robison, David	Los Angeles, Calif.; formerly a teacher at Columbia University in New York and at Fisk in Nashville; currently a writer.	do	Mar. 30, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 3, p. 653 ff.
Ruskin, Shimen	Los Angeles, Calif.; born in Poland; entered the United States in 1923; became a citizen of the United States in 1929; an actor.	do	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 820.
Rutman, Robert J.	6331 Ross St., Philadelphia, Pa.; assistant professor of biological chemistry at Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.	U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Division of Water Analysis.	Nov. 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 3003 ff.
Sabinson, Lee S.	743 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.; producer of plays, e. g., Finian's Rainbow.	No Federal employment listed	May 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 4, p. 1429 ff.
Schlipf, Paul	791 Prospect, Oakland, Calif.; a factory worker employed in an Oakland automobile plant.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 3 ff. (galley).
Schwarzbart, Elias M.	104 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.; title attorney, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York.	do	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2506 ff.
Scott, Janet, Miss	Albany, N. Y.; newspaper reporter	do	July 14, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 1, p. 2458 ff.
Shapiro, Hannah, Mrs.	Albany, N. Y.; born in Poland; entered the United States in 1920; naturalized by derivation through her father; received a teachers certificate in June 1953 from Albany State Teachers College.	do	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2528 ff.
Shepro, Harry	Los Angeles, Calif.; born in the Ukraine in Russia; entered the United States in 1903; a citizen by derivation; a teacher in Los Angeles city schools since 1922.	do	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 744.
Singer, Marcus	109 Iroquois Rd., Ithaca, N. Y.; associate professor of zoology, Cornell University.	do	May 26, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 5, p. 1545 ff.
Sipser, I. Philip	New York, N. Y.; practicing attorney since 1940.	do	July 20, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Government-Labor), pt. 2, p. 1954 ff.
Skadron, Bernard	Los Angeles, Calif.; public accountant, self-employed.	do	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 806.
Soler, Esther, Mrs.	5243 Lebanon Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher of the 4th grade, William B. Mann School.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2956 ff.
Soler, William Gordon	5243 Lebanon Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at Central High School.	do	Nov. 17, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 2, p. 2969 ff.
Springer, Joseph	4237 Drucker St., Los Angeles 32, Calif.; born in Poland; became a citizen in 1928; proprietor of Camp Tenaya, Crestline, Calif.	do	Mar. 25, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 1, p. 400 ff.
Stander, Lionel	Actor, producer, and writer	do	May 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 3, p. 1364 ff.
Stein, Peter	1146 Ogden Ave., Bronx, N. Y.	do	July 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 6, p. 2006.
Steinmetz, Harry C.	San Diego, Calif.; teacher of psychology at San Diego State College since 1930.	Consultant in personnel research methods, United States Naval Training Station, San Diego, 1931.	Apr. 7, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 729 ff.
Tarloff, Frank	Los Angeles, Calif.; writer in radio and television for 12 to 13 years.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 817 ff.
Thomas, Estelle Naomi, Miss	4288 Parkside Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.; teacher at the Bache School, 2d grade, since February 1951.	Taught educational recreation in WPA, 1938; employed by the U. S. Signal Corps, Philadelphia, 1953.	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2925 ff.
Toopeekoff, Eugene Alexander	1050 Mountain Blvd., Oakland, Calif.; employed as a draftsman with C. C. Moore & Co. (engineers) 450 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif.; born in Russia; entered the United States in 1923; became a citizen in May 1934.	No Federal employment listed	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 65 ff. (galley).
Treuhaft, Robert E.	730 59th, Oakland, Calif.; an attorney	do	Dec. 3, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 96 (galley).
Velson, Irving Charles	1798 Bedford Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.; an ironworker for Steel Fabricators, Long Island City.	Shipfitter, Brooklyn Navy Yard, 1931-39.	May 6, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. 3, p. 1420 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities during 1953—Continued

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Wachsman, Robert	Los Angeles, Calif.; publicist	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 815.
Wagner, Murry	Van Nuys, Calif.; radio announcer	do	do	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 799.
Ward, Douglas Whitney	827 16th St., Sparks, Nev.; apparently employed by Southern Pacific RR. in Sparks, Nev.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 9 (galley).
Webster, Flora, Mrs. (Mrs. Willard Parker Webster).	4625 East 15th, Tucson, Ariz.; sister of Barbara Darling.	Currently an employee of the Post Office in Tucson, Ariz.	June 18, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Columbus, Ohio, Area, p. 1825 ff.
Weitzman, Max	Boston, Mass.; born in Poland; entered the United States in 1920; a citizen of the United States; teacher in the public schools of Boston.	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 22, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 3, p. 1063 ff.
Wepman, Sarah Walsh, Mrs	Solebury, Bucks County, Pa.; housewife; formerly a teacher at Penn Treaty Junior High School until 1946.	do	Nov. 16, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 1, p. 2928 ff.
Wheeler, Donald Niven	Sequim, Wash.; apparently a dairy farmer; formerly an instructor in government, Yale University, 1938–39.	Last Federal Government employment: Acting chief, P-6, $7,341.60 per annum, State Department, Research and Analysis, until Aug. 5, 1946.	Dec. 1, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 29 ff. (galley).
Wilenchick, Clement	Los Angeles, Calif.; artist and actor	No Federal employment listed	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 816.
Williams, Joy, Mrs	5646 Marywood Dr., Oakland, Calif.; present employment not specified.	do	Dec. 4, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 8 ff. (galley).
Woerner, Harold T., Jr	8450 Boulevard East, North Bergen, N. J.; salesman, Hauck Manufacturing Co.	do	Apr. 29, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 5, p. 1504 ff.
Wood, James Fenton	975 Grove St., San Francisco, Calif.; employed as a draftsman with Bechtel Corp. until served with a subpena.	do	Dec. 2, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, p. 64 ff. (galley).
Wright, John	Albany, N. Y.; born in England; naturalized by derivation through his father; unemployed; previously employed by the Division of Parole, State of New York, since 1930.	do	July 15, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area, pt. 2, p. 2517 ff.
Young, Ned	Los Angeles County; actor and writer	do	Apr. 8, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 4, p. 825.
Zilsel, Paul Rudolph	Storrs, Conn.; born in Austria; became a citizen of the United States in November 1946; assistant professor of physics, University of Connecticut.	do	Apr. 22, 1953	Communist Methods of Infiltration (Education), pt. 3, p. 1036 ff.
Zuckman, Morris	62 Morris St., Albany, N. Y.; attorney and counselor at law since 1933.	do	July 14, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y. Area, pt. 1, p. 2455.
ADDENDUM				
Brown, John	Los Angeles, Calif.; an actor in radio, motion pictures, and television; born in Yorkshire, England; entered the United States in 1915; became a United States citizen in 1923 through the naturalization of his father	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 23, 1953	Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area, pt. 8, p. 3509 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives during 1953

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Connelly, Gerald Patrick	1535 East River Ter., Minneapolis, Minn.; previously resided in Chicago, Ill., and Florida; representative of Local 548, Teamsters Union, 706 1st Ave. NE., Minneapolis, Minn.	No Federal employment listed	Nov. 25, 1953	Investigation of Welfare Funds and Racketeering, p. 380 ff.
Dorfman, Allen	3420 Lake Shore Dr., Chicago, Ill.; engaged in the insurance business since 1949; manager, Union Insurance Agency of Illinois; previously taught at the University of Illinois, School of Physical Education.	do	Nov. 23, 1953	Investigation of Welfare Funds and Racketeering, p. 73 ff.
Dorfman, Paul J	7347 North Sheridan Rd., Chicago, Ill.; secretary-treasurer, Local 20467, Waste Material Handlers' Union, Chicago, Ill.; father of Allen Dorfman.	do	Nov. 25, 1953	Investigation of Welfare Funds and Racketeering, p. 310 ff.

Witnesses who invoked the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution in testimony before the special subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations and Education and Labor of the House of Representatives during 1953

Name	Identification	Federal employment if any	Date testified	Hearings citation
Monteleone, Leonardo da Vinci	4659 Lakewood, Detroit, Mich.; employed by Swanson & Son, Detroit, Mich.	No Federal employment listed	June 11, 1953	Investigation of Racketeering, p. 96 ff.

SUMMARY OF WITNESSES BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations of the U. S. Senate 67
Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U. S. Senate 102
Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives 144
Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives 3
Special Subcommittees of the House Committees on Government Operations and Education and Labor 1

PERSONS WHO INVOKED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT BEFORE TWO DIFFERENT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES IN 1953

Belfrage, Cedric Henning: House Committee on Un-American Activities, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

D'Usseau, Arnaud: House Committee on Un-American Activities, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Glasser, Harold: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mins, Leonard E.: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Ullmann, William Ludwig: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Wilkerson, Doxey A.: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

PERSONS WHO INVOKED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT BEFORE THE SAME CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE AT TWO SEPARATE APPEARANCES BEFORE THAT COMMITTEE IN 1953

Coe, V. Frank: Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Darling, Byron Thorwell: House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Glaser, Eda Habinsky, Mrs.: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Hyman, Harry A.: Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Wilkerson, Doxey A.: Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

UNION ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ALL PERSONS WHO INVOKED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION IN TESTIMONY BEFORE COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS DURING 1953, TOGETHER WITH THE NAMES OF THE COMMITTEES

(In this list: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations means Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations, U. S. Senate; Internal Security Subcommittee means Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate; Committee on Un-American Activities means Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives; Committee on Education and Labor means Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. House of Representatives; Committee on Government Operations means Special Subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations and of Education and Labor, U. S. House of Representatives.)

Abernethy, Milton A., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Abernethy, Minna, Mrs. (Mrs. Milton A. Abernethy), Internal Security Subcommittee.

Abt, John, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Albert, Sam, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Allen, James S., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Andren, Carl, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Anthony, Robenia F., Miss, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Anton, Benjamin David, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Aptheker, Herbert, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Archdeacon, Henry Canning, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Aron, Paul Harvey, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Aronson, Allan James, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Atkinson, Sadie T., Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Atarian, Aram, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Austin, Kenneth Craig, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Austin, Richard H., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Bailey, William J., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Bancroft, Frank C., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Barker, Elizabeth, Mrs. (Mrs. Guy Barker), Internal Security Subcommittee.

Barnes, Carroll, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Barrows, Alice Prentice, Miss, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Bazer, Julia Older, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Beilan, Herman Aaron, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Belfrage, Cedric Henning, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Belfrage, Cedric Henning, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Blinky, Sidney, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Benet, James Walker, II, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Berke, Sylvia, Miss, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Berman, Louise Rosenberg Bransten, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Black, Robert, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Blau, Harold Raymond, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Bliss,[1] Willard, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Bortz, Louis, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Bowen, Mildred, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Boyer, Richard O., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Brand, Millen, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Bressler, Joseph, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Briney,[1] Harold K., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Browder, Earl Russell, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Brown,[1] John, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Burgum, Edwin Berry, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Burke, Libby, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Byrne, Norman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Cameron, Angus, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Carson, Saul, Internal Security Subcommittee.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Chown, Paul, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Coe, Charles J. (Robert), Internal Security Subcommittee.

Coe, V. Frank, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Cohen, Morris U., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Collins, Henry H., Jr., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Connelly, Gerald Patrick, Committee on Education and Labor.

Cooke, Marvel J., Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Darling, Barbara Ann, Mrs. (Mrs. Byron Thorwell Darling), Committee on Un-American Activities.

Darling, Byron Thorwell, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Davin, Thomas, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Davis, Horace Bancroft, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Deacon, Thomas, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Delgado, John, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dodd, Rena, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dorfman, Allen, Committee on Education and Labor.

Dorfman, Paul J., Committee on Education and Labor.

Douglas, Dorothy W., Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Duarte, Charles Alfred, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dunham, Barrows, Committee on Un-American Activities.

D'Usseau, Arnaud, Committee on Un-American Activities.

D'Usseau, Arnaud, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Eagle, Eugene, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Eastman, Philip Dey, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Einhorn, Nathan, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Elfont, Sophie, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Elveson,[1] Leon, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Evans, Gertrude, Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Fagerhaugh, Ole, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fajans, Irving, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Faragoh, Francis Edward, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fast, Howard, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Faxon, George R., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Fine, Daniel, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fitzgerald, Edward J., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Fitzpatrick,[1] Thomas J., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Flacks, David, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Flacks, Mildred, Mrs. (Mrs. David Flacks), Committee on Un-American Activities.

Flanagan,[1] Thomas, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Flato, Charles Sidney, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Flynn, Hulda Rees, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Foner, Philip S., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Frauenglass, William, Internal Security Subcommittee.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Frederick, George Van, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Freedman, David M., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Friedman, Samuel, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Fruit, Harry, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Furry, Wendell Hinkle, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gelbart, Abe, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gelfan, Harriet Moore, Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Geller, Louis, Committee on Un-American Activities.
George, Harrison, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gerber, Serrill, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gift, Charles, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Gilbert, Jody, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Glaser,[1] Eda Habinsky, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Glasser, Abraham, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Glasser, Harold, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Glasser, Harold, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Glassman, Sidney, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Gold, Hyman, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Gold, Irving, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Goldfrank, Helen, Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Goldstein, Evelyn, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Goldstein, Theodora Mitzberg, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gorney, Jay, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Grauman, Jacob, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Greenstein, William, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Grier, Mary Catherine, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Gropper, William, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Gruen, Sonia, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Grundfest, Harry, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Guarnaccia, Elizabeth, Miss, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Gustafson, Elton, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Haas, Solomon, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Halling, Bjorne, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Halperin, Maurice, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hammett, Samuel Dashiell, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Harap, Louis, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Harris,[1] Jack Sargent, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Harris, Lement U., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hee, Kathleen Griffith, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Henderson, Donald, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Heyman, Ezekiel, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Hiskey, Clarence F., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hlavaty, Julius H., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Hoch, Myron L., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hudson, Roy, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Huebsch, Edward, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Hurlinger, Iven, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hurvich, Leo M., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Hutner, Eleanor Glassman, Mrs., (Mrs. Eugent Hutner), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Hyams, Jacob Shalom, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Hyman, Harry A., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Isenberg, Irvin, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Itskowitz, Harry Gordon (also known as Harry Gordon), Committee on Un-American Activities.
Ivens, Louis, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Jacobs, Florence H., Mrs. (Mrs. Julius G. Jacobs), Committee on Un-American Activities.
Jacobs, Julius G., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Jerome, Alice, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Joseph, Julius J., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Josephson, Leon, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Kamin, Leon J., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Kaplan, Louis, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Kaplan, Samuel Meyer, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Kaplan, Sol, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Kaufman, Sarah Schwartzman, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Kent, Rockwell, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
King, Harold, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Kipnis, Ira Aaron, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Kirkwood,[1] Robert C., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Knowles, Mary, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Kramer, Charles, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Laros, Betty, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lazarus, Simon M., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lehman, Lloyd, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Levine, Ruth, Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Levitsky, Joseph, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Levy, Arthur L., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lewis, Helen, Mrs. (Mrs. Naphtali Lewis), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Lewis, Matilda, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Linfield, David LaPorte, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Loney,[1] Stanley L., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Looschen, John, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lowenfels, Lillian, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lubell, David Gabriel, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Lubell, Jonathan William, Internal Security Subcommittee.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Lubin, Louis J., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lundmark, Carl J., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Lusher, Bernard, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Lynden, Richard, Committee on Un-American Activities.
McCombe, Dan, Committee on Un-American Activities.
McGrath, Thomas Matthew, Committee on Un-American Activities.
McNeil,[1] Allan D., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Maddow, Ben, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Magdoff, Harry, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Mah, Dan Kew, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Mandell, William Marx, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Margolis, Adele Pollock, Mrs. (Mrs. Nathan Walter Margolis), Committee on Un-American Activities.
Margolis, Nathan Walter, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Markham, George F., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Markham, Helen Wendler Dean, Mrs. (Mrs. George F. Markham), Internal Security subcommittee.
Martineau, Paul Victor, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Marzani, Carl Aldo, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Mass, John W., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Melia, Joseph, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Michelson, William, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Minkus, Abraham, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Mins, Leonard E., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Mins, Leonard E., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Monteleone, Leonardo da Vinci, Committee on Government Operations.
Morrill, Donald Herbert, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
Mullen, Virginia, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Naboisek, Herbert, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Nelson,[1] John W., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Nixon, Russell Arthur, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Norton, Robert, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Novikoff, Alex Benjamin, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Ober, Harry, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Oberwager, Jerome A., Internal Security Subcommittee.
Offner, Mortimer, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Oliver, William E., Committee on Un-American Activities.
Olson, William, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Osman, Arthur, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Page, Charles Albert, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Paley, Jack, Committee on Un-American Activities.
Panzino,[1] Frank, Internal Security Subcommittee.
Parry, William T., Committee on Un-American Activities.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Pataki, Ernest, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Percoff, Joseph H., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Perlo, Victor, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Perloff, Caroline Kramer, Mrs. (Mrs. David Perloff), Committee on Un-American Activities.

Perloff, David, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Piekarski, Witulad W., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Pieper, Mary, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Polumbaum, Theodore S., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Porter, Margaret B. Bennett, Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Posell, Rose, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Powell, Doris Walters, Mrs., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Quinn,[1] Thomas J., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Rappaport, Arpad David, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Rein, David, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Reiss, Julius, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Reivich, Isadore, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Reynolds, John Henry, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Roberson, Doris Brin Walker, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Robeson, Eslanda Cardoza Goode (Mrs. Paul Robeson), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Robeson, Naomi, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Robinson, Jerome, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Robison, David, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Rosinger, Lawrence K., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Rothschild, Edward M., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Rothschild, Esther, Mrs. (Mrs. Edward M. Rothschild), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Ruskin, Shimen, Committee on Un-American Activites.

Rutman, Robert J., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sabinson, Lee S., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sarant, Louise, Mrs. (formerly Mrs. Al Sarant), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Savitt, Morris, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Schappes, Morris U., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Schlipf, Paul, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Schwarzbart, Elias M., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Scott, Janet, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Selsam, Howard, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Shaftel, Oscar H., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Shapiro, Hannah, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Shepro, Harry, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Shoiket, Henry N., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Sillers, Frederick, Jr., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory, Internal Security Subcommittee.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Silvermaster, Nathan Gregory, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Singer, Marcus, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Siporin, Mary R., Mrs., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Sipser, I. Philip, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Skadron, Bernard, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Smith, Edwin Seymour, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Snyder, Samuel Joseph, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Socol, Albert, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Socolar, Sidney J., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Soler, Esther, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Soler, William Gordon, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Solomon, Benjamin, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Spitzer, Ralph, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Springer, Joseph, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Stabor,[1] Alexander, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Stander, Lionel, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Steigman, Joseph, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Stein, Peter, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Steinmetz, Harry C., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Stern, Bernhard J., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Stolberg, Sidney, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Stuart, John (also known as Harry Vinegar, Harry Winegar, Harry Vinacur, and Harry Vinacuar), Internal Security Subcommittee.

Studenberg, Irving, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Svenchansky,[1] Alexander, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Tarloff, Frank, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Taylor, William C., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Tenney, Helen B., Miss, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Thomas, Estelle Naomi, Miss, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Toopeekoff, Eugene Alexander, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Treuhaft, Robert E., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Trinkhaus, Charles, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Ullmann, Marcel, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Ullmann,[1] William Ludwig, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Ullmann, William Ludwig, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Velson, Irving Charles, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Vincent, Craig S., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Vuletich,[1] Mike, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Wachsman, Robert, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wagner, Murry, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Ward, Douglas Whitney, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Weber, Frederick Palmer, Internal Security Subcommittee.

[1] Name listed in addendum to regular committee list.

Webster, Flora, Mrs. (Mrs. Willard Parker Webster), Committee on Un-American Activities.

Weitzman, Max, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Weltfish, Gene, Miss, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Wepman, Sarah Walsh, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wheeler, Donald Niven, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wilenchick, Clement, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wilkerson, Doxey A., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Wilkerson, Doxey A., Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Williams, Joy, Mrs., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Witt, Nathan, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Woerner, Harold T., Jr., Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wolff, Milton, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Wolman, Diana Molderber, Mrs. (Mrs. Benjamin Wolman), Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Wood, James Fenton, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wortis, Joseph, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Wright, John, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Wuchinich, George S., Internal Security Subcommittee.

Young, Murray, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Young, Ned, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Zelitan, Elizabeth Aiken, Mrs. (also known as Miss Elizabeth Aiken), Internal Security Subcommittee.

Zilsel, Paul Rudolph, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Zucker, Jack, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Zuckman, Morris, Committee on Un-American Activities.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In the following tabulations of occupations, the grand total is greater than the total number of witnesses appearing before congressional committees. The reason for this fact is that a number of the witnesses mentioned more than one occupation in their testimony, and each such occupation has been recorded. An example of this is Mrs. Diana Molderber Wolman. She is listed in table 4 as a teacher, in table 2 as an employee of the Federal Government, and twice in table 5 as a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Sciences and an employee of the Four Continent Book Corp.

There is, however, one exception to this rule of recording all occupations. The exception is those persons who listed an occupation and then noted that they were currently unemployed. In these cases the former occupation has been tabulated, but the individuals have not been counted again in the unemployed category. This classification includes only those persons who listed themselves as unemployed without giving any further occupational data.

The Jefferson School of Social Sciences in New York has been given special treatment in that it has not been included in the educational institutions table (table 4) since it is a Communist Party agency. It has been included in table 5 (other nongovernmental occupations).

The fact that a person is recorded as an employee of a particular educational institution or governmental agency (international,

Federal, or State) does not mean that he or she is presently in the employ of that institution or agency. The listing simply means that at sometime during his or her career, the person was in the employ of the institution or agency listed. This fact, of course, accounts for the presence of some Federal agencies which no longer exist, for example, the National Recovery Administration.

TABLE 1. *Employees of international organizations*

Employees of the United Nations and affiliates	9
International agencies other than the United Nations	2
Total	11

TABLE 2. *Employees of the Federal Government*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Government Printing Office	3

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Departments:	
State:	
Foreign Service	1
Office of Public Affairs	1
Presentation Division	1
Research and Analysis	2
Total	5
Treasury:	
Division of Monetary Research	3
Office of International Finance	1
Total	4
War (now Department of the Army):	
Army Signal Corps	11
Corps of Engineers	1
Frankford Arsenal	1
Press Control Officers	2
Quartermaster Corps	1
Unit Unknown	2
Total	18
Navy:	
Brooklyn Navy Yard	3
Hydrographic Office	1
Mare Island	1
Naval Training Station, San Diego	1
Washington Naval Gun Factory	1
Total	7
Justice:	
Special Assistant to the Attorney General	1
Unit unknown	1
Total	2
Post Office	1
Interior: Bureau of Mines	1
Commerce:	
Civil Aeronautics Administration	2
Coast and Geodetic Survey	1
Office of Small Business	1
Unit unknown	1
Total	5
Labor:	
Bureau of Labor Statistics	1
War Manpower Commission	1
Total	2
Independent agencies:	
Federal Security Agency (now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare):	
Howard University	1
Office of Education	1
Total	2

TABLE 2. *Employees of the Federal Government*—Continued

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Independent agencies—Continued	
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	1
National Labor Relations Board	4
National Recovery Administration	1
Office for Emergency Management:	
Office of War Information	4
War Assets Administration	2
War Production Board	1
War Shipping Administration	1
Total	8
Office of Price Administration	3
Office of Strategic Services	8
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	2
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	1
Veterans' Administration	2
Works Progress Administration	4
Total	85

TABLE 3. *Employees of State governments*

Employees of the State of New York	7

TABLE 4. *Employees of educational institutions*

College and university teachers:	
Boston University	1
Brooklyn College	4
Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute	2
City College of San Francisco	1
College of the City of New York	3
Columbia University	5
Cornell University	1
Fisk University	1
Harvard University	3
Howard University	1
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia	1
Los Angeles City College	2
New York University	2
Ohio State University	1
Queens College, N. Y	1
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	1
San Diego State College	1
Sarah Lawrence College	2
Smith College	2
Syracuse University	1
University of Buffalo	1
University of California (Berkeley)	1
University of Chicago	5
University of Connecticut	1
University of Florida	1
University of Illinois	1
University of Kansas City	2
University of Vermont	1
Yale University	1
Special school, Cooper Union	1
Total	51
College and university employees other than teachers	3
Elementary and secondary school teachers	38
Elementary and secondary school employees other than teachers	2
Students (college and university)	3

TABLE 5.—*Other nongovernmental occupations*

Actors and actresses	8
Artists	4
Attorneys	14
Authors, writers, editors, and literary critics	28
Barber	1
Bookkeeper	1
Clerical and secretarial personnel	3
Commercial photographer	1
Dairy farmer	1
Dentist	1
Draftsmen	3
Economists	6
Electrician	1

TABLE 5.—*Other nongovernmental occupations*—Continued

Employed in industry	15
Employed in small business	10
Employed in the laundry business	2
Employee of the Polish Delegation to the U. N	1
Employee of the Polish Embassy in the United States	1
Employees of learned societies, associations, etc	3
Employees of the Jefferson School of Social Science	4
Employees or officials of the Progressive Party	2
General contractor	1
Housepainter	1
Housewives	6
Inactive minister	1
Insurance	1
Labor union officials and employees	23
Laboratory employees:	
1. Federal Telecommunications Laboratory 6	
2. Physical Research Laboratories 1	7
Librarians	2
Longshoremen	2
Manager of a cooperative	1
Motion-picture industry other than actors and actresses	4
Musicians and composers	3
Newspapermen and women	8
Optometrist	1
Physicians	2
Play producer	1
Plumber	1
Printing trades	3
Professional dancer	1
Public accountant	1
Publicist	1
Publishers and publishing	2
Radio and television	5
Railroads and railroading	1
Salesmen	3
Self-employed	10
Summer-camp proprietor	1
Truckdriver	2
Unemployed	5
Waitress	1
Warehouseman	1
Information lacking	15
Total	227

TABLE 6. *Summary of occupations*

International organizations	11
Federal Government	85
State of New York	7
Colleges and universities	57
Elementary and secondary schools	40
Arts and entertainment	26
Professions	27
Authors, editors, and literary critics	28
Newspapers, printers, publishers	13
Industry and small business	34
Service trades	17
Labor union officials and employees	23
Self-employed	11
Housewives	6
Clerical and secretarial	4
Unemployed	5
Other	18
Information lacking	15

TABLE 7. *Place of birth of persons born outside the United States*

Austria	2
Canada	1
China (Manchuria)	1
Denmark	1
England	4
Hungary	3
India	1
Norway	2
Poland	6
Russia	9
Scotland	1
Unknown	1
Total	32

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter and other data.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Georgetown University, a prominent Catholic seat of learning run by the Jesuit order, is well known to most of the Members of the House. A considerable number of the Members are proud to claim Georgetown University as their alma mater. Others of us have come to know and appreciate the great work of that university through the many important public services it renders.

One of these public services is performed through the Georgetown University Forum, which is carried on both television and radio. Through this forum millions of Americans have heard and seen vital public issues discussed and explained. The university has attained an enviable record for being objective, factual, and fearless in the presentation of the forum programs.

On February 16, 1954, I inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1236, a transcript of the Georgetown University Forum which had taken place on Sunday, November 15, 1953. I had the pleasure of hearing the radio portion of that program and seeing the television presentation of it, and was tremendously impressed by the facts presented therein by eminent American scholars who have spent many years on the study of communism and Russian imperialism. I felt the material presented in that program would be of special interest to the Members of Congress because of the bearing it had on the future security of the United States of America.

I was amazed when I had a telephone call several days later from the Reverend Daniel E. Power, S. J., program director of the forum, telling me of a complaint he had received from the Library of Congress concerning the forum program. There is a person called Mr. Sergius Yakobson, who holds the title of Chief, Slavic and East European Division of the Library of Congress, who made a serious allegation challenging the integrity of Georgetown University and the forum it sponsors. This Mr. Yakobson, in a memorandum to Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, made the following charge:

> I watched the television program on What Is Russia? on the Georgetown University Forum; however, there was no reference to me, to the Legislative Reference Service, or to the Library. It must have been interpolated later for one reason or another.

In this same memorandum, Mr. Yakobson made some other statements which I am sure will be of interest to Members of Congress.

Georgetown University authorities immediately made a full investigation of the charge and found it to be completely unfounded. The university authorities naturally became interested in getting at the full facts behind the false charge and the other statements made by this Mr. Yakobson in his memorandum.

One of the participants in the Georgetown University Forum program which was challenged by Yakobson was Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, professor at Marquette University, and a renowned international scholar. He was presented with a copy of Mr. Yakobson's memorandum and invited to present any comments he desired on the charges made. Dr. Smal-Stocki's reply is most enlightening. He draws attention to the fact that a book written by Corliss Lamont, a notorious pro-Communist and Russia-Firster, was used as an authoritative source in the preparation of House Document No. 754, entitled "Communism in Action." He also points out some important reasons why Sergius Yakobson is now seeking to escape from any responsibility for the compilation of House Document No. 754.

I have also received a communication under date of March 23, 1954, from the Reverend Daniel E. Power, S. J., concerning this matter. Father Power makes it clear that he has the highest regard for Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, as a sound scholar and who is likewise concerned about the charges made by Mr. Sergius Yakobson. There are other important questions raised in this letter which, as yet, are unanswered. I am therefore asking unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

In view of the material provided me, which I have very carefully studied, I think it is fair to ask the question, "What is Mr. Sergius Yakobson up to?" Others may very well ask themselves after they have read this material, "For whom is Mr. Sergius Yakobson working?"

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1954.

The Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN: I am writing to you in reference to the Georgetown University Radio Forum program entitled "What Is Russia?" produced November 15, 1953. You were kind indeed to have it inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the date of February 16, 1954. Its appearance therein occasioned a protest by Dr. Sergius Yakobson, Chief, Slavic and European Division, Library of Congress. You will recall that I phoned you immediately to inform you of the protest. I now wish to tell you the sequel.

Under the date of February 23, 1954, Dr. Yakobson sent a memorandum to Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. That memorandum contained the following words:

"1. I watched the televised program on 'What Is Russia?' on the Georgetown University Forum; however, there are no reference to me, to Legislative Reference Service, or to the Library. It must have been interpolated later for one reason or another."

This was clearly an allegation of interpolation by Georgetown University officials of words not appearing on the spoken program, for reasons not known to the writer of the memorandum.

Mr. Griffith, a sound scholar and personal friend of mine, who had also appeared on our forum program some time ago, immediately phoned me, to tell me of Dr. Yakobson's allegation.

I checked the original tape and found that the printed transcript which you had inserted in the daily RECORD was an exact reproduction, word for word. Therefore, on page A1237, there was no interpolation and therefore the allegation was as unfounded as it was hasty and unfair.

The explanation is as follows: Dr. Yakobson, reputedly a competent scholar, either did not read the entire text or read parts of it hurriedly. On page A1236 it is clearly stated radio Forum. Had Dr. Yakobson scanned the entire insertion with the same eagerness he manifested in imputing motives for alleged interpolation, he, as a sound scholar, would not have confused the television Forum which he says he saw and the radio Forum, part of the transcript of which he could not possibly have read.

Thank you for your interest in our Forum. I feel sure that Mr. Griffith will suggest that Dr. Yakobson's unfounded allegation will be corrected.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. POWER, S. J.,
Program Director.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

FEBRUARY 23, 1954.

To: Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service.

From: Sergius Yakobson, Chief, Slavic and East European Division.

Subject: Criticism—Tensions Within Soviet Union.

Just to keep the record straight, here are a few comments with regard to page A1237 in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1954:

1. I watched the television program on What Is Russia? on the Georgetown University Forum; however, there was no reference to me, to LRS or to the Library. It must have been interpolated later for one reason or another.

2. As far as I can see the nationality problem in the Soviet Union is touched upon in Communism in Action (H. Doc. No. 754) twice in chapter 10 on pages 93–94 and in chapter 15 on page 134. Corliss Lamont's book is quoted only once, on page 134. Besides, I would like to point out that I did not write a single chapter of Communism in Action. The authors of chapter 10 were Nancy Baster, Virginia Brewer, and Dudley B. Ball, and of chapter 15, Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree, who, as you remember, was also the editor and thus responsible for the whole study.

3. That I have minimized the non-Russian nations in my report Tensions Within the Soviet Union is not correct. Out of 11 chapters, 2 chapters—4 and 5—deal with religious groups and the minorities in the Soviet Union and fill 20 pages, page 31 to 50 of the 92-page text. Thus, over 21 percent of the report is devoted to the subject.

4. The accusation that by the use of the word "sect" I have insulted the Ukrainian Catholic Church is fallacious and absurd. The word "sect" is certainly not a derogatory term. It means, according to Webster's, "one of the organized bodies of Christians; a denomination." Besides, if the quotation taken from Tensions and which is full of errors had been extended three more lines,

the malicious character of the attack on the report would become self-evident. These additional lines prove convincingly that I am perfectly aware of the existence of a Uniate Church and referred to it as such regardless of whether Soviet terminology does or not. Here is the whole quotation:

"Important among these [the nonconformists], and perhaps typical in pattern, is the Uniate group of the Ukraine. This group certainly is a potential enemy of the Soviet regime. This sect, which acknowledges the supremacy of Rome, has had a long history of suppression at the hands of the Russian Orthodoxy and the state, and more recently at the hands of the Politburo. When the Bolsheviks defeated the Germans on the territories of Poland inhabited by the Uniates, and since incorporated into the Soviet Union, the Uniate Church bishops and clergy were, for the most part, arrested and deported."

Finally, I would like to mention here that the Ukrainian newspaper Suchasna Ukraina, published in Munich, devoted a whole page in its issue of October 4, 1953 to a review of the Tensions which praises it as being "correct," "objective," and "free of any propaganda undertones" in its presentation of the nationality and minority problems in the Soviet Union.

MEMO ON THE OFFICE MEMORANDUM, FEBRUARY 23, 1954, FROM SERGIUS YAKOBSON, CHIEF, SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN DIVISION, TO ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, ON SUBJECT: CRITICISM—TENSIONS WITHIN SOVIET UNION

I call attention to the fact that the subject of the memo is not correctly formulated by Mr. Sergius Yakobson; the criticism refers not only to Tension Within Soviet Union but also to Communism in Action. To his points I make the following remarks:

1. I did refer to him personally and to the Library of Congress in the Georgetown University Forum, November 15, 1953; this discussion was tape-recorded.

2. Regarding Communism in Action (House Doc. No. 754) I wish to state:

(a) Mr. Sergius Yakobson's statement that not he, but Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree, its editor, was responsible for the whole study, is contradicted by the fact (cf. my book, the Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union, p. 361) printed on page 7 of the mentioned House document that Dr. Sergius Yakobson, Library consultant, reviewed the entire study. Taking this officially printed statement into consideration, Dr. Sergius Yakobson, then Library consultant, is also responsible for the misinformation about the problem of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union submitted by the Library of Congress to the American Congress despite his asseveration: "I did not write a single chapter of Communism in Action." As a consultant and expert on Soviet matters for the Library of Congress he reviewed the entire study and regarded the information as objective and truthful.

(b) But, in spite of his rejection for any responsibility for the misinformation given to the Congress—and this rejection is in reality an avowal about the quality of that information—the former consultant of the Library attempts to minimize the basic importance of the quotation from Corliss Lamont's book by stating "Corliss Lamont's book is quoted once." But the whole chapter "Nationalities" is based on Corliss Lamont's book, and the pro-Soviet propaganda of this chapter is strengthened and intensified by a quotation from Hans Kohn, Nationalism in the Soviet Union, London, 1933. I stress that since 1933 Prof. Hans Kohn has gone through a deep evolution in these matters and his excellent new book Pan-Slavism (1953) demonstrates that he grasped facts about Russia proper, present, and past, which he did not realize before. Nevertheless it is a fact that the book, from which the quotation was taken, is still today a classic of Communist propaganda in the Anglo-Saxon world against the struggle for liberty of all non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union (cf. my book, p. 182–196).

Thus the tragic fact is on record that the Library of Congress, with the approval of its consultant, Sergius Yakobson, presented to the Congress the crucial problem of the Soviet Union, the fight of the non-Russian nations against the Russian Communist dictatorship, on the basis of pro-Communist books, silencing in bibliographical references the whole anti-Communist literature on that subject.

I am not questioning the right of the American pro-Communist scholars to present their views to the American Congress through the Library of Congress. I am only questioning the right of a Library consultant (a) to approve information based on pro-Communist literature as objective and truthful, and (b) his right to silence the whole literature of the anti-Communist Americans in a study submitted to the Congress. Even the application for a quarter of a century of the outrageous linguistic theory of Marr was silenced, about which I published as long ago as 1936, a book: Ukrainska Mowa w Sovietskiy Ukraini, Warsaw, where I vehemently attacked Mr. Sergius Yakobson's brother, now a professor of Slavistics in Harvard, for his pro-Communist activities, defending the linguistic policy of Stalin in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Sergius Yakobson, an employee of the Library of Congress, as a scholar, used a similar method of silencing the anti-Communist publications from 1946–50 in the compilations of the bibliography of articles in the American Historical Review, section: Russia and Slavic Countries (cf. my book The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union) and in the bibliography of 500 Books About Russia, published by the Library of Congress. This term "Russia" includes here the whole Soviet Union, but the bibliography which influenced all university libraries, lists only three books on the peoples of Russia. Any objective bibliography about the Soviet Union, where academic freedom does not exist, should in addition include the free voice of the scholars who have been emigrees since 1920 and have created a whole literature about all aspects of the non-Russian nations and the Russian regime itself.

3. Sergius Yakobson regards as not correct my statement that he minimized the non-Russian nations in his report Tensions Within the Soviet Union: "Out of 11 chapters, 2 chapters, 4 and 5, deal with religious groups and the minorities in the Soviet Union and fill 20 pages, pages 31 to 50, of the 92-page text. Thus, over 21 percent of the report is devoted to the subject." To this I reply:

(a) he minimized the whole problem presenting the non-Russian nations as minorities, thus creating a false connotation and association because in international political terminology this term has a clearly established meaning. He himself demonstrates excellently in his above statement, his scholarly method by now calling them (for his own defense) "non-Russian nations," but using for the chapter in the report the term "minorities" in spite of the fact that he knows that according to Lenin, the Russians constituted before World War I a minority of 43 percent. They constitute also presently a minority in the Soviet Union. Besides how can the Legislative Reference Service ignore, by the use of such a terminology, article 13 of the Soviet Constitution: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet Socialist Republics," followed by the enumeration of all 16 national republics of whom one is Russian? This terminological acrobatics must have some reason. In Communism in Action where the life of the non-Russian nations was presented according to Corliss Lamont and Hans Kohn, the chapter was still entitled "Nationalities"; in the Tensions Within the Soviet Union where a part of the truth was by Sergius Yakobson presented, the non-Russian nations are degraded to "minorities," being in reality majorities in their national republics (with the exception of the Karelo-Finnish Republic).

(b) In order to increase the number of pages dedicated to the problem of the non-Russian nations, Mr. Sergius Yakobson includes now into the nationality problem the Religious Groups chapter 31–42, thus reaching his "21 percent"; but a fact is that nearly 5 pages of the chapter Religious Groups are dedicated to the Russians. Besides he simply eliminated the nationality problem from the presentation of the Orthodox Church by silencing the whole struggle of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the fight of the recently deceased Metropolitan Polikarp. Therefore, his percentage is false. But in spite of some important connections with the nationality problem, the "Religious Groups" must be separated from the first one; thus it remains a fact that only 9 pages of 92 present the cancerous problem of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, in addition, under the completely misleading title Minorities.

(c) These minorities as a tension problem in the Soviet Union were put in the report in fourth place, behind the Soviet Youth and Soviet Intelligentsia chapter, thus creating the impression (so dear to official Soviet propaganda) that the Russian Communist regime has already formed a "Soviet people" with a Soviet youth, Soviet intelligentsia and Soviet scholars. But that the problem of the non-Russian nations is the paramount tension in the Soviet Union is clearly shown by the Beria case, the present celebrations of the 300th anniversary of the alliance of Ukraine and Muscovy, by all the ideological troubles of the Russian Communists with history, literature, philology of all non-Russian nations (cf. the last 30 copies of the Current Digest of the Soviet Press) and finally by the history of the last 30 years. And Russian cultural imperialism, the reason for the tension, is also not sufficiently elaborated. Marr's linguistic theory, which was a most important aspect of this Russification of non-Russian languages for the last quarter of a century, has now been discovered by Sergius Yakobson but put into a footnote on page 19, and my mentioned book (Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union) presenting this problem, is silenced, obviously for the reason that there are submitted the facts how his brother, a former cultural attaché of the Soviet Mission in Prague, now in Harvard, glorified Stalin's linguistic policy in Europe, thus fighting the anti-Communist scholars.

In connection with the problem of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, a most important tension is completely silenced, that is, the existence and activities outside the Soviet Union of the exiled national democratic governments, national committees, and revolutionary organizations of the non-Russian nations.

Summing up, Tensions Within the Soviet Union, published 1952, with the chapter Minorities, written by Sergius Yakobson,

Chief Slavic and East European Division, is a striking refutation of the chapter Nationalities reviewed by Sergius Yakobson, Library consultant, published in Communism in Action, 1946. But not a complete one, because this tension in regard to importance and dynamism is minimized according to "Russian Menshevik Marxist world outlook."

4. Mr. Sergius Yakobson states that my accusation that he insulted the Ukrainian Catholic Church by the use of the term "sect" is "fallacious and absurd. The word is certainly not a derogatory term. It means, according to Webster's, 'one of the organized bodies of Christians, a denomination'." My remarks are as follows:

(a) According to his scholarly methods he quoted from Webster's Dictionary only the fifth meaning, but overlooked the previous fourth meaning, presenting the meaning of the word "sect" in religion just in the sphere he applied it. I quote: "Sect, 4, in religion, the believers in a particular creed, or upholders of a particular practice; especially, now a party dissenting from an established church; a religious denomination, a separate religious organization. Historically, a sect differs from a religion in that it differs from other sects of the same religion in its interpretation or application of what is recognized by all as the same revelation, while different religions differ as to what is to be taken as revelation." I supplement this information with Funk & Wagnalls' New Standard Dictionary: "Sect, 1, a body of persons distinguished by peculiarities of faith and practice from other bodies adhering to the same general system. Specifically: the adherents collectively of a particular creed or confession; a denomination, communion; as, the Presbyterian sect, the various sects of Jews, Mohammedans, or Christians; 2, especially, an organized body of dissenters from an established or older form of faith: often with derogatory implication; as the sects of the Gnostics, the sect of Montanists."

After carefully examining the whole chapter, I was, and I am, convinced Mr. Sergius Yakobson used the term "sect" for the Catholic Church in Ukraine in the meaning of "a party dissenting from the established church" and that the established church he had in mind was the Church of the Orthodox Patriarch in Moscow because the term is also used in reference to the footnote: R. S. Journal of the Moscow Patriarchy—II. op. cit. 132. Every reader should have this impression because the subdivision the Uniate Group of the Ukraine immediately follows his discussion of the Orthodox Church and it was not presented as a part of Catholicism in the next subdivision, Roman Catholics. Thus the Ukrainian Catholics are presented as a sect which must be separated from the Roman Catholics.

He apparently does not know that all Catholics are Roman Catholics and they differ only according to rite; the Byzantine-Slavic rite of the Ukrainians and the Latin rite of the Americans or Irish, as all other rites are Roman Catholic according to official terminology. And the publications prepared by the Library of Congress should keep it.

(b) Whether the term "sect" for the Catholics in Ukraine is an insult or not, derogatory or not, I propose to ask for a statement from the Most Reverend Apostolic Exarch for Americans of this rite, the Most Reverend Apostolic Exarch Konstantyn Bohachevsky, Philadelphia, or I propose Mr. Sergius Yakobson may introduce into the publications of the Library of Congress this term for the Roman Catholics of the Latin rite in the United States and watch the consequences.

Besides, I call attention to the fact that in that chapter Mr. Sergius Yakobson again ignored an important pamphlet by Walter Dushnyck, Martyrdom in Ukraine, with the imprimatur of Francis Cardinal Spellman, published 1946 by the America Press, but the publications of the New Leader authors are by him carefully, often by quotations and footnotes, used and registered in the whole study.

(c) Mr. Sergius Yakobson states that "the quotation taken from Tensions * * * is full of errors." I should like to state that my quotation on the tape recorder surely has no single error because I read from the original. The transcript of the Georgetown University Forum, November 15, 1953, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have the following errors: (1) instead "modern Russia"—"more than;" (2) instead "Uniate group"—"unique group;" thus two errors are exaggerated by Sergius Yakobson to "full of errors."

Next, Mr. Sergius Yakobson states that "if the quotation * * * had been extended three more lines the malicious character of the attack on the report would become self-evident. I am perfectly aware of the existence of the Uniate Church and referred to it as such regardless of whether Soviet terminology does or not. Here is the whole quotation, and he quotes now my given quotation, adding the following lines: 'When the Bolsheviks defeated the Germans on the territories of Poland inhabited by the Uniates, and since incorporated into the Soviet Union, the Uniate Church bishops and clergy were, for the most part, arrested and deported'."

First, I stress the term Uniate Church is used clearly in the connection with Poland. Secondly, Sergius Yakobson promised the whole quotation with the addition of three lines, but simultaneously he let magically disappear the three first lines of my quotation: "Furthermore, there are many large groups of traditional nonconformists within the territories that comprise modern Russia." The three disappeared lines dominate the whole meaning of the next sentence. Any student of Russian history knows that the term nonconformist is used for the Russian Orthodox sects, and into such nonconformists sects is here included the Catholic Church in Ukraine, under the term "Uniate Group of the Ukraine," exactly in line with present Soviet terminology. Webster shows why he eliminated the three lines: "Nonconformist, 1. One who does not conform to an established church, its doctrine, discipline, or polity; esp. (often capitalized) one who does not conform to the established church of England; orig., a member who refused to conform to its discipline or practice in certain respects, specif., one of the clergymen (about 2,000) who left the Church of England in 1662, rather than submit to the Act of Uniformity; later a member of a religious body separated from it; a dissenter, now chiefly a Protestant dissenter;" Funk & Wagnalls: "Nonconformist, 1. One who does not conform to established usage or law, especially in church matters, specif., a person especially a Protestant clergyman, refusing to conform to the Book of Common Prayer where the Church of England is established by law; a dissenter."

Everybody knows what must be regarded as the established church in the Soviet Union, and anyone knows whom this church regards as "nonconformists" and sects. How can an integral part of the Catholic Church be classified in the Soviet Union as one of the nonconformist sects of or with Russian orthodoxy? According to this Soviet terminology Sergius Yakobson eliminated the "Uniate group" or Uniate Church from the Roman Catholic subdivision and included them into the sects which are nonconformists with the Russian Orthodox Church of the present Patriarch. But to use such a terminology for the Ukrainian Catholic Church (which has also many believers in America) here in the United States is inadmissible, misleading, and insulting. These eliminated three lines (and also the beginning of the subdivision "The Uniate Group in the Ukraine") also settle the question in what meaning the term "sect" was used by Mr. Sergius Yakobson and whether it is derogatory for Catholics or not to be included among the Russian Old Believers, Dukhobors, Molokany, etc. The term "sect" and "nonconformists" and the elimination of "The Uniate Group of the Ukraine" from the Catholic subdivision support my point of view.

I regarded it as my duty as an American university professor to request the use of objective and scientific terminology in the publications of the Library of Congress prepared for the Congress; I regarded it as my duty as an American Catholic of the Byzantine-Slavic rite to object to the insulting classification of my Catholic Church as a Russian sect (the Soviet term "sect" is in American literature translated "sect," cf. p. 37, footnote 113, V. G. Sokolov, Present-Day Sects and Their Reactionary Role. Translated and condensed in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press (N. Y.), vol. II, December 16, 1950, p. 9).

Mr. Sergius Yakobson qualifies my objections, based on religious feelings and scientific reasons, as well as my efforts to improve and to correct the information for the Congress as a "malicious attack" on his report. He is intolerant and unjust; he assumes the role of an infallible judge in his own case.

5. At the end of his memorandum, Sergius Yakobson mentions that the Ukrainian newspaper Suchasna Ukraina, October 4, 1953, in a review of the Tensions, praises it as being "correct," "objective," and "free of any propaganda undertones" in its presentation of the nationality and minority problems in the Soviet Union." I reply:

(a) Sergius Yakobson again demonstrates his terminological acrobatics and now speaks about "nationality and minority problems." Apparently he understands that the term "minority problem" or "minorities" is incorrect.

(b) He selected for his justification words out of context from the mentioned paper and again he is simply dropping lines which are not in his favor. I supplement the sentences from the mentioned book review:

"We already mentioned the unsuitable term 'minorities' and the partly used term 'Russian people,' which constantly obscure the picture of the true reality in the Soviet Union, and this is the expression of a planned tendency in many of the current publications in the United States. We remark that in the study in question these errors have a rather formal character. The introduction about the minorities is edited after all (in the groundwork) correct and objective."

In the previous part of the review is stated regarding the nationality problem in the study:

"Thus are examined the youth, Soviet intelligentsia, religious groups, minorities, Soviet army, women, workers, Kolkhoz-workers, the prisoners and forced laborers, etc. Depsite the fact that such a method decides in advance an all-Soviet evaluation of the interior problems and a strong stress on social aspects, the national problems of

the Soviet Union also found in the pamphlet a serious place and for the most part they are objectively summed up. * * * From the methodological point of view a whole series of theses supported by a large literature of well known authors in America, or better to say in the Anglo-Saxon world, experts on Soviet problems, is presented in the study. Among them are, we are sorry to say, a large number of decided enemies of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, like Boris Shub, Michael Koriakov, Isaak Don Levine, David Dallin. Of the Ukrainians, Lev Dobriansky and Professor Reshetar are mentioned. * * * But we deplore that the last work of Professor Smal Stocki which exhausts the national policy of the bolsheviks, remained unused in the study. The official bolshevist literature is very broadly used and therefore the study has character (of a work) based on primary sources, and is free of any propaganda undertones, in spite of the fact that one cannot agree with all theses of the author."

The review also contains a rather strong criticism concerning the disregard of the heroic struggle of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the presentation of the Uniates, and the presentation of the famine in Ukraine, etc. Thus the words selected and presented by Sergius Yakobson can be evaluated only on the background of these excerpts from the review.

I am astonished that Sergius Yakobson now, in the year 1954, has begun this whole discussion against my statement, that his report minimized the nationality problem in the Soviet Union. Prof. Lev Dobriansky, immediately after the publication of his report, reviewed it, and wrote: "Indeed, in the face of overwhelming evidence easily accessible to those responsible for this document, it appears that the importance of this crucial subject of national relationships, in which the imperialist Russian Bolsheviks have failed miserably, has been intentionally minimized." It is frankly inconceivable that the two experts engaged in the preparation of this work are ignorant of the mass of outstanding literature on this subject. As a direct result, their depreciation of this highly important problem accounts for the fact that in his lucid summary of the report, Senator WILEY is helplessly left with the notion that the minority groups merely "suffer from policies of a centralistic totalitarian system." (The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 3, p. 259–260.)

The problems and tensions of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are stimulated by the continuous radiation behind the Iron Curtain of the memorable ideas of the American Declaration of Independence and the principles of Woodrow Wilson and, therefore, they deserve to be presented to the Congress according to the full truth. How the Congress was informed in these matters by the Library of Congress through Communism in Action and Tensions is on record.

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI,
Marquette University.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 15, 1954.*

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8224. An act to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include additional matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. JONES of Alabama to include certain charts and tables in remarks he expects to make today in Committee of the Whole on the bill, H. R. 8583.

Mr. HELLER in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. DEANE to include extraneous matter in his remarks on the housing bill.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

Mr. FARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in the debate on TVA in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include three letters.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF), for March 31, 1954, on account of illness in family.

Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. DURHAM), for today, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, April 1, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1405. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 2151, 2153, 2154, 2155, and 2156 of title 18, United States Code, relating to sabotage"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1406. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1407. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $1,825,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 361); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1408. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission, entitled, "Rates of Return (After Taxes) for 516 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries—1940, 1947–52," pursuant to section 6 of the act creating the Federal Trade Commission; 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. GRAHAM: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 1453). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8539. A bill to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CRUMPACKER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5420. A bill to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants; with amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois; Committee on Rules. House Resolution 488. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2556, a bill to amend section 3185 of title 18, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 7306. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on port of Seattle transportation difficulties pursuant to House Resolution 127 (83d Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Twelfth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled, "Army Budget Justifications for Procurement of Overcoats"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459). 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. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 8647. A bill to amend Revised Statute 4426; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8648. A bill to establish for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service an equitable system for classification of positions and determination of rates of basic compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8649. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 8650. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 8651. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 8652. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung nut and tung oil-producing industry, to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8653. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Minerals Advisory Council; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8654. A bill to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8655. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant a permit to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., to occupy certain land in the Angeles National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 8656. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to provide for a variable interest rate, second mortgage security for loans under title I, insurance of mortgages not exceeding the reasonable value of the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 8657. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Minerals Advisory Council; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 8658. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the punishment of persons who jump bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8659. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8660. A bill to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8661. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir and the White Bridge Dam and Reregulating Reservoir on the Middle Santiam River, Oreg., with participation for power by a licensee under the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8662. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8663. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 8664. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price supports for dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8665. A bill to extend the time limitations in certain cases during which veterans may commence and pursue training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and under the acts providing vocational rehabilitation training for disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean service period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8666. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8667. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung-nut and tung-oil-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8668. A bill to provide that only acreage allotted, under marketing quotas, for, and actually devoted to, the production of certain crops shall be excluded in determining acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8669. A bill providing for the withholding of veterans' benefits from persons who refuse to file a loyalty oath; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 487. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Unemployment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. J. Res. 489. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the 1954 agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 487. Resolution for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the strike of dockworkers in New York; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8670. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Vano; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 8671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARENDS (by request):

H. R. 8672. A bill for the relief of Dr. Helen Maria Roberts (Helen Maria Rebalska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8673. A bill for the relief of James Flying Horse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 8674. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Waleski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 8675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 8676. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8677. A bill for the relief of Milad S. Isaac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 8678. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Savarese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 8679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Green; 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:

604. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Farm Bureau Federation local of Raymond Center, Racine County, Wis., that the central offices of the Farm Bureau Federation and the Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin be requested and invited to oppose reduction of 15 percent on the price of milk and to offer instead as a counterproposal that the reduction on the price support of milk be limited to no more than 5 percent effective until December 31, 1955; to the Committee on Agriculture.

605. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to endorsing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

606. Also, petition of the chairman, Democratic Party of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., opposing and condemning the illegal commonwealth amendment to S. 49; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

607. Also, petition of Mrs. Effie Baker and others, Fort Myers, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. Also, petition of I. T. Boyd and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

609. Also, petition of Mrs. Alice P. Yarnell and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.