

Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., AO18447, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earle William Hockenberry, AO18454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Keppler Mooney, AO18479, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Robert Merrill Lee, AO18483, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, AO18495, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jacob Edward Smart, AO18516, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester LeRoy Hilman Kunish, AO18528, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, AO18529, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

× Col. Carl Fillmore Damberg, AO18531, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wendell Washington Bowman, AO18532, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Spencer Carter, AO18542, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hilbert Fred Muentner, AO18543, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Clarence Gordon, AO18571, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bowman Dougher, AO18581, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. David William Hutchison, AO18585, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerald Evan Williams, AO18604, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr., AO18619, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Nolen Backus, AO29600, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Archie J. Old, Jr., AO29608, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Lloyd Tarr, AO29634, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Frederick Kalberer, AO29521, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Tanner Wray, AO18657, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Peter Dahl, AO18699, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Bevier Ackerman, AO18706, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Paul McConnell, AO18728, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe William Kelly, AO18731, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Clifford McCawley, AO18739, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

× Col. John Morgan Price, AO18740, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Stone Campbell, AO18751, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Burton Hobson, AO18763, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Reynolds Sutherland, AO18764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Linwood Hardy, AO18765, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., AO18766, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Albert Clark, Jr., AO18776, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Porter Huglin, AO18780, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Dowery Campbell, Jr., AO18783, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Hardin Anderson, AO18785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hunter Harris, Jr., AO18808, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Albert Piddock, AO18813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew Meulenberg, AO18827, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Guldlin Simenson, AO18829, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Haynes Terrill, AO18833, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Connell Darcy, AO18840, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford Harcourt Rees, AO18847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Smith, AO18850, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Porter Mussett, AO18853, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Willis Suarez, AO18855, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

× Brig. Gen. Herbert Bishop Thatcher, AO18865, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Broussard Landry, AO18868, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Greenleaf Jamison, AO18874, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Romulus Wright Puryear, AO18894, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Madison Garland, AO18900, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Gurr, AO18906, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., AO18908, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Reginald Conner, AO51359, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Smith Blair, AO29813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward E. Toro, AO38728, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., AO18998, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Burns Hall, AO19010, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Travis Monroe Hetherington, AO19022, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Cooper Donnelly, AO19040, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Oscar Senter, AO19042, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sidney Francis Giffin, AO19045, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Roth Maddux, AO19086, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Laurence Browning Kelley, AO19108, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Totten, AO19128, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Fredrick Summerfelt, AO19153, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gabriel Poillon Disoway, AO19156, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Franklin Stone Henley, AO19169, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cordes Fredrich Tiemann, AO19193, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Abner Mundell, AO19206, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stephen B. Mack, AO19240, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nelson Parkyn Jackson, AO19253, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., AO19271, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Hoffman Pottenger, AO19290, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kermit Douglas Stevens, AO30128, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Milton Gross, AO19463, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Donald Robert Hutchinson, AO20441, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

NOTE.—The date of rank for these officers will be the date of appointment.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Isaac N. P. Stokes, to be Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

M. S. Szymczak, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1948.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we glory in the glad assurance that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations.

May our hearts be filled with gratitude that in our Nation's history we have the record of the lofty idealism of Thy servant whose memory we delight to honor and whom we reverently and



affectionately call the Father of His Country.

We thank Thee for his passionate yearning to be true to himself as he sought to keep alive within his breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience.

We bless Thee for his courageous fidelity to the principle of human rights which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

May we praise Thee above all for his humble spirit and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer to hold council with the God of all wisdom.

Grant that the memory of our great patriot may strengthen the soul of our beloved country and inspire its chosen representatives to labor in faith, in faithfulness, and in the fear of the Lord for the freedom and welfare of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 20, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

|           |                 |                |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Aiken     | Hawkes          | Morse          |
| Baldwin   | Hayden          | Murray         |
| Ball      | Hickenlooper    | O'Connor       |
| Barkley   | Hill            | O'Daniel       |
| Brewster  | Hoey            | O'Mahoney      |
| Bricker   | Holland         | Overton        |
| Brooks    | Ives            | Pepper         |
| Buck      | Jenner          | Reed           |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Colo.  | Revercomb      |
| Butler    | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson, Va. |
| Byrd      | Kem             | Saltonstall    |
| Cain      | Kilgore         | Smith          |
| Capper    | Knowland        | Sparkman       |
| Chavez    | Langer          | Stennis        |
| Connally  | Lodge           | Stewart        |
| Cooper    | McCarran        | Taylor         |
| Cordon    | McCarthy        | Thomas, Okla.  |
| Donnell   | McClellan       | Thomas, Utah   |
| Downey    | McFarland       | Thye           |
| Dworshak  | McGrath         | Tobey          |
| Eastland  | McKellar        | Vandenberg     |
| Ecton     | McMahon         | Watkins        |
| Ferguson  | Malone          | Wiley          |
| Flanders  | Martin          | Williams       |
| George    | Millikin        | Wilson         |
| Gurney    | Moore           | Young          |

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate, the Farewell Address of George Washington will be read by the Senator heretofore designated for that purpose by the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McMAHON advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

#### *To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination

incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude,



urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary

agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical discriminations*,—*northern and southern*—*Atlantic and western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are



duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each

member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its

administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently



prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, insti-

gated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in

frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from na-



tion to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it

probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED  
BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 402. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 500. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman;

S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING LEGISLATION (H. DOC. NO. 547)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1560.)

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME  
AND OTHER SITES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites" approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED FEPC LEGISLATION—PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram signed by several citizens, presidents, chairmen, and general managers of sundry industrial organizations, New York City, N. Y., relating to FEPC legislation. Without objection, the telegram will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

NEW YORK, February 15, 1948.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
President pro tempore,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned American citizens believe that passage at this session of the Congress of a national act against discrimination in employment is important to the welfare of the country. We note with satisfaction that the Ives-Fulton bill has been favorably reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education and we ask you, and through you your colleagues, to use your fullest influence to expedite its passage by both Houses of Congress.

The great majority of employers in the United States, together with their fellow Americans, believe in the principle of non-discrimination in employment. They know that such discrimination is uneconomic, in that it results in an unsound use of manpower and retards the development of purchasing power. They know it is undemocratic and un-American, being contrary to the principles upon which our Government was founded and upon which it endures. They know, finally, that it weakens the position of the United States in the eyes of the world and in the war of ideas between freedom and totalitarianism.

In our judgment the Ives-Fulton bill, if enacted into law, will substantially advance the cause of nondiscrimination in employment. It will strengthen the hands of those who believe in its purposes and it will tend to bring into compliance those few who do not. Our judgment in this respect is based in part upon the successful working of very similar laws in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and other States. We like the reliance which the bill puts upon education and conciliation. On the other hand, we recognize the necessity of governmental sanctions when conciliation breaks down.

We do not believe that passage of this bill will eliminate prejudice from America. But it will be an effective step along the road. For this reason, we have formed ourselves into a committee to advocate its adoption. We hope you will do all in your power to help toward this objective.

William L. Blatt, President, S. K. F. Industries; Allen W. Dulles, Sullivan & Cromwell; Paul G. Hoffman, President, Studebaker Corp.; Eric Johnston, President, Motion Picture Association; Henry R. Luce, Time, Inc.; Dwight R. G. Palmer, President, General Cable Corp.; Martin Quigley, President, Quigley Publishing Co.; Nelson A. Rockefeller; Anna M. Rosenberg; Beardsley Ruml, Chairman of Board, R. H. Macy & Co.; Spyros P. Skouras, President, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.; Paul C. Smith, General Manager, San Francisco Chronicle; Herbert Bayard Swope; Charles H. Tuttle, Breed, Abbott & Morgan; Oren Root, Jr., Chairman.



## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Resolution 42

"Concurrent resolution in reverence of the late JOHN M. ROBSON

"Whereas God, in His infinite wisdom, has seen fit to call from earthly labors a great servant of Kentucky and of our Nation, JOHN M. ROBSON; and

"Whereas his passing is a source of the deepest sorrow for the members of this body; and

"Whereas it is just and fitting that this body properly express reverence to this true statesman: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the members of this body do express to the family of JOHN M. ROBSON their deepest sympathy, and their regret that he should have been taken at a time when he was of such great usefulness to the people of Kentucky, and their gratitude for the services he rendered to the people of Kentucky in his capacity as a faithful public representative and servant.

"That the members of this body do convey to the Kentucky delegation in Congress of the United States condolence in the loss of their worthy fellow member.

"That the members of this body do make known to the Congress of the United States their pride in the representation that the people of Kentucky received through the untiring efforts of JOHN M. ROBSON.

"That it is the sincere feeling of the members of this body that all honor is due to the memory of this man who was an example of rugged honesty, standing in fear of no person or organization in denouncing corruption wherever he found it, and faithful and untiring in his efforts to serve the people of Kentucky.

"That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the senate to the family of the late JOHN M. ROBSON and to each member of the Kentucky delegation in Congress, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"Attest:

"MARY LOU HUBBARD,  
Assistant Clerk of the Senate.

"FEBRUARY 18, 1948."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress to enact legislation prohibiting the use of the mail to advertise and dramatize the use of alcoholic beverages

"Whereas the advertisement of alcoholic beverages in the newspapers and magazines are inimical to the good morals and sobriety of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas such advertisements convey to the youth of our land a false philosophy of life; and

"Whereas the United States mail and interstate commerce should not lend their powers and facilities to the distribution of such advertisements: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested and memorialized to enact legislation prohibiting the advertisement of liquor and alcoholic beverages through the use of the United States mail and interstate commerce."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such necessary legislation as to provide funds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other Government agencies, for the purchase of notes and mortgages of veterans, so as to facilitate the operations of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended, title 38, U. S. Code)

"Whereas the Congress of the United States granted to honorably discharged veterans of World War II certain benefits and privileges outlined in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; and

"Whereas one of the major provisions of this Readjustment Act provided for the rehabilitation of veterans by the guarantee of loans for the primary purpose of aiding and assisting veterans in the borrowing of funds over a long period of time at a reasonable rate of interest to finance the purchase of homes, farms, or businesses; and

"Whereas this provision of the act has failed to give any relief to the majority of veterans in that no provisions have been made in the act for the financing of these loans and the great majority of veterans desiring to build or purchase homes, farms, or businesses have been unable to obtain loans from local banks or other lending institutions largely because local institutions do not have the surplus funds to invest in long-term real estate loans to any of the many governmental agencies financing almost every phase of American business life; and

"Whereas the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's policy of purchasing these loans was discontinued as of July 1, 1947, and since that time no governmental agency has either the authority or the funds to underwrite or purchase loans made under the said Servicemen's Readjustment Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact such legislation and appropriate such funds as may be necessary to enable and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or such other governmental lending agency, to purchase such notes, mortgages, and securities as are given by the World War II veterans to banks and lending institutions under the provisions and regulation of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, title 38, United States Code; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America and a copy to the President of the Senate of the United States of America and a copy to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America from South Carolina and a copy to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

A petition of the Townsend Clubs of the Fifth Congressional District in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system; by the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate resolution requesting the War Department or such other agency of the United States Government to send the proper official or representative to Conway or Georgetown, S. C., to handle and recover properties heretofore used during the war period

"Whereas during the recent World War, the War Department secured various tracts of

land from the citizens of Horry and Georgetown Counties, which properties were used for vital defense needs; and

"Whereas many of these citizens desire to secure the return of these properties by purchase or otherwise; and

"Whereas the nearest office from which information can be obtained regarding these sales and transfers is Atlanta, Ga., which is too far removed to assist the citizens of these counties; and

"Whereas the complications involved in the handling of these sales are a serious handicap to the citizens and farmers of this section; and

"Whereas should an office be placed at either Conway or Georgetown, S. C., to handle these sales and assist those interested in these properties, such would prove most helpful: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, that the proper official in charge of surplus property land sales in the War Department be requested to immediately send a representative to be stationed at Conway or Georgetown, S. C., for the purpose of handling lands and properties secured in Horry and Georgetown Counties for the benefit of those who desire to purchase or reclaim the same.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following:

"1. Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

"2. Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

"3. Director Surplus Property Sales, War Department, Washington, D. C."

## EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a statement of Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, on January 24, 1948, relating to the European recovery program.

There being no objection, the statement was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

(Statement of Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, to Senate Foreign Relations Committee, January 24, 1948)

Mr. Chairman, I appear before your committee today as the president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, a national organization of some 3,000,000 women who have officially expressed their approval of the Marshall plan for European recovery. I come to plead for prompt enactment of an aid-to-Europe program along the lines outlined by President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has had as a first interest the building and maintenance of peace in the world. We have supported efforts to promote international cooperation in political, economic, and social fields through advocacy of the United Nations and such specialized agencies as FAO, IRO, UNESCO, and the proposed world health and international trade organizations. We believe that the cause of peace will be advanced by the European recovery program, which seeks to help the nations of western Europe to rebuild their shattered economies. Stable economic conditions are a prerequisite to the restoration of strong, democratic governments in this important area. Such governments will bulwark peace.

We further believe that the European recovery program is vital to the welfare and security of the United States. If western Europe, the traditional bastion of free insti-



tutions across the seas, is forced through economic exigencies to accept totalitarian government, the position of this country will be precarious indeed. We cannot afford not to aid the 16 nations which have entered into a cooperative venture with us to restore their economies so that they can remain free, independent, and capable of resisting any pressure which may be brought against them. The risk involved for us in undertaking a European recovery program is small compared to the risk we run should we refuse to do so.

It would be presumptuous for me, a layman, to attempt to discuss the details of so vast and complex a program. I do, however, feel justified in emphasizing the importance of not jeopardizing its chances for success by undue delay, by curtailment, or by the imposition of conditions which would place too heavy a burden on the recipient countries, or be distasteful to them as sovereign nations.

Failure to make aid available by April 1, when it is estimated the interim-aid funds will be exhausted, will be a step backward on the hard road we are traveling. Therefore, I hope the Congress will act as quickly as possible in authorizing the long-range program.

Reduction in the amount of the aid recommended might seriously cripple the effectiveness of the program. I am willing to accept the word of Secretary Marshall, based largely on the Harriman committee report, that \$6,800,000,000 is the minimum necessary to do a recovery job. This figure was arrived at after months of painstaking analysis of the needs of the cooperating nations. In the long run inadequate aid will be a disadvantage to the United States, which seeks as the return on its investment the recovery of western Europe.

It also seems important to me that the terms of the aid be kept sufficiently flexible so that grants can be made to those nations whose economies will be further strained by the necessity of paying off the huge foreign debt. Ability to pay should be the basic consideration in determining the nature of the aid to be rendered. What we should seek is a self-supporting Europe, not one paralyzed by debt.

In addition to humanitarianism, a main purpose of the European recovery program is to help rebuild strong, democratic governments in western Europe. The United States should be very careful not to undermine the strength of these governments by interfering in their internal affairs. We must constantly bear in mind that the nations we seek to help have a great tradition of freedom similar to our own. They are sensitive and proud as we would be under reversed circumstances. The program will succeed only if it is based on mutual respect and cooperation.

As regards the administration of the program, I feel very strongly that the administering agency must be subject to direction by the President of the United States, who is, under the Constitution, responsible for the conduct of foreign policy. On basic foreign policy the Administrator should look to the Secretary of State, who is the President's deputy in this field. The Administrator should, of course, be solely responsible under the President for the economic and business operations of his agency, but there must be the closest coordination between the Department of State and the new independent agency both here and abroad. Without such coordination confusion will result and the efficiency of the program will be impaired.

Mr. Chairman, the European recovery program outlined by Secretary Marshall fulfills the broad essentials of a constructive aid program. The importance of its speedy enactment, in view of the present world situation, outshadows all other considerations. The future peace of the world may well depend upon it.

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING IN PEACETIME, ETC.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD an impressive letter I have received from Rev. Q. W. Brakebill, of Colony, Kans., expressing his opposition to compulsory military training in peacetime, and the sale of intoxicating liquor near military training camps.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED CHURCH,  
Colony, Kans., February 17, 1948.  
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

#### RE MILITARY TRAINING IN PEACETIME

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In the course of years I have written to you concerning many issues which I considered of great importance to our Nation.

This one—it seems is more important than any yet I have called your attention to.

Naturally I am opposed to compulsory military training—not that I wouldn't gladly and willingly volunteer my services to aid in the defense of our country were I needed. I had two sons in the last World War. I was glad they were willing to do their part in winning the victory—and we would gladly do the same thing again if it became necessary.

There are various and good reasons why I am opposed to military training or compulsory enlistment in peacetime.

First. It would tend to a militaristic form of government, such as prevailed in Germany—the very thing that we do not want.

Second. Germany had compulsory military training and their boys and young men were taught things that will live in their consciousness for many years—that Germans are the superior race. They gloried in their military might. That same philosophy could and I believe would be inculcated in all our training camps were that law passed. God forbid.

Third. Conditions in and around these United States military training camps are to be deplored. Many young men were ruined. They came back with their physical, mental, and spiritual beings ruined. That was so in many cases. My boys never indulged—they never touched the stuff. However they told me all about the deleterious effects of beer and liquor on the boys and young men.

Fourth. Liquor is not required to make good soldiers.

Fifth. It is an economic waste to maintain large armies. The next war, according to the best authorities, will not be won by large armies or large navies. That is absolutely true in the light of atomic energy. Then why saddle this enormous tax burden on the American people?

Now in closing I do not doubt the sincerity of Ike Eisenhower or Secretary Marshall or any of the other higher-ups in military circles; but they are wrong in thinking large armies and large navies can win the next war.

I hope and pray that the Congress of the United States will not pass the bill now before Congress and recommended by President Truman. I am confident that the great majority of our citizens in the church and out of it do not want this measure passed.

Sincerely,

REV. Q. W. BRAKEBILL.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which

was referred the resolution (S. Res. 196) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study and investigation relative to certain matters, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2196. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. FEPPER):

S. 2197. A bill authorizing the construction of a comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2198. A bill for the relief of Umberto Randaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2199. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area, section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2200. A bill to extend college education to children of persons whose death results from service in the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and Mr. TRYNGS):

S. 2201. A bill supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State Roads Commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself and Mr. CUNNALLY):

S. 2202. A bill to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2203. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Ozawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2204. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Elser; and

S. 2206. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Treasury Department who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.



## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILEY (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILEY (for Mr. WAGNER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. WAGNER to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111), supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2182) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, to provide for the termination of controls on maximum rents in areas and on housing accommodations where conditions justifying such controls no longer exist, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator KNOWLAND at Louisville, Ky., on February 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

## LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALDWIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator BALDWIN at Pittsburgh, Pa., on February 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONGRESS AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALDWIN

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Congress and the Republican Party, delivered by Senator BALDWIN before the Hennepin County Republican Committee at Minneapolis, Minn., February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him at Habana, Cuba, on February 15, 1948, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, which appears in the Appendix.]

## JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson-Jackson Day speech delivered by him at Fort Wayne, Ind., on February 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

## JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ANDERSON

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, in Louisville, Ky., on February 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONDITIONS IN GERMANY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter containing an account of conditions in Germany, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE RENT-CONTROL PROBLEM—LETTER FROM ROBERT W. PRESCOTT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to him, dated February 14, 1948, from Robert W. Prescott, of Eugene, Oreg., together with an enclosure therewith setting forth the position of the Eugene (Oreg.) Real Estate Board in regard to rent control, and Mr. MORSE's telegram in reply thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a brief statement which I have prepared on the subject of the many endorsements which I have received of the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution now pending before the Senate, and including excerpts from several communications thereon.

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

## WISCONSIN ENDORSES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. President, from all over the State of Wisconsin, I have received literally hundreds of communications—wires and telegrams endorsing efforts for the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway resolution. Recently the Milwaukee Association of Commerce for the first time since 1939 endorsed the seaway. Opinion in the Badger State is more completely united on this issue than on virtually any other single issue that I can recall since my coming to the Senate.

## WISCONSIN SEEKS NATIONAL WELFARE

Critics may scoff that Wisconsin is interested, particularly because of its many ports on the Great Lakes whose welfare and progress would be advanced by the development of this great project. But I assure these critics that, while Wisconsin does have a stake in the seaway, so too does the entire Middle West and 50,000,000 Americans.

Moreover, in endorsing the seaway, Wisconsin's citizens and organizations writing to me have invariably stressed the fact that, in all sincerity, and in all humility, they favor the seaway not basically because it would serve the interests of their own State in part, but because of the vital benefits to the national welfare.

Every Wisconsin Legislature since the inception of this project has endorsed the seaway—every high public official that I can recall. I do not want to burden the RECORD with extensive statements which have been filed with me on the seaway, but as a token of the sentiment of my State, I shall ask that excerpts from a few of the statements which I have received be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am sure that my colleagues from other States throughout the Union could submit similar statements from widespread sources.

## SEAWAY IS CONTINENTAL PROJECT

Again I emphasize that this is a national project, a continental project, if you please, endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the Rural Electric Cooperatives' Associations, by five past presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and leading unions throughout the Nation.

As will be noted, the initial statement comes from a distinguished public servant from Wisconsin, Judge Irvine Lenroot, who formerly served in this great body. I might, incidentally, note that it was Judge Len-

root who back in 1919 initially offered an amendment to a River and Harbor Act providing that the Corps of Engineers study the feasibility of the St. Lawrence seaway. This study, like all the studies which followed, confirmed the need and feasibility for the seaway.

Some of the excerpts I am including commend my own efforts in the seaway battle. While I am humbly grateful for these kind messages, I feel that I am but one servant of Wisconsin and of the Nation out of the literally hundreds and thousands who have sought throughout the long history of this project to advance this noble objective. The great Senators of Wisconsin who have preceded me, the distinguished businessmen and labor leaders, the illustrious public officers of the Badger State—all these have set a path and have established precedents for me. It has been my humble aim to be worthy of the magnificent mark that they set.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 13, 1948.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ALEX: I have yours of the 11th, with enclosures which I have read with very great interest. I congratulate you upon the splendid fight for the St. Lawrence waterway. I subscribe for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have followed the debate very closely. You and Senator AIKEN have done a wonderful job, and if the Senate would consider the matter upon its merits it would pass by a large majority.

It is clear that the postponement from time to time of this great national undertaking is due solely to the selfishness of sectional interests and the opposition of the railroads and their employees. If the Senators and Congressmen from the Middle West had taken the same selfish attitude when the Panama Canal was authorized, it probably would not have been in existence now.

I venture the hope that you may remain in the Senate until the St. Lawrence waterway improvement becomes an accomplished fact. As you are no doubt aware, I originated congressional action with respect to this subject in 1919 when a Member of the Senate, and I hope to live to see the day when ocean steamers will ply the Great Lakes.

With kindest regards and best wishes for your success,

Very sincerely,

IRVINE L. LENROOT.

WISCONSIN MILITARY ASSOCIATION,  
Milwaukee, Wis., February 2, 1948.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This association has followed your vigorous, timely, and patriotic drive in the United States Senate for favorable action to get the St. Lawrence seaway on the status of the United States.

We frown on narrow sectionalism which retards the advance of an entire continent.

As soldiers, we have gone to war, not for New England, not for the western prairies, not for the Great Lakes region, but for the entire United States.

It is too bad that narrow-mindedness prevents legislation that benefits the entire country.

These people should have lived in the days of the building of the Union Pacific.

Sincerely yours,

REINHOLD C. DEDI,  
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry Reserve,  
President.

FEDERATED TRADES COUNCIL  
OF MILWAUKEE,  
Milwaukee, Wis., January 19, 1948.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is the hope of the Federated Trades Council that you will con-



tinue your vigorous support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

We are confident that if enough push is put behind this project at this session of Congress it cannot fail getting approval.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. RANNEY,  
General Secretary.

THE JAMES SHOE  
MANUFACTURING CO.,

Milwaukee, February 9, 1948.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE DEAR SENATOR: We want to congratulate you and thank you for the wonderful fight you are putting up in the Senate on the many different bills that are confronting it today and especially for the battle you are putting up for the St. Lawrence seaway.

I just want you to know that we here in the James Shoe Manufacturing Co. are back of you 100 percent, and we wish that we had more men like you in the Senate who are not afraid to fight for what they feel is right in the true American way. \* \* \*

Yours very truly,

H. E. McMAHON,  
President.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS  
OF MILWAUKEE COUNTY,  
Wauwatosa, Wis.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the Young Republicans of Milwaukee County, hereby wish to inform you that we have gone on record as favoring the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project and ardently hope that you will use your utmost influence toward the passage of the pending legislation.

Realizing that this subject is raising a sectional dispute, we ask that you remind those Congressmen and Senators from dissenting areas that we of the Middle West have been willing to bear our share of the cost of numerous projects from which we have derived little or no benefit—Boulder Dam and TVA, to mention only two. Unless each section of our country can recognize the needs of other areas and work toward providing those improvements which will make for a more prosperous Nation, the progress of our Nation is doomed.

Yours very truly,

Miss RUTH M. BURTON,  
Secretary.

GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION,  
Milwaukee, Wis., February 5, 1948.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In behalf of the members of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, I wish to extend our deep appreciation for the gallant fight you have made for the St. Lawrence waterway.

While I have been fearful that this Senate is more apt to listen to the adverse lobbyist than to the welfare of the people in the Great Lakes area, yet the St. Lawrence deep waterway is indispensable for the proper defense of this Nation. More than this, the box-car and tank-car shortage will never be eliminated until this project is completed.

Most sincerely,

DANIEL W. HOAN,  
President.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., February 4, 1948.  
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your efforts on St. Lawrence seaway bill and know you will keep up the good fight. Milwaukeeans are 100 percent behind you in the battle for this bill.

ARTHUR S. EHRMANN.

MILWAUKEE WOMAN'S CLUB,  
Milwaukee, Wis., February 3, 1948.  
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of the Milwaukee Woman's Club, at its last meeting, voted to reaffirm its stand in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

And also to thank you for your valiant efforts in behalf of Wisconsin and its neighboring States in securing this transportation highway.

Very truly yours,

SYLVIA W. ROECKER,  
Corresponding Secretary.

WISCONSIN WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
Milwaukee, Wis., February 19, 1948.  
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Noticing that the St. Lawrence resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 111, is scheduled to come up for a vote in the Senate on February 27, I take this opportunity of reaffirming our previous advice to you that this association and its members are very strongly in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway project. We will be glad to have you so record our association to this effect.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. ASHWORTH,  
Executive Secretary.

#### MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the question of tidelands be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so that those Senators who desire to present motions or offer amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 111, the St. Lawrence seaway measure, may do so. As Senators know, under the unanimous-consent agreement such amendments and motions must be offered today.

At this time I wish to make a statement, for the information of the Senate, as to the legislative program. After motions and amendments relating to the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution shall have been offered and discussed, if no further business is taken up, it is my intention, assuming it is not too late in the afternoon, to ask the Senate to revert to the consideration of the rent-control bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from California when he expects there will be another call of the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The calendar probably will not be called again until after the conclusion of the consideration of the rent-control bill, and possibly not until after the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution shall be acted on.

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, some confusion appears to have arisen regarding the important question: How much American shipping may be expected to use the seaway, if constructed, in view of the proposed 27-foot channel?

In order to clear up this confusion, let me say that on January 28 I stated on the floor of the Senate that some 90 percent of American shipping tonnages would be excluded from the seaway because of the shallowness of the channel. I quote, in part, from my remarks on page 638 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date:

If this 27-foot channel is to be effective as a reserve or alternate route in time of war, as the proponents maintain, it must be manifest that fully loaded cargo ships will be physically able to navigate this channel. This would seem a basic factor. Let us look at this. Here are some figures now that are utterly binding on this matter of whether the engineering features of this proposition are sound. Let us look at the facts. The Port Warden Regulations in Montreal for oceangoing ships require a draft clearance of 2½ feet for ships of 8,500 tons dead weight, that is, underneath the bottom; they require 3 feet for ships of 10,500 tons dead weight; they require 3½ feet for 12,000 tons dead weight.

Our ships operating in the overseas trades have a total dead-weight capacity as follows, and these include cargo, bunkers, stores, and so forth, and these figures apply to fully loaded draft in salt water:

A Liberty ship's dead-weight capacity is 10,590 tons. Thus, loaded, a Liberty draws 27 feet 9¼ inches. That is already 9¼ inches too much.

A Victory ship's dead-weight capacity is slightly more than a Liberty's—10,681 tons—and it draws 28 feet 3¼ inches.

A C-2 type ship has a 10,560-ton capacity and draws 27 feet 8 inches.

A C-3 type ship has a dead-weight capacity of 12,041 tons and draws 27 feet and 1 inch.

T-2 and T-3 tankers, which are even larger ships than the C-3's, draw 30 feet. Those are the big Standard Oil tankers.

No prudent ship operator would load ships such as these deeper than 24 feet, as there must be at least a 3-foot clearance under the keel for these sized ships; moreover, allowance for squat and variation of fresh water would amount to nearly one additional foot. "Squat" is the possibility of a ship going down a little lower. They always go down lower when they are running.

A 24-foot loaded draft would be the deepest within a reasonable degree of safety. Obviously to load a Liberty, Victory, C-2, and C-3 to only 24 feet would be economically unsound, although it does not seem to be admitted here by everybody.

From the foregoing—and I hope Senators will look it over at their leisure—it can be readily seen that nearly all ships under United States registry, engaged in the overseas trade, and such ships fully loaded, drawing on the average 28 feet, must necessarily be excluded, on account of draft limitation, from navigation over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. The figure is about 90 percent.

Let me say that my statement, "The figure is about 90 percent," refers to total tonnage and not to total ships. The percentage of ships whose draught is too deep for the proposed channel is about 83 percent. I now realize that I



should have made that distinction clearer.

I now quote from the remarks of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. [Mr. WILEY] which appear on page 1050 of the February 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Repeated charges have been made on the floor to the effect that an insufficient percentage of the shipping of the United States and of the world could utilize the St. Lawrence seaway, if it were built. The figure 9 percent has been used as to the total amount of United States shipping that could use the seaway. Any lawyer knows he must get the facts before he can arrive at his conclusions. I am going to give facts which will

astonish Members of the Senate, and will totally contradict the statement respecting the 9-percent figure. Such a figure is, of course, absurd and is not confirmed in any way, shape, or form by the United States Maritime Commission.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin then inserted into the RECORD two tables submitted by the United States Maritime Commission and dated January 29, 1948, which, for the sake of convenience, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

*United States flag and world seagoing merchant fleet as of June 30, 1947, vessels of 1,000 gross tons each and over with maximum loaded draft of 27 feet or less including United States flag Liberty and Victory vessels with drafts of 27 feet 9½ inches and 28 feet 6¼ inches, respectively*

| Vessel type                                                   | Grand total, all vessels |                | Vessels of 27-foot draft or less, and United States flag Liberty and Victory |                        |                |                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
|                                                               | Number                   | Gross tons     | Vessels                                                                      |                        | Gross tons     |                        |
|                                                               |                          |                | Number                                                                       | Percent of grand total | Tons           | Percent of grand total |
| World fleet, total.....                                       | 12,370                   | Millions 70.42 | 9,587                                                                        | 77.5                   | Millions 45.09 | 64.0                   |
| Freighters (excluding United States Liberty and Victory)..... | 7,314                    | 33.22          | 5,921                                                                        | 81.0                   | 22.56          | 67.9                   |
| United States flag Liberty.....                               | 1,714                    | 12.31          | 1,714                                                                        | 100.0                  | 12.31          | 100.0                  |
| United States flag Victory.....                               | 358                      | 2.73           | 358                                                                          | 100.0                  | 2.73           | 100.0                  |
| Combination passenger and freight.....                        | 1,015                    | 7.13           | 786                                                                          | 77.4                   | 3.57           | 50.1                   |
| Tankers.....                                                  | 1,969                    | 15.03          | 808                                                                          | 41.0                   | 3.92           | 26.1                   |
| United States-flag fleet, total <sup>1</sup> .....            | 4,202                    | 30.90          | 3,072                                                                        | 73.1                   | 20.50          | 66.3                   |
| Freighters (excluding United States Liberty and Victory)..... | 1,221                    | 7.60           | 799                                                                          | 65.4                   | 4.34           | 57.1                   |
| United States flag Liberty.....                               | 1,714                    | 12.31          | 1,714                                                                        | 100.0                  | 12.31          | 100.1                  |
| United States flag Victory.....                               | 358                      | 2.73           | 358                                                                          | 100.0                  | 2.73           | 100.1                  |
| Combination passenger and freight.....                        | 108                      | 1.11           | 67                                                                           | 62.0                   | .54            | 48.6                   |
| Tankers.....                                                  | 801                      | 7.15           | 134                                                                          | 16.7                   | .58            | 8.1                    |

<sup>1</sup> Includes 272 USMC-owned vessels aggregating 1,809,000 gross tons transferred to foreign flags under lend-lease or other agreements and remaining under foreign registries as of June 30, 1947, by subsequent arrangement.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Research Division.

*United States flag and world seagoing merchant fleet as of June 30, 1947, vessels of 1,000 gross tons each and over with maximum loaded draft of 25 feet or less*

| Vessel type                                        | Grand total, all vessels |                | Vessels of 25-foot draft or less |                        |                |                        |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
|                                                    | Number                   | Gross tons     | Vessels                          |                        | Gross tons     |                        |
|                                                    |                          |                | Number                           | Percent of grand total | Tons           | Percent of grand total |
| World fleet, total.....                            | 12,370                   | Millions 70.42 | 5,579                            | 45.1                   | Millions 16.97 | 24.1                   |
| Freighters.....                                    | 9,386                    | 48.26          | 4,500                            | 47.9                   | 13.33          | 27.6                   |
| Combination passenger and freight.....             | 1,015                    | 7.13           | 646                              | 63.6                   | 2.34           | 32.8                   |
| Tankers.....                                       | 1,969                    | 15.03          | 433                              | 22.0                   | 1.30           | 8.6                    |
| United States flag fleet, total <sup>1</sup> ..... | 4,202                    | 30.90          | 637                              | 15.2                   | 2.95           | 9.5                    |
| Freighters.....                                    | 3,293                    | 22.64          | 518                              | 15.7                   | 2.47           | 10.9                   |
| Combination passenger and freight.....             | 108                      | 1.11           | 42                               | 38.9                   | .28            | 25.2                   |
| Tankers.....                                       | 801                      | 7.15           | 77                               | 9.6                    | .20            | 2.8                    |

<sup>1</sup> Includes 272 USMC-owned vessels aggregating 1,809,000 gross tons transferred to foreign flags under lend-lease or other agreements and remaining under foreign registries as of June 30, 1947, by subsequent arrangement.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Research Division.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent that a table appearing on page 51 in Public Affairs Bulletin No. 58, entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway Project," July 1947, prepared by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, with the source given as

the United States Maritime Commission, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

*United States and world merchant vessels with maximum drafts of 25 feet or less<sup>1</sup>*

| Type of vessel                         | Total number | Total gross tons | Vessels 25-foot draft or less | Percent of total vessels | Gross tons 25-foot draft or less | Percent of tonnage |
|----------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| World fleet (Sept. 30, 1945):          |              |                  |                               |                          |                                  |                    |
| Freighters.....                        | 7,605        | 45,001,047       | 2,640                         | 34.7                     | 9,343,948                        | 20.8               |
| Combination passenger and freight..... | 764          | 6,264,225        | 438                           | 57.3                     | 1,972,875                        | 31.5               |
| Tankers.....                           | 1,806        | 14,593,932       | 276                           | 15.3                     | 967,149                          | 6.6                |
| Total.....                             | 10,175       | 65,859,204       | 3,354                         | 33.0                     | 12,283,972                       | 18.7               |
| United States fleet (Sept. 30, 1945):  |              |                  |                               |                          |                                  |                    |
| Freighters.....                        | 4,432        | 29,922,751       | 646                           | 14.6                     | 2,813,825                        | 9.4                |
| Combination passenger and freight..... | 148          | 1,498,392        | 66                            | 44.6                     | 480,991                          | 32.1               |
| Tankers.....                           | 949          | 8,668,859        | 51                            | 5.4                      | 195,954                          | 2.3                |
| Total.....                             | 5,529        | 40,090,002       | 763                           | 13.8                     | 3,490,770                        | 8.7                |

<sup>1</sup> Covering 30 principal countries and the British colonies, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say that in the table just cited the total gross tonnage for vessels of 25-foot draft or less is 3,490,770 of a total of 40,080,002, or 8.7 percent of the total United States tonnage. This figure rounded off is the 9 percent which the senior Senator from Wisconsin described as "absurd." I think it is only absurd in the sense that the proponents ask us to authorize a seaway which would physically exclude 91 percent of American tonnage.

With reference to the second table inserted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin for merchant type vessels with maximum loaded drafts of 25 feet or less, this table shows that for the United States commercial fleet, 15.2 percent of the number of vessels are of 25-foot draft or less, and 9.5 percent of the gross tonnage are vessels of 25-foot draft or less. Note the close similarity between these two figures from the table of the Senator from Wisconsin, and the two figures appearing in the table of September 1945 which I have inserted in the RECORD and upon which my figures were based.

The table I have used shows that only 8.7 percent of the total American tonnage are of sufficiently shallow draft to navigate the seaway, while the latter table, inserted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, and not available to me at the time I prepared my original statement, shows that figure to be 9.5 percent—certainly not a very startling variation. The variation of less than 1 percent is attributable to the fact that the wartime construction program was practically complete by September 30, 1945, the date used in the tabulation in the Library of Congress report. The slightly larger percentages in the Maritime Commission report quoted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin as of June 30, 1947, is accounted for by the retirement of old over-age vessels of smaller tonnage capacity which are no longer required now that the war emergency is over and have therefore been sold for scrap or retired.

But both his tables and my tables bear out my conclusion that 90 percent of total American tonnage could not, fully loaded, navigate the seaway. The figure for vessels which could not navigate the seaway is about 83 percent.

Now, let me correct a statement of fact made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. He, himself, states, "Any lawyer knows he must get the facts before he can arrive at his conclusions." I am not a lawyer, but I think I can spot an error of fact. I read from page 1050 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1948. The senior Senator from Wisconsin is speaking:

However, in order that we might have the most up-to-date statistics on this subject, I ask the Maritime Commission to prepare totally new data. Its research division compiled, as of January 29, 1948, a report on the number of United States flag and world merchant ships that could use the seaway project. This report shows, for example, that 73 percent of the United States flag fleet total are vessels of 27-foot draft or less and could, therefore, use the seaway.

With regard to the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin that "73 percent of the United States flag fleet total are vessels of 27-foot draft or less



and could, therefore, use the seaway," I want to point out that this is a misstatement of the description in the table to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers. The table heading definitely says: "Vessels of 27-foot draft or less and United States Libertys and Victories." However, Mr. President, in reading the table, the Senator from Wisconsin omitted the reference to United States Victory and Liberty ships. Nevertheless, Liberty and Victory ships are clearly stated in the table heading to be both over 27-foot draft—namely, 27 feet 9½ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively. If the senior Senator from Wisconsin wants to use the correct figure for the percentage of the United States-flag fleet which are vessels of 27-foot draft or less, he must exclude 1,714 Liberty ships and 358 Victory ships. When this is done, the total vessels of 27-foot draft or less becomes 1,000 rather than 3,072; and the number of vessels in the United States fleet as of June 30, 1947, that are 27-foot draft or less is 24 percent instead of 73 percent, and the gross tons in the same category are 5,500,000 instead of 20,000,000, and only 17.7 percent instead of 66.3 percent of the total fleet.

So, Mr. President, I cannot help but wonder whether the senior Senator from Wisconsin read the table which he himself put into the RECORD.

It should be noted that this is entirely apart from the fact that with a proposed channel of 27-feet, vessels of 27-foot loaded draft could obviously not navigate unless they were loaded considerably below their capacity, and therefore the figures showing numbers and tonnages of 25-foot loaded draft are the more realistic, but only 24-foot draft would be safe for navigation.

To substantiate this point, I refer again to the regulations of the Port Warden in Montreal and to the Maritime Commission draft figures of fully loaded Liberty, Victory, C-2, C-3, and T-2 tankers. Bear in mind that these figures apply to salt-water draft, and that there is a tendency to draw more in fresh water. Refer to the considered opinion of the heads of many shipping lines in their letters submitted to the late Senator Bailey, and referred to many times during this debate, and note their statements that 24 feet is the maximum practical safe draft. Consider these facts, and we can put the Q. E. D. on the proposition that of the total American commercial flag fleet tonnage of 31,000,000 tons, only 3,000,000, or 10 percent, are of sufficiently shallow draft to permit navigation over the proposed 27-foot St. Lawrence Channel. I therefore stick to my guns, Mr. President, and repeat: 90 percent of American shipping tonnages would be excluded from the seaway.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks excerpts from a very informative letter which I think will be of interest to all Members of the Senate. It comes from Mr. C. Campbell Patterson, Jr., of Chestnut Hill, Mass.

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

CHESTNUT HILL, MASS., February 12, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I was extremely interested in reading the remarks in reference to the St. Lawrence waterway contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1948. It is really surprising to see how some people are willing to go on record with positive statements about a subject of which they are totally ignorant. As I said to you in my letter of January 30, 1948, I was actively engaged in the steamship business from the fall of 1919 up to the time I went into the Army during World War II. In spite of this experience I would not dare to hold myself out as an expert. However, a lawyer, farmer, banker, politician, or what have you, once he becomes a Senator is an expert on any and all subjects. When you get down to brass tacks, I have just as much right to tell the farmer in Wisconsin how to grow wheat as he is to tell me about deep-water ships.

When a shipping man is considering whether he is going to put a ship on a particular berth, two paramount questions first must be answered: 1. Is there sufficient payable cargo? 2. Is there depth of water for his ship to sail in safety? If the answer to No. 2 is "No," all the cargo in the world will not move the ship through a foul channel. Of course, if the vessel can make the passage partly loaded and the freight rates are sufficiently attractive, that is a different story. But is it going to help the individual cargo owner if he has to pay for a lot of dead space in a ship, rather than for just that portion utilized for his cargo?

Now let us consider the 27-foot proposed channel. It seems to be taken for granted that the immersion of ships of the size of Libertys and Victories in fresh water as opposed to salt is 6 inches. Maybe this is cutting it a little fine, but grant that 6 inches, there is talk of 2½ feet clearance under the deepest draft of the vessel. As I remember it that was picked out of the Montreal Port Wardens and I should guess is for moving around that harbor at slow speed. After all what have they got to say about the river once the ship has cleared the port? There are other authorities who enter the picture and who decide in case of an accident whether or not a vessel is seaworthy. Again in this case let's grant them 2½ feet clearance, but I should hate to be a passenger on a ship with so little water under the keel were she moving at any speed but dead slow. It doesn't take much for a ship to swell the bottom resulting in a sudden shear, which shear needs plenty of room to break. Combining the 6 inches for fresh water and the 2½-foot clearance we get a minimum of 3 feet. That reduces the ship's extreme draft to 24 feet. All the talk of the loaded draft of the Liberty is 27 feet 9¾ inches. I very much doubt from the questions raised that some gentlemen understand what this draft means. Ships do not navigate on an even keel. In other words a Liberty loaded, does not draw 27 feet 9¾ inches forward, 27 feet 9¾ inches aft. Even though the middle westerner does not know about ships he can learn something from a rowboat on a lake. His boat is deeper at the stern than forward. And if he is using the boat he so arranges his passenger that it will be trimmed by the stern. He does this because his boat is easier to maneuver. This is the same principle as loading a deep water vessel.

Every ship has its own peculiar quirks. Some operate efficiently when there is a difference of 5 feet between the forward and aft drafts—some might even have 9 feet. This is known as the drag. To get back to the 27 feet 9¾ inches mean draft. This is the depth of water at the Plimsoll mark and gives the vessel a specified freeboard at that

point. Suppose one ship requires a 5-foot drag to produce her best speed and maneuverability. That would mean her draft forward would be 25 feet 3¾ inches, aft 30 feet 3¾ inches. Add these two figures together and you get 55 feet 7½ inches. Divide by 2 and you get your 27 feet 9¾ inches mean draft. Now let's get to our ship which must transit a 27-foot fresh-water channel. It is granted she must have 6 inches plus 2½ feet under the deepest spot. That means the maximum draft cannot exceed 24 feet. Give the waterway every benefit and load the ship with a mere 2 foot drag. She is down to 24 feet aft and 22 feet forward, mean 23 feet. Our ship is, therefore, 27 feet 9¾ inches less 23 feet or 4 feet 9¾ inches light. I do not have an immersion scale of a Liberty, but at about the draft on which we are figuring it is approximately 48 tons per inch; 4 feet 9¾ inches at 48 tons per inch means our ship is 2,772 tons shy of her lifting capacity. Now let's take a look at the cargo. We are told this will consist chiefly of grain, ore, petroleum, and coal. The economical carriage of petroleum is in bulk by tankers, so leave this out of our picture. The stowage of grain, ore, coal is such that a ship would normally take her full dead weight of such commodities. Furthermore these are low freight-rate cargoes. The idea seems to be to send our Liberty through a dangerous channel with a port cargo of low-revenue freight. Do not let anyone sing a song about blowing up the ship with autos. Europe, or wherever the grain is destined, is not taking flocks of United States cars. Labrador, nor Wabana, has no general cargo to top off any ore. Nor has North Africa, unless we so change our tariff set up that we can import large quantities of eastern Mediterranean cotton, tobacco, etc.

While on this subject of cargo, mention might be made of an attempt at a comparison between Panama Canal transits and the St. Lawrence dreams. The great preponderance of movement through the Canal consists of general cargo which not only pays a good rate but fills a ship before she is down. On the other hand, those favoring the St. Lawrence state their proposed cargo will consist of at least three-fourths heavy low-freight commodities. The lake carrier of these commodities is so built that practically her whole deck can be opened for fast mechanical discharge. Such a ship is safe on the Lakes, but would not be permitted in the ocean. The Pioneer Steamship Co., of Cleveland, states they have one vessel 621 feet over all, which will lift in excess of 15,500 gross tons on a 24-foot draft. No deep-water vessel could equal or come near to this. On the other hand, I am sure you would find this vessel would not be permitted to sail the North Atlantic.

What about the period of open navigation? The time between the last and first sailings at Montreal show about 4½ to 5 months closed navigation. But, mind you, this is Montreal. The future ship will not get to Montreal any sooner than those in the past. She must then transit the upper St. Lawrence and then proceed through the Lakes to her destination—Chicago, Duluth, and so forth. Furthermore, the ships are not going to sail up the channel side by side. In the fall we have the reverse procedure. And here comes the rub. Owners are not going to wait till the last minute to sail from a western lake port. They could not afford being caught by a quick freeze or being held up by congestions at the bottlenecks caused by locks or river navigation.

Senator WILEY talks of his hardy northwesterners sailing car ferries through the ice. The old *Bear* sailed through ice for some 40 years before Admiral Byrd took her to Antarctica. Such a ship would not be of much use as a cargo carrier. Ferries operate all winter between the city of Quebec and Levis. They, too, must be run by hardy individuals,



and I venture to say have had just as much experience as those people from what the Senator calls the Northwest. I always thought that Washington and Oregon were the Northwest. I'll wager Senator CAIN would dub these hardy souls easterners—nonetheless Montreal and Quebec have yet to find a way to sail ships from their ports to the Atlantic during the winter months. These hardy northwestern ferrymen are not the controlling factor as far as the lower St. Lawrence is concerned.

Senator WILEY put into the RECORD figures to show what is the depth of water at various world ports. If he is serious, then he must be either trying to fool people ignorant of shipping conditions, or else he himself does not know what it is all about and has just picked places out of the thin air to try and bolster his arguments.

1. Stettin. Hamburg and Bremen were the two German world ports. Cargo for interior Germany and central Europe was transshipped through these two cities. Stettin is a Baltic port and in no sense of the word a competitor for world business.

2. Seville is up the Guadalquivir River and, except for small ships, cargo is transshipped from Cadiz, located at the mouth of the river.

3. Bangkok definitely is not a port. When I was in that city, I saw nothing but small launches and sampans on the river. Paknam was the port, and even that was no real port, being served mostly by feeder lines. Naming Bangkok makes just as much sense as giving the depth of water at Sacramento.

4. Nassau, Bermuda: This foggy picture is naive, to say the least. Both the Bermudas and Bahamas are set up for tourist trade; neither have any real industries, and so Nassau and Hamilton are not true cargo ports.

5. Canton: Just river ships serve this city, cargo being transshipped from Hong Kong or Kowloon.

6. Haiphong cargo is usually transshipped from Hong Kong.

7. Rosario: This city is at the end of the line. Inbound vessels discharge at Buenos Aires and then proceed up the river, when light, to Rosario. Exports are loaded first at Rosario, the ships then dropping down to Buenos Aires for further loading. If necessary, the ship can complete at Montevideo. I have just been talking with an Argentine skipper who has just arrived with his ship from the Plata. We discussed the depth of water in the river. At present there are spots where there is only 28 feet of water in the Plata below Buenos Aires, the river having silted up, as rivers do. However, because this is soft mud, deep-draft vessels can force their way through. Just check the class of commodities loaded in the Plata—wool, hides, meat, bones, all measurement cargo. Here we have 28 feet, causing trouble for large ships lifting comparatively light cargo—what about 27 feet with ships loaded with ore, wheat, and coal?

Furthermore, there is one essential fact overlooked by Senator WILEY. If one picks out of his list the few cities which really are ports, he will find that if for one reason or other the vessel cannot reach its destination her cargo can be transshipped from a deep-water port nearby. But what is one going to do if the ship cannot pass through the 27-foot channel of the upper St. Lawrence?

Senator AIKEN stated there are few ports outside of the United States which have 27 feet of water, with Liverpool as one of these few exceptions. The gentleman picked a very unhappy example. My guess is that his knowledge of Liverpool was gleaned as a passenger. Liverpool is a great port, but it is not a natural one. Because of the great rise and fall of the tides, ships have to go to docks through gates, very much like a ship entering a lock in a canal. Cargo and stores are handled at these gated docks. Passengers are handled at a landing stage at

which ships may tie up at any time. During stormy weather ships have been held up at the cargo docks, as it might be unsafe to pass through the gates. Of course, they can only pass through on the tide.

It so happens that I have traveled a little and know from personal experience conditions at a few foreign ports. Let me just list those where I have docked as a passenger on ships larger than any which have ever been thought of for the waterway. I might say that most of these ports have docks and facilities far in advance of most of our ports. Let me hasten to say my visits were early in the 1930's and war damage might have hurt some. But anyway they have had the deep water piers and will have them in the future. The list: Tilbury, Naples, Piraeus, Port Said, Singapore, Ooijhaven (Batavia), Soerabaja, Macassar, Tarakan, Kowloon, Shanghai, Manila, Keelung, Kobe, Yokohama, Auckland, Wellington, Sydney, Mombassa, Delagoa Bay, Durban, Cape Town, Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Santos, Rio de Janeiro. This is just my limited personal experience and of course does not include the many, many other large and modern world ports.

I am sorry to have written at such length, but the more I read and the more I think of the statements made by people who are childishly ignorant of their subject, the madder I get.

Very truly yours,

C. CAMPBELL PATTERSON, Jr.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

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

Bipartisan "horse trading" is an activity of even the best regulated parliamentary groups and a device whereby members of one party get the support of opposition members on a reciprocal basis for some specific piece of legislation. There is, however, vast difference between friendly, reciprocal horse trading and downright legislative extortion. Wisconsin's Senator WILEY has made a threat which comes dangerously close to being the second.

Debate is underway in the Senate on the highly controversial and twice-rejected St. Lawrence seaway proposal, and has been carried along on a nonpartisan basis to a point where it has reached the intellectual brass knuckle stage. Many of its most vigorous proponents and opponents are on the Republican side of the aisle. Democratic support is being given by those who rigidly adhere to administration desires under any and all circumstances, and those whose constituencies would be directly aided by such a seaway. Naturally, the proposal isn't getting any sympathy from Gulf and Lower Mississippi Valley Members.

The frenzy and seeming desperation currently marking the arguments of its proponents, of whom Senator WILEY is one, inspires conclusion that they recognize that they are fighting a lost cause. It could have been only desperation which would cause a Member of Senator WILEY's prestige to assert on the floor that if some Members continued their opposition he would delay their waterway projects until "hell freezes over."

That's strange language and an amazing threat. In other words, Senator WILEY intends to cram the St. Lawrence seaway project down the Senate's throat whether it likes it or not, and whether or not the plan is economically and defensibly feasible. His threat to block inland waterways bills which, we presume, covers flood-control bills, too, is what we mean by political extortion.

It is not a threat likely to change the minds of most of those opposed to the sea-

way project, and we prefer to think it is one stemming from heat of debate rather than from premeditation. If the St. Lawrence seaway is ever to be built, it can be only on a basis of proved merit and not on a political pique or obstruction to worthier projects.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Ascension," from the Boston Herald for January 28.

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

#### ST. LAWRENCE ASCENSION

The St. Lawrence seaway and power perennial sticks its head out again, this time from Senate soil with the sunshine of a Truman instead of a Roosevelt political blessing. Its appearance has the customary and time-worn generalities of "great engineering enterprise" and "rich natural resources," and "benefit to the whole United States" that have met their match in specific objections from shipping and railroads and labor unions and commerce groups over the Nation as well as in directly affected New England.

Our own area remembers too acutely the vision and eventual nightmare that was Quoddy to take much stock in another walking dream aimed to harness not merely the tides but to bring a Middle West doorstep to the Atlantic Ocean. The waterway would be no year-round sunny pleasure dome, but have the 5 months obstacle of caves of ice. This St. Lawrence balloon has been up again and again. The current Truman enthusiasm is nothing but a New Deal Sir Echo in backing the political instead of the practical.

Over its battered years, the St. Lawrence project has been successively a navigation imperative, a power blessing, a defense than which, an unemployment (that didn't take place) panacea. Now, apparently, it is a chance to spend maybe a billion dollars for a part-time service on a theoretical self-liquidating basis, without benefit of precedent in tolls or engineering traffic survey. Somehow the raw mixture does not mellow with age.

Specifically, the waterway's proposed 24-foot draft does not accommodate ocean-going vessels. Ocean ships, too, are not designed in hull, engine, or steering gear for operation in swift current, narrow channels at low speeds. Picture, as an extreme of course, the *Queen Mary* trying to negotiate the Cape Cod Canal. The railroads, with lines to established coast ports, would lose some of their pay-load freight, and then have the physical burden tossed back in the tough going of winter months.

Canals now exist along the proposed system. Their improvement for practical purpose would be a matter of millions, not billions. And from the defense angle, the Great Lakes area—probably the sole beneficiary from the project—once proposed as a haven for wartime shipping, is now more susceptible to attack by air than the seaboard areas, west or east. One bomb on the dams of the project and the Great Lakes-ocean link would fall apart.

The St. Lawrence proposal, in its persistence, assumes the guise of a policy of attrition. In the endurance test, only flood control and soil erosion pleas have been missing in the cycle of arguments that the public power proponents customarily run. Rather than the "interests" blocking forward progress of a nation's welfare, a small segment of the Nation seems determined that subsidized navigation and power shall be fostered on the taxpayers for the benefit of a few. We should do more than take air out of the balloon. It should be punctured for keeps.

Mr. LODGE. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in



the RECORD an editorial on the same subject, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of January 29.

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

#### UNTIMELY AND UNPROVED

President Truman remarks that for 25 years Presidents have supported, as he is now doing, the St. Lawrence seaway project. The fact is that in the 25 years technological developments have increased the magnitude of the undertaking, lessened the justifications for it. The original proposal has been revised from a 25-foot to a 27-foot channel depth to accommodate vessels plying between the Atlantic and the Great Lakes. But the modern shipping trend is still toward greater depth. And there is no port on the Great Lakes, no approach channel to accommodate a 27-foot draft, let alone the 35 feet many authorities now deem essential.

Similarly, technological developments in warfare have outdistanced earlier arguments for the seaway as a defense resource. The locks would be particularly vulnerable to air attack, their own defense would be costly. The final justification, power development, does not depend upon completion of the navigation project.

Present plans call for tolls on shipping in an effort to make the project self-liquidating. The agreement between Canada and the United States, which Congress is now asked to approve, limits the charges that can be levied. Moreover, the St. Lawrence is open only 7 or 8 months of the year, so that the seaway could never operate to more than, say, 60 percent of capacity. Consequently, there is little likelihood that the seaway can ever be anywhere near self-liquidating.

Estimated costs, based on the inadequate 27-foot channel, range from \$300,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. If congressional legislators can forget the election, they will recognize that an inflationary period is the worst possible time for any major public work which draws heavily upon scarce materials and sends prices still higher. They will recognize that the necessity for financing the European recovery program and for channeling materials and productive efforts into essential restoration of economic stability at home and abroad rules out unnecessary Government expenditures and commitments. This is definitely not the time for Congress to embark upon a vast project the cost of which cannot be accurately calculated, the national benefits of which are yet to be proved.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram coming from Dr. Joseph J. Tronolone, city clerk of the city of Buffalo.

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

BUFFALO, N. Y., February 4, 1948.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,

Senate Chamber:

The city of Buffalo reasserts its continued unqualified opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The port of Buffalo is the hub in the interchange of lake canal and rail traffic and its industry would be destroyed and employment greatly affected. This telegram is forwarded pursuant to unanimous resolution of the common council.

Dr. JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,  
City Clerk.

Mr. LODGE. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Say Pan-

ama Locks Can't Be Defended—Military and Atomic Experts Voice Fear of Vulnerability — Sea-Level Canal Urged," from the New York Times of February 8.

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

#### SAYS PANAMA LOCKS CAN'T BE DEFENDED— MILITARY AND ATOMIC EXPERTS VOICE FEAR OF VULNERABILITY—SEA-LEVEL CANAL URGED

WASHINGTON, February 7.—Panama's turn-down of a United States request to keep military bases on her soil appears beside the point in view of a report by a high-rank group of military and atomic energy experts.

They say that the Canal cannot be defended regardless of how many bases we have.

This was stressed repeatedly in a study which Congress recently received from the Governor of the Panama Canal, J. C. Mehahey.

Congress ordered the investigation in 1945. It cost almost \$5,000,000 and was conducted largely by officials of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The report, which was unanimously agreed to in all essential particulars, concluded that only a sea-level canal would be secure against attack. It said such a canal could be most economically built at the site of the present waterway.

#### VULNERABLE FOR ATTACK

"The military defenses of the Canal could not prevent a determined and resourceful enemy from striking the Canal with one or more of the modern weapons loaded with atomic or conventional explosives," said the report.

"The Canal as it exists today cannot be considered as meeting the future needs of national defense.

"Even with a very strong military defense no assurance would exist that an enemy could not penetrate the Canal with aircraft of great speed carrying conventional or atomic weapons, or with aerial rockets and torpedoes."

The vulnerable features of the Panama or any other lock canal are the locks and the "summit lake" (Gatun Lake, in the case of the Panama Canal), which supplies water for navigation and lockage.

One or two atomic bombs or a series of hits by conventional bombs could breach the lock chambers, or the retaining walls of Gatun, an artificial lake. Even if the structures could be rebuilt it would then take 1 or 2 years to refill the lake, depending on the rainfall.

#### DOUBLE PEARL HARBOR FEARED

A successful sneak attack when our fleet was making the 8½-hour Canal passage would thus be a double Pearl Harbor. We would lose the use of the highly strategic Canal and major components of our sea power would be grounded for perhaps 2 years.

According to the report, lingering radioactivity would prevent repair of the locks. New ones would have to be constructed some distance away, and this would take at least 4 years.

The experts believe, however, that no conceivable attack on a sea-level canal would close the channel for more than a few weeks. They said slopes could be constructed to prevent landslides.

Atomic bombing of the channel would block it with radioactive debris, but the experts say that if personnel and equipment were available the obstruction could be removed within a few weeks.

The proposed sea-level canal would have tidal regulating structures on the Pacific side. These could be wrecked by bombs, but the report says the canal then could be used as an open waterway.

#### SEA-LEVEL CANAL COST HIGH

Need for these tidal regulating structures was the only thing on which the board did not agree unanimously.

Between high and low tides on the Pacific side the water sometimes drops or rises 20 feet. The maximum on the Atlantic side is only 2 feet.

This would cause a current as swift as 4½ knots, which would endanger vessels if their power failed.

The tidal structures would consist essentially of a set of locks for the passage of vessels when the tide was high or low, and a navigable pass in a separate channel.

Mehaffey did not minimize the importance of a strong defense establishment in the area. Even if the Canal could not be kept open, he said, military forces could reduce to a minimum any chance of capture of the zone.

A sea-level canal, which the experts regard as the only really secure type, would cost \$2,483,000,000 and take 10 years to build.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch, in which it is stated that it is most unfortunate that the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have injected into the argument the story of the depleted Mesabi Range.

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

#### ORE AND THE SEAWAY

Eastern seaboard business interests are already massing their forces for a renewed attack on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. At a meeting in Boston this week, speakers warned that its completion will cripple Atlantic ports, produce mass unemployment, and "put the squeeze on railroads" for lower freight rates to inland points. At the same time, they refuted one argument which has tended to undermine seaway support in the upper Great Lakes area.

This was the plea introduced recently that the seaway is needed to open the way to imports of iron ore from the rich deposits around Belle Isle, Newfoundland, to replace dwindling supplies from "exhausted" Lake Superior diggings. The story now is that no such replacements will be needed within the next four or five centuries. The true situation is discussed by President Wilfred Sykes of Inland Steel Co. in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle.

The common assertion that proved deposits of direct shipping ore may be exhausted in 12 to 20 years is true enough, but it is subject to easy misinterpretation. According to Mr. Sykes, there are quite certainly large bodies of high-grade ore under unexplored areas, but "we don't want to find them under present conditions" because that would render them subject to heavy taxation. He agrees with the geologists who told mining engineers in Duluth Wednesday that available high-grade ore should last 40 years or more, while there is enough taconite to supply all demands "oh, for 400 to 500 years, or something like that."

Introduction of iron ore into the seaway debates was ill-advised on all accounts. The seaway is needed, without any regard to ore supplies. As for the threat of foreign competition with Lake Superior ore, a prospect that had caused some weakening of seaway support around the Head of the Lakes, Mr. Sykes believes that even processed taconite will be much cheaper than the best foreign ore for use in the lower Lakes steel mills.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tolls



and the Seaway," from the New York Times of February 8.

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

#### TOLLS AND THE SEAWAY

In 1934 Army engineers predicted that a St. Lawrence seaway would carry a maximum annual tonnage of 27,000,000. The St. Lawrence survey report arrived at the closely similar result of 25,000,000. Last year the National St. Lawrence Association raised these figures to 37,000,000. The discrepancies indicate that no one knows what the potentialities of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway are. Secretary Harriman has testified that the Department of Commerce "has not yet made a detailed analysis of potential traffic on the seaway." Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler furnished the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Eightieth Congress with Army estimates of expected traffic—estimates which have been used to prove that the seaway can be made to pay for itself by levying tolls—but declines to be bound by them in the absence of a thorough study of all prospective traffic, the character and amount of tonnage that would actually move under a toll system \* \* \* and the actual net income from those tolls is compared with the assessed navigation costs. In other words, all estimates of potential seaway traffic are little better than romantic hopes.

Proponents and opponents of the seaway split on the issue of self-liquidation. Last year's Senate joint resolution fixed a maximum toll of \$1.25 a short-ton of laden cargo that would pass through the deep-water navigation works, with exemptions in the case of local or way or government traffic. Probably \$1 would be the average cargo-ton toll. A study made by the Port of New York Authority indicates that the annual cost of maintaining and operating a channel 27 feet deep, exclusive of power facilities, would be \$20,000,000 annually to American taxpayers. There are not more than 5,500,000 tons of toll-paying traffic in sight, so that on the basis of a one-dollar-a-ton average (Secretary Harriman thinks that 50 cents a ton should be the maximum for grain, coal, petroleum, woodpulp, and ores), a belief in the possibility of self-liquidation seems mere day-dreaming.

Costs, too, have risen since the St. Lawrence seaway was first seriously discussed in 1921. Last year the Chief of Army Engineers estimated the total cost of the work still to be done on the whole navigation and power project from Duluth to Montreal at \$674,707,000, of which \$491,609,000 would be borne by the United States—an estimate that allows nothing for deepening channels of lake ports and providing adequate harbor basins. Every one of our great engineering projects outran the estimates. The Welland Canal was to have been built for \$70,000,000, but cost three times as much; the Chicago Drainage Canal cost not the estimated \$16,000,000 but \$53,000,000; and the New York State Barge Canal cost \$176,000,000 instead of the expected \$53,000,000. If the seaway should be constructed, it would probably cost American taxpayers annually far more than \$20,000,000 for fixed, operating and maintenance charges, so that the prospect of self-liquidation becomes more and more dubious.

Congress would be well advised to proceed with caution. We need a more thoroughgoing study of engineering costs and potential traffic than has been made before it can be asserted with confidence that a seaway can be made self-liquidating by levying tolls that shippers will pay.

Mr. LODGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway—Is Proposal Sound?"

from the Christian Science Monitor of January 17, 1948.

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

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—IS PROPOSAL SOUND?

(By George Ericson)

Debate is reaching the fervid stage on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project. A decision may be reached before long in the Senate, where a resolution sponsored by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG (Michigan) is scheduled for debate next week. President Truman is urging passage of the enabling legislation, following in this respect most of the departments of the Federal Government which recorded themselves in favor of the project early in 1946. There is powerful opposition making itself heard, however, which precludes the easy assurance that this "shorter, cheaper, all-water access to world markets" will ere long become an actuality.

Where experts disagree, the layman will be in good company whichever side he espouses. The seaway proposal has engaged the attention of the United States and Canadian Governments as well as business interests for almost half a century. It must be supposed that every argument, favorable and unfavorable, has been uncovered during that period. The fact that no overwhelming preponderance of logic or opinion has swung the pendulum definitely one way or the other would indicate some very weighty reasons on both sides why decision is still in abeyance.

#### WATERWAY FEATURES 27 LOCKS

The salient features of the plan envision a waterway of 27-foot minimum depth from Duluth, Minn., at the western end of Lake Superior, to the Atlantic Ocean. There would be 27 locks needed to overcome the 600-foot difference in water levels between Lake Superior and the Atlantic, 9 of which are now in operation. Most of the construction would be in the 115-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, where dams, locks, and canals would be required to regulate the flow and maintain the water-level of Lake Ontario.

While the primary object of the seaway would be to open the Great Lakes to ocean-going vessels, a correlative goal is the production of hydroelectric power in the international rapids section of the river. It is estimated that generators there will have a total capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, surpassed in magnitude only by the Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee projects. Total cost of the entire project was estimated last year by Army engineers at \$674,707,000, of which \$330,699,000 would be paid by the United States Government, \$183,098,000 by Canada, and \$161,000,000 by New York State.

On the face of it, such a development would seem eminently desirable. It would shorten the distance between Liverpool and Detroit by 251 miles; it would develop a large supply of cheap electric power available to northeastern United States, and, it was argued by proponents, it would benefit economically the land-locked Middle West. President Truman predicts that "it would stimulate our economies to new growth \* \* \* and spread the flow of trade."

#### SELF-INTEREST HELD GUIDING OPPOSITION

Opposition has been labeled self-interested and sectional, and supporters point to the antagonism which tried to bar the TVA development but which now has largely vanished following the success of that power and flood development scheme. However, supporters from the Middle West region tributary to the Great Lakes, who seek the benefits of cheap water transportation, and others in New York State interested in the development of St. Lawrence power, can be similarly charged. It is to be noted that

opinion in Canada likewise has been divided on the subject. The final determination will be based, no doubt, on the paramount public interest.

Many prominent persons and organizations have lined up in formidable array against the seaway plan. Among individuals are Senators ROBERT WAGNER and IRVING IVES, of New York; Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York City; Speaker Oswald D. Heck, of the New York Legislature; Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts (who would, however, support the hydroelectric part of the plan); and, among others, four members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senators LODGE (Massachusetts), WHITE (Maine), CONNALLY (Texas), and GEORGE (Georgia).

Organizations fighting the project are the Association of American Railroads, the Port of New York Authority, the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, the New York Board of Trade, the American Federation of Labor, the National Federation of American Shipping, the United Mine Workers, the railroad brotherhoods, and various transportation and industrial interests.

#### WHAT THE OPPONENTS SAY

The gist of their arguments is that Atlantic and Gulf ports would lose much trade to the seaway, that the railroads would lose traffic, that the consumption of coal would be reduced by 40,000,000 tons a year, that the canal would be frozen and hence inoperative for above 5 months in the year, that the 27-foot depth was inadequate for large ocean-going vessels, since only vessels drawing 24 feet could use it, that there are no harbors or piers on the Great Lakes capable of accommodating the large ocean-going vessels, that of the 1,182 miles of the St. Lawrence from Ontario to the open sea, 95 percent of the river would be in Canadian territory, that no one knows what the cost will be since every one of the 10 dams and canals constructed by the United States cost two to three times the estimates, that the canal will benefit chiefly foreign-owned vessels, since only 16 percent of ocean-going United States flag vessels of more than 1,200 gross tons, as compared with 62 percent of foreign flag vessels of similar size, have a loaded draft of less than 25 feet, and finally that the project would be patently vulnerable in case of war.

The enumeration of the arguments of the opposition is made not to predispose the reader to the negative side of the proposal, but to indicate that there are valid objections to a deep-water seaway which carries romance and drama in its potential unfolding—a water road delving 2,400 miles into the heart of America. Will its benefits outweigh its apparent disadvantages? Can it be built at a cost which will be justified economically? Is this the time to undertake it when the Government is ostensibly seeking to reduce expenditures? The country may be able to answer those questions more readily after the coming congressional debate.

Mr. LODGE. Finally, Mr. President—and this concludes my remarks—I wish to refer to an editorial appearing in the New York Sun of February 4. It is so short that I shall read it. It is as follows:

#### PERSISTENT DOUBTS ABOUT THE SEAWAY

If the ordinary person had time and opportunity to read the current Senate debate on the St. Lawrence seaway—everything said for and against this project—he would be bound to reach something like the following set of conclusions:

Cost of the project: Still in dispute.

Capacity of the seaway if built: Still in dispute.

Use of the seaway if built: Still in dispute.

Tolls to be levied on seaway shipping: Still to be determined.

Vulnerability of the seaway locks to attack: Still in dispute.

In the evenly divided discussion in the Senate, both sides have been making positive statements. But when these are weighed in the scales they show nothing more clearly than that the main advantages claimed by advocates of the seaway can still be disputed after all these years of public agitation on the question. Any project that is still under a cloud of doubt after 20 years of discussion had better be deferred until some of the practical problems can be reduced to something approaching clear and definite conclusions.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield the floor, or I shall yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I gather from the Senator's remarks that he believes that 27 feet is not sufficient depth for the proposed seaway.

Mr. LODGE. I said that 27 feet is not sufficiently deep to accommodate the bulk of American ocean tonnage, fully loaded.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, how deep does the Senator from Massachusetts think it should be in order to accommodate the Liberty ships and the Victory ships, fully loaded.

Mr. LODGE. I am not an expert; I am simply quoting what the experts say.

Mr. AIKEN. But did not the experts tell the Senator from Massachusetts that it is planned to construct the locks for a 30-foot depth, anyway?

Mr. LODGE. What did the Senator say?

Mr. AIKEN. Did not the experts tell the Senator from Massachusetts that the locks are to be 30 feet deep over the sills, anyway—and if it is desired to deepen the seaway beyond the 27 feet, that is only a matter of dredging a few miles here and there, to make a 30-foot channel, in order to accommodate, fully loaded, every Victory ship and every Liberty ship in the world.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Vermont think those channels should be dredged in order to make them deep enough?

Mr. AIKEN. I should be very glad to see the channel deep enough to accommodate any ship fully loaded.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator from Vermont think it would be better, if they are to be dredged, to include the cost of such dredging in the stated cost of this project, and get a project that is really modern and up to date and deep enough for all the ships that sail the ocean today, rather than to provide a waterway suitable merely for vessels which sailed the ocean 30 years ago?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because I prefer to take the statement of General Marshall that 80 percent of all our merchant marine could use the 27-foot channel to good advantage, or the statement made by Mr. Edward Macauley before the committee, in 1946, that, as I recall his statement, 75 percent or 80 percent of our tonnage would use the channel to good advantage.

And did not the experts tell the Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont asks me three or four questions at once, and then pauses. Let me answer one question at a time.

Of course, there is no dispute at all that a ship can use the proposed seaway if it is not fully loaded. There is no doubt about that. Perhaps 75 or 80 percent of our merchant fleet could use the seaway under those circumstances. Possibly the *Manhattan* or the *George Washington* could be inched through the seaway if there were nothing in their holds; but there would not be much point in doing that.

I suggest that if we are going to embark on a project of this sort, we should do so in a modern, scientific, carefully thought out way, rather than in the present strange way, similar to that of a man running across the country like a house afire with his shirt tail out. That is my statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I prefer to take the statement of General Marshall.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, neither General Marshall nor the Maritime Commission have ever said that 80 percent of our ships could use the seaway when fully loaded.

Mr. AIKEN. They have said that 80 percent of our ships could use the seaway to advantage.

Mr. LODGE. But not when fully loaded.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Massachusetts has not told us that all our ships operate fully loaded at all times.

Mr. LODGE. They operate fully loaded whenever they can.

Mr. AIKEN. They prefer to operate fully loaded as to bulk; but fully loaded as to bulk does not necessarily mean fully loaded as to weight. The Senator from Massachusetts has not told us that ships fully loaded with furniture from Grand Rapids, Mich., or ships fully loaded with automobiles from Detroit could not use the seaway.

The presently proposed channel is designed to accommodate approximately 80 percent of our merchant marine. If it is desired to have the seaway built so as to accommodate every one of our merchant ships when fully loaded, of course that can be done. As a matter of fact, in the plans the locks are designed so as to be 30 feet deep over the sills.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the Senator from Vermont says the locks are going to be sufficiently deep. Let us assume that will be. Does not the Senator from Vermont think it would be more honest to the American people to submit to them an undertaking in which not only the locks but the channels and the harbors and everything else are of the correct depth, and then figure the total cost on that basis, and present the total bill to the American people, and have them consider the entire project in that way, rather than in the presently proposed way of doing it by bits and pieces?

Mr. AIKEN. The answer to that is that if it is impossible to have a waterway sufficient to accommodate 100 percent of the shipping, I, for one, favor a waterway accommodating 80 percent.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but it would be impossible for them to use any of it if the

harbors in the Great Lakes are not sufficiently deep.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as the shipping interests of the Atlantic coast are concerned—and they almost unanimously oppose the project—the reason for their opposition is that they do not want any competition in shipping around the world. They own and control the terminals now, and they do not want any new competition coming into the picture to deprive them of their profits. Speaking of their profits, these shipping interests should be the last people in the world to come before Congress urging us not to spend money for anybody else, because ever since 1936 they have had their hands in the Federal Treasury, clear up to the armpits, and they have taken amounts reaching into billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, for which, in my opinion, they have not given value received.

Mr. LODGE. I am not going to disagree with a single word of the Senator's last statement. I am not here to defend the shipping interests. I have no interest in them at all. I do not know what they do, and in these matters I am not going to argue that point at all. I simply arose to clear up this question of fact, from the official figures which I produced, from the official figures which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin produced. All those figures prove the fact that 90 percent of American ocean tonnage fully loaded cannot use the seaway. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. IVES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I do not wish to accept it on that basis. I desired to reply briefly to the Senator from Massachusetts and to have the RECORD show at this time what my thoughts were in answer to his contention. I shall appreciate it if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for a few moments.

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. First, Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that there be printed two amendments to the St. Lawrence seaway resolution, intended to be proposed by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], to which I have previously agreed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize that in our interchange recently in relation to figures the figures struck home. We have been talking about a 9-percent ratio. On page 1051 of the RECORD, I introduced two tables, from one of which I call attention to the following statement:

World fleet, total, 12,370; gross tons, in millions, 70.42; number of vessels of 25-foot draft or less, 5,579; percentage of grand total, 45.1.

There are 5,579 vessels in the world fleet that have a draft of 25 feet or less.



Testifying recently before the Foreign Relations Committee, the Secretary of Commerce explained that the normal merchant marine that should be sustained by the Government would not exceed 14,000,000 tons. The table shows a gross tonnage of 70,000,000 with 5,579 vessels of 25-foot draft or less. The remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts lead in the wrong direction, when he endeavors to tell the American people that there are not sufficient ships to handle the commerce of the world, when there are over 5,000 of them. That does not include Victory ships. It is clearly indicated in the findings of the Commerce Department that Victory and Liberty ships could use the canal with profit, and that Victory ships could pass through the canal loaded to 79 percent, the Liberty ships to 85 percent of their total deadweight. Therefore it is necessary to add to the 5,579 ships all the Victory ships and all other ships.

An ordinary ship of 10,000 tons will carry a weight of 10,000 tons. The ships that ordinarily pass through the Welland Canal have been small lake ships, yet the traffic through the canal has amounted to fifty or sixty million tons, at times, and the traffic through the canal at the Soo had reached 110,000,000 tons in a season. With reference to paying for the canal on a toll basis. I regret to note that my distinguished associate from the great Bay State is following in the steps of one of his great predecessors, John Quincy Adams, who, on the question of the Louisiana Purchase, was found to be in opposition to it. He was lacking in vision. He took a narrow view. He took a sectional view of it. He said, "No, no, no; we cannot do that."

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

Mr. WILEY. In a moment, please. I did not interrupt the Senator.

What is being sought by the proponents of this measure? We are not taking the words of the Senator from Massachusetts or the words of the Senator from Wisconsin. We are taking the only expert testimony in the record, that of General Wheeler, who made the estimates. He is the man who, within the same agency, estimated within a few hundred dollars the cost of the Panama Canal. Those figures are available. It is a remarkable fact, but nevertheless it is true, that the Panama Canal when completed cost less than the estimates. It was the work of the Army engineers, who have now, year after year, supplied estimates of the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway. No one contradicts them. Where are the engineers who would contradict them? Where are the specialists? No witness appeared to contradict those figures. The figures were accepted until the measure reached the floor of the Senate. Thereupon, it is asserted that the ships cannot pass through the canal. In answer to that contention we have shown the number of ships in the world fleet. How many ships would be required to handle the entire tonnage if one ship has a capacity of 10,000 tons a trip?

I want to say that all the smoke-screening, all the fears, all the provincial

aspects will not refute the testimony in support of the measure. If I were younger, I might quote the words of Lord Beaconsfield, to the effect that if we are not hurt now, the time will come when we shall be hurt. We trust we shall not be facing a world situation in which one avenue of travel may be destroyed, where the cities of Boston and New York will be isolated through the destruction of railroad traffic, such as the destruction which was seen in World War II, with respect to the routes of traffic from the hinterland in France, from the coast to the hinterland in Germany, to the cities. It is imperative that we in this day and generation lift our sights in order that we may see what is involved.

Senators talk of centralization, when in the affected areas the great percentage of the population is living like sardines in a box, when an atom bomb could destroy a whole city. We speak now of meeting the challenge. The figures that I introduced in the RECORD recently show clearly that there are available thousands of ships of 25-foot draft or less, that could pass through the channels when built.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the disposition of the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 111, provides that a motion to recommit the resolution shall only be in order on February 23, but a vote thereon shall not be had prior to February 27, 1948. I propose presently to move that the joint resolution be recommitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in connection with the motion I desire to make a few remarks.

I think I express the feeling of a great many of my colleagues when I say that the vote on the pending resolution is an exceedingly difficult one. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which held hearings last May and June, but the testimony was limited to the national defense and self-liquidating features of the St. Lawrence project. I was not a Member of the Senate at the time of the earlier hearings and, consequently, did not hear the original testimony, which went much more fully into many other aspects of the project.

Considering the evidence presented at our hearings last summer, I have come to the conclusion that on the national defense issue, the St. Lawrence project, while helpful to national defense, is not vital to national defense. This statement is in almost the exact words of the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, and General Wheeler.

The national defense issue, therefore, while important, cannot, in my judgment, be the determining factor.

With regard to the self-liquidating feature, the testimony is so varied that I frankly see no way to reconcile it. My general conclusion is that the project, as now contemplated, is not adequate in size to sustain a tonnage that could liquidate the cost. I feel this is the really vulnerable point of the whole case for the proponents, if we are making the self-liquidating feature a condition of approval of the plan. My general con-

clusions on this point are that, taking the generally accepted assumptions of cost of the contemplated canal, and the average accepted estimates of potential tonnage, we find ourselves facing a probable annual deficit in operations of between seven and ten million dollars. I feel, therefore, that to be honest with myself, I must conclude that the project of present dimensions probably would not be self-liquidating, certainly for some years to come, and that if we authorize the project we should willingly face the possibility of facing that deficit, such as I suggested, and justify that deficit on the ground of the general national good.

Considering this project as a whole, I feel it is an inevitable development sometime in the future. In this connection, although I come from a State that is on the Atlantic seaboard, and most of my constituents are opposed to the project as it is presently presented, nevertheless, it is my conviction that all of us should think in terms of the national interest and the development of our great country ahead of any purely selfish advantage to any particular section. It is my conviction that those of us who serve in the United States Senate, while of course we must vigorously guard the interests of our respective States, are nevertheless the representatives of the Nation as a whole, and if we do not think in terms of the Nation as a whole it is hard to see how those interests can properly be protected. I certainly object to the log-rolling process.

In the long run, with the expanding development of our great country, I cannot see how the building of the St. Lawrence seaway project could permanently injure the port of New York, in which New Jersey participates, nor can I feel in the long run that our railroads would be injured. On the contrary, I feel that they would be benefited by the increasing expansion of productivity to which an expanding transportation system would contribute.

I feel, therefore, that this project should be looked upon as one of the inevitable future developments of our country, and I should be sorry indeed to see the proposal finally defeated.

I am bound to say, however, that the questions which have come to me are of such a serious nature, and have been so emphasized in the debates on the floor in the past few days, that I feel we should know more before taking the final step toward authorization. My present feeling is that this development must inevitably be a much larger one than that contemplated by the proposed plans. We will be better prepared to face that development after, and not before, we have tackled some of the pending world problems which are calling upon us for immediate attention. We do not see today the pattern of the new world. We are thinking in terms of the so-called Marshall plan for the economic rehabilitation of Europe, and much will depend on the rapidity of European and world recovery. If the world can get back on a sound economic basis, as I am confident it will, and world-wide prosperity follows, there is no doubt in my mind that the United States will prosper with other nations of the world, and the interchange of trade with

other nations will be a most important factor.

Frankly, I can see no urgent need for immediate action on the pending resolution. In light of the many inquiries and doubts in the minds of so many of us, we shall lose nothing by getting more information before we proceed with the definite authorization of the project. Even if we should vote to authorize this project, the most that would happen to it would be to include it in the pot with other public-works projects, awaiting first the pressure on us all for the European relief program, and second, for an appropriate recession in employment so that the conditions would be right for making a start. Certainly it is inconceivable that the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate would vote any more money for any enterprise that was not of immediate, urgent importance at the present time.

I am, therefore, moving to recommit the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. In asking that this matter be recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee I am hopeful that the committee will have in mind obtaining for us answers to certain pending difficulties that have been, as I see it, legitimately raised in this debate, and the answers to certain questions which are entitled to consideration.

As an example of what I have in mind, it seems that the Secretary of the Army should be authorized and directed to make a further and more complete report on the whole project. Such report should include:

First. Detailed estimates of the cost of constructing the seaway with channels not only of the 27-foot-depth, but depths of 30 feet and 35 feet.

Second. Detailed estimates of the cost of deepening channels and harbors on the United States side of the Great Lakes which may be needed to accommodate the traffic it is estimated may use the seaway, having in mind the channels and harbors in the neighborhoods of the large cities on the Great Lakes.

Third. The estimated tonnage which will use the seaway—based on the three channel depths referred to above. This is with a view to determining if the proposed new deep water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes can be made self-liquidating by charging tolls. As I pointed out above in my remarks, the discrepancy in the estimates of what the tolls would yield is one of the most disconcerting features in the whole discussion.

Fourth. An analysis of the estimated traffic on such seaway—based on the three channel depths referred to above—with a view to determining its effect on other areas in the United States, and, for example, whether this development of a waterway is more important than a further development of the Mississippi Basin, or the basin of any other large river in the country, or whether at the same time all these water developments should be explored.

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

Mr. SMITH. I prefer, if I may, to finish the summary of my recommenda-

tions. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. SMITH. Fifth. Sample tables of tolls on selected commodities.

Sixth. Sample tables of over-all transportation costs of selected commodities to be transported over such seaway—based on the three channel depths referred to above—from inland points in the United States to selected points both inside the United States and abroad.

Seventh. The estimated diversion of traffic to the seaway from existing facilities, such as railroads, and so forth, and whether in the long run these existing facilities will not be benefited rather than harmed.

Eighth. The most advantageous method or methods to be used in constructing the seaway, together with the reasons therefor.

Ninth. Estimates of the cost of constructing the proposed power project on the United States side of the International Rapids.

Tenth. The potential power output of the plants proposed to be constructed and the areas that could be served by such plants.

Eleventh. A recommendation of a system of equitable distribution of the power generated at such plants throughout the entire area which could be served by such plants and with particular emphasis on safeguarding the interests of all the States included in such area.

I suggest also that the Secretary of the Army should cause to be printed preliminary blueprints of such seaway and power projects and that such blueprints should be made a part of such report.

But beyond this, I should like to see steps taken by the committee to request the President to negotiate a treaty or an agreement with the Government of Canada at the earliest possible date, in which the Government of Canada gives satisfactory assurance that it agrees to the following principles.

These have all been brought out in the debate, and I have tried to summarize them.

First. Of making the proposed new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes self-liquidating by charging tolls for the use thereof.

There should be an agreement with Canada on that principle, definitely.

Second. That such tolls shall be fair and equitable and that due consideration shall be given to the encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities and to the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials.

Third. That tolls shall vary for ships in ballast and according to the character of cargo so that each classification of cargo will, so far as practicable, derive relative benefits from the use of such seaway.

Fourth. That tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the proposed new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River, with such exception of local or way or Government traffic as may be agreed upon by the two countries.

I should like to add here that if an agreement, rather than a treaty, is negotiated under this section, such agreement shall be effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada. Of course, if a treaty were negotiated, it would have to be ratified, as provided in the Constitution of the United States, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

In line with the foregoing recommendation, I believe the committee should request the President to negotiate for an agreement with the Government of the State of New York as soon as possible for the transfer to the appropriate agency of that State of such power facilities on the United States side of the international rapids as may be constructed in whole or in part by the United States Government. The cost would be determined by the method for allocation included in the joint recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Power Authority of the State of New York, dated February 7, 1933. I understand those allocations have already been determined.

This method was presented at public hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee February 10, 1933, Seventy-second Congress, second session. Such agreement with the State of New York should be consistent with the laws of the United States and should protect the interests of the United States and should become effective only after approval by the Congress and the Legislature of the State of New York. Furthermore, such agreement should contain a provision that the power generated by such facilities should be allocated equitably, by the President or by such agency or instrumentality of the United States as he may designate, among the several States of the United States whose nearest border is not more than 300 miles in a straight line from the United States side of the International Rapids. I understand that to be the estimated distance over which the power could be distributed.

I am aware that there might be some cost in making the investigations and surveys herein proposed, and I feel that the committee should pass an appropriate resolution asking the Congress to appropriate such sums as may be necessary to carry out this program. It is my considered judgment that at this time, with the situation in the world as it is, this is the wisest course to take, in order to lay the proper foundation for the authorization of this important national project.

I think it is obvious that if the motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations were agreed to it would not be possible to get all this information at this session of Congress, but I think it is proper that the joint resolution be recommitted, with the suggestion that the questions I have enumerated be definitely answered before the matter is brought back to the Senate at a subsequent session.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I move that the pending joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 111, be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the motion will come before the Senate for a vote on the 27th instant.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to add one word before I yield, if I may.

I regret to say that, on the advice of my physician, I shall be obliged to be away during the coming week for reasons of health, for a little rest, and have asked the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] if he will not, at the session on the 27th, present my motion for recommitment. He has consented to do that, and I express my gratitude to him for saying he would do so, although he says he intends to vote against my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion will come up automatically on February 27.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator two questions. At the beginning of his statement he estimated that there might be a loss of as much as \$7,000,000 a year in the operation of the proposed development; in other words, that it might fail to meet the requirements of a fully self-liquidating project by that amount. May I ask on what authority he bases the estimate of a \$7,000,000 annual loss?

Mr. SMITH. I had the testimony introduced in the record of the hearings analyzed by a gentleman in whom I have the fullest confidence, and taking the average figures, and the best judgment we could both exercise in working out the problem, we arrived at the figure I have given. I admit there was a wide variation in the estimates of the tonnage. I think the estimates varied from somewhere around ten to fifteen million tons, to as high as 60,000,000 tons. It is one of those problems to which no one can give a definite answer. If I were voting for the joint resolution I think it would only be fair, if I may put it this way, to say to myself, "I am voting for this with the conviction in my own mind that it is going to cost my country from 7 to 10 million dollars." I might be willing to vote for it under those conditions, if it were going to do any appreciable good.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe the Department of Commerce studies are reliable?

Mr. SMITH. There were a great many studies which I thought were reliable, and it is hard for a layman to take all the figures which are given and reconcile them.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Commerce, after studying only four commodities which it was estimated would use the seaway, came to the conclusion that the tolls on those four commodities alone would meet the requirements for annual charges, amortization, and so forth.

The Senator asked that studies be made as to the self-liquidating features

of the development. Whom does he propose to have make those studies?

Mr. SMITH. I would suggest that the Army undertake the job first, because they have the Army engineers available to make studies of proposals for different sized canals, a 30-foot canal, a 27-foot canal, and even a 35-foot canal. If in the postwar period there were an increase in traffic, it would be desirable to have those figures.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe the Army engineers are in a better position to make an estimate of the kind and amount of commerce that would use the canal than the Department of Commerce?

Mr. SMITH. I think the Department of Commerce should deal with it. I should also like to see the Interstate Commerce Commission make a study of the situation. They have the means for determining figures as to tonnage, and they might have an opinion in regard to the proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will permit, I should like to have something inserted in the RECORD. On May 6, 1947, I wrote to Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers of the Army, telling him that I had heard that the engineers were opposed to charging any tolls whatsoever on the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes development. On May 9 I received a letter from General Wheeler in which he confirmed my fears and stated that the Army engineers believed that no tolls whatsoever should be charged and that they could not be charged without applying the same tolls to every other inland waterway which we have in the United States.

I then wrote on June 2 to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, telling him what General Wheeler, of the Army Engineers, had said and asked for his opinion as to whether or not tolls could be charged on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and he wrote back to me, under date of June 12, completely refuting everything that General Wheeler had said and blowing his argument into little bits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from General Wheeler to me under date of May 9, 1947, my letter to General Marshall of June 2, 1947, and General Marshall's reply to me under date of June 12, 1947.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington May 9, 1947.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am in receipt of your letter of May 6, 1947, in which you state that you have been informed that the Corps of Engineers is opposed to the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway on a self-liquidating basis. You request confirmation of that information. You ask further if this opposition is based on the premise that all waterways should be toll free or if, in my opinion, tolls could not be collected in an amount adequate to liquidate the cost of the development.

As you know, the Corps of Engineers does not oppose nor sponsor legislation, rather I

conceive its duty to be to do that which Congress directs. However, inasmuch as you have asked specific questions, I shall endeavor to make answers thereto.

Congress has in the past defined as its policy that waterways should be toll free as indicated by the following:

"Sec. 6. That section 4 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 5, 1884, be, and is hereby, amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:

"'Sec. 4. That no tolls or operating charges whatever shall be levied upon or collected from any vessel, dredge, or other water craft for passing through any lock, canal, canalized river, or other work for the use and benefit of navigation, now belonging to the United States or that may be hereafter acquired or constructed: \* \* \*'"

Act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 818; 33 U. S. C. 5).

The Interstate Commerce Commission has followed that policy as is indicated by the following transcript of a decision made in 1914:

"INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION REPORTS,  
VOLUME 31, PAGE 281

"Decision in case of Decatur Navigation Co. v. Louisville and Nashville Railroad, July 14, 1914.

"'A natural waterway, improved by the expenditure of public funds, should be thrown open as far as possible to the free and unrestricted use of all those who desire to avail themselves of it. It differs materially from a privately constructed and privately owned roadbed, which, though quasipublic in nature is built by individuals or corporate interests primarily for their own gain. A navigable river is a public highway, a natural avenue of commerce, and the public interest demands that its advantages be utilized to the fullest extent.'"

The question of tolls on the St. Lawrence is tied in closely with that of tolls on the inland waterways. My opinion that such is the case is borne out by the following quotation from page 31, part VII "the St. Lawrence seaway" prepared for the Commerce Department by N. R. Daniellian, director of the St. Lawrence seaway:

"Tolls cannot be charged on the St. Lawrence without studying the effects of this practice upon the Ohio and the Mississippi River systems and the New York State barge canal."

As you know, representatives of the Corps of Engineers have repeatedly testified in appearances before congressional committees that the construction of the proposed seaway is feasible and sound from an engineering and economic standpoint. I gave that as my opinion last year and after a review of the project, on the basis of present-day high construction costs, I would, if called upon, make the same statement now.

I consider the St. Lawrence seaway project to be similar to projects which are proposed from time to time and on which the Corps of Engineers is directed by Congress to make a report. I am not in favor of charging tolls thereon as indicated by the reasons given in the foregoing paragraphs. You may be assured, however, that the Corps of Engineers now, as always, desires to carry out to the best of its ability the directives of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,  
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

JUNE 2, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to congratulate you for the splendid statement which you made before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the St. Lawrence resolution. It is a great contribution to the public understanding of the place of the St. Lawrence sea-

ways and power project in the Government's plan for continental industrial mobilization.

Your expressed support, following Canadian consent of the principle of charging tolls in order to meet the costs of this project, will improve our chances of securing congressional approval immeasurably. It is the view of Senator VANDENBERG and the other 15 sponsors of this legislation, as well as many other Senators, that putting this project on a self-liquidating basis will make it possible to secure congressional approval of the Canadian-American agreement. In fact, many of us feel that in this period of retrenchment in governmental expenditures, it is the only way in which the project has a chance of passage. The choice, therefore, is not whether we shall secure the seaway with or without tolls; a choice that may be before us is whether we shall secure the consent of Congress to the approval of the St. Lawrence project with toll provisions in it or not have the project at all. You have shown great statesmanship in appreciating this situation. Since the project is so important to the national defense factors involved, it is no detriment to have tolls for meeting the costs of the seaway.

I am concerned about the feeling that seems to exist in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, that they would oppose the charging of tolls on the seaway. This attitude in the present state of congressional opinion is equivalent to taking the position that they would just as soon see the project not approved. Such a result will be utterly inconsistent with the position taken by the administration that this project is important to national defense.

I believe that the Corps of Engineers' position is based upon a misunderstanding of the applicable laws governing traffic on the St. Lawrence River, which is an international stream. I have received the enclosed letter from Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, which bases their opposition upon the laws governing our domestic rivers and harbors. I have been under the impression that the St. Lawrence River is governed by international conventions and not by our domestic laws and policies.

Would you be kind enough to have the Department of State explore this question of the legal and international status of the St. Lawrence River? I would appreciate having a memorandum on this subject, but even more important, it would seem imperative that various departments of the Government have a clear and consistent understanding of the applicable laws and conventions concerning the control and regulations of the St. Lawrence River. If I am correct that this stream is subject to international agreements and treaties, then the question of tolls and policies with regard to it is wholly within the jurisdiction of the President and the State Department, as well as the Canadian Government, in which case it would not seem to be consistent for the executive agencies not concerned with international relations to take a position contrary to the expressed views of the Secretary of State and the Department of State.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, June 12, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Thank you for your kind letter of June 2, 1947, concerning my statement on May 28 in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project before the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. I appreciate having had the opportunity to testify in behalf of the project, and I am happy to know that you found my statement useful.

With regard to the principle of making the seaway self-liquidating by means of tolls on shipping, I feel as you do that the choice is

not whether we shall secure the seaway with or without tolls but whether we shall secure it with tolls or not at all. It is partly for this reason, that, as I said in my statement, the Department of State supports the principle of self-liquidation. I added, as you may recall, that as this is a time of necessary financial retrenchment for the Government of the United States it seemed to us in the Department that there is good reason for having the cost of the seaway construction paid over the years by the traffic using the new facilities. Incidentally, I pointed out that tolls would not be levied on traffic using the existing 14-foot canals on the Canadian side nor on navigation within the Great Lakes system nor on vessels traversing the Soo lock and connecting channels.

With your letter of June 2 you enclosed a copy of a letter addressed to you on May 9, 1947, by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the Army engineers, who argues that "Congress has in the past defined as its policy that waterways should be toll free" as shown by section 6 of the act of March 3, 1909 (33 U. S. C. 5), which reads, in part, as follows:

"That no toll or operating charges whatever shall be levied upon or collected from any vessel, dredge, or other water craft for passing through any lock, canal, canalized river, or other work for the use and benefit of navigation, now belonging to the United States or that may be hereafter acquired or constructed."

While I fully recognize the measure of responsibility borne by the Army engineers with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and while I have every respect for General Wheeler's professional competence and judgment, I am unable to agree that the above-quoted section of the act of March 3, 1909, would stand in the way of the proposal to charge tolls on shipping using the St. Lawrence seaway. My reasons are as follows:

1. Section 6 of the act of March 3, 1909, is a law of the United States relating to inland waterways "belonging to the United States or that may be hereafter acquired or constructed." The last clauses clearly also refer to acquisition or construction by the United States of inland waterways. It is not considered to be applicable to the St. Lawrence seaway, which is an international waterway. Navigation on the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, diversion of these waters, and other problems relating to them are not regulated exclusively by the United States legislation, as in the case of inland waterways, but are the subject of international treaties and agreements with Canada.

2. The convention between the United States and Great Britain concerning "boundary waters between the United States of America and Canada," ratifications of which were exchanged on May 5, 1910, expressly provides in article I as follows:

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries."

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting

parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof." (36 Stat. 2448—brackets supplied.)

This convention, as the supreme law of the land, expressly permits such tolls as are proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 111. Similar provisions are contained in treaties respecting the Panama Canal, on which tolls are charged. (Hackworth, Digest of International Law, vol. II, pp. 772-774.)

For the foregoing reasons the Department of State considers that the inclusion in Senate Joint Resolution 111 of the provisions relating to the charging of tolls on the St. Lawrence are constitutional, are in conformity with treaty obligations of the United States, and are not inconsistent with the statutes of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Jersey proposes to do is to turn this study over to the enemies of those who would put the seaway through on a self-liquidating basis, and I am absolutely opposed to that. I trust the Department of Commerce to make a better survey of the situation than will the Army engineers. It is not the business of the Army engineers to run the economy of the country anyway. It is their business to build dams, locks, levees, and canals. They are not to decide whether the automobile business will pay better with the canal or without the canal, or whether grain will bring a better price to the western farmer with or without the canal. It is their business to build it as they are told, in the event the Congress approves it. What the Senator from New Jersey proposes to do is to turn the project over to the hands of its enemies.

Mr. SMITH. I made the suggestion that the matter be studied further. I do not care how we obtain the figures. I believe we should get them from every source we can.

Mr. AIKEN. We have already obtained them from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SMITH. I am not satisfied with the figures heretofore obtained. The very confusion which is raised by the Senator's question showing the difference of opinion which exists between the Army engineers and the Department of Commerce gives an additional reason why the joint resolution should be re-committed so we may see whether we can secure an agreement. I cannot make anything out of the record as it has heretofore been made.

Mr. AIKEN. If we cannot trust the Department of Commerce, why not abolish the Department?

Mr. SMITH. Then we might also abolish the Army engineers.

Mr. AIKEN. Why spend \$250,000,000 a year—whatever the amount may be which is appropriated for the operation of the Department of Commerce—if we do not trust it? Why not abolish it if we do not care to accept any of the figures it sends to us?

Mr. SMITH. The difference of opinion which exists is such that I think the committee should further explore the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; there is a difference of opinion between the Department of



Commerce and the Army engineers. The Department of Commerce says, "Charge tolls and let the project pay for itself, because it will do so." The Secretary of State says it would be perfectly legitimate to charge tolls on the St. Lawrence seaway without affecting any other inland waterways. The Army engineers are opposed to charging tolls on anything, and they should not be the ones to make a study of this project. If anyone is against the project he is against it anyway.

I shall not bother to refute any more of the technicalities which are raised in connection with the subject, Mr. President, because as quickly as we refute one point the opponents of the project have another one which they bring out from their pocket. If any one is against it, let us all stand up in man fashion and vote for or against the project.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy which has taken place with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway, and I must say that I reach very much the same conclusion that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] does, that if we should propose to deepen this waterway to 35 or 40 feet, and should bring in all the reports that could be assembled proving that it would be self-liquidating, the opposition would still be present. The opposition of the railroads was originally based on the idea that in building the St. Lawrence development the Government was subsidizing a competing means of transportation. I do not know why the railroads should raise the objection that the project would be subsidized, inasmuch as a good many of the railroads have also been heavily subsidized. The attempt to make the project self-liquidating by charging tolls has not changed the position taken by the railroads against it. Despite what qualified engineers have said upon the subject, it will not be known whether the charging of tolls will result in liquidating the project until a beginning is made in charging tolls, but if tolls are charged it will at least have the result of lowering the burden upon the American taxpayers, and the taxpayer will be much better off than if no tolls are charged.

Mr. President, a considerable effort has been made by Senators from the East Coast to persuade this body against the essential merits of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, by the use of arguments predicated entirely upon national issues. But one of the real issues is the fear that eastern railroads and ports might be affected by the more economical water route over the St. Lawrence.

I should like to direct attention to the real fundamentals of this proposition and to the hopes and fears of man that are aroused by real and imaginary dangers.

The real issue is and always has been this: The St. Lawrence project will provide cheap power and low-cost water transportation. This fact raises two questions: First, does the country in the next 10 to 20 years need this low-cost power and transportation? and, second,

Will this project hurt any other segment of our economy?

It is the position of the proponents that the Northeast needs the power and that the Middle West needs the low-cost transportation—additional transportation, I might say. It is their further contention that since the beneficial effects of this project will affect such a large part of our country, its people, and industry, the national effect will be beneficial.

The opponents, if not on the floor of the Senate, but certainly outside, claim that the low-cost water transportation will take business away from established agencies in the East and the South.

My friend the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been candid about this fear concerning the port of Baltimore. Off the floor of the Senate, others have also recognized this fear to be the real issue. I call attention, Mr. President, to page 97 of last year's hearings on the resolution where the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] recognized that the motivating force of the opposition was "to mitigate the effect of this thing—the St. Lawrence seaway—on their homes, their lives, and their economy." The year before the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] appeared before the Senate committee to express concern about the effect of this project on the port of Boston and the New England railroads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a part of the testimony given at that time by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, 1946. HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 104

All we want in Massachusetts is to go ahead and to compete without obstacles being placed in our way by the Government. \* \* \* We do not want to have things happen to make it harder for us in Massachusetts and New England to continue as an industrial area. I mention that because that is the over-all problem. \* \* \*

We tried, when I was in that office (Governor) to stimulate the port of Boston. Under Governor Tobin last year a bill was put through the legislature and we are doing everything we can to stimulate the port of Boston. \* \* \* Then we have our railroads. The Boston & Maine Railroad has its headquarters in Boston. It does not go any further south to any other port, like New York. It is dependent on the port of Maine and on the port of Boston for all the goods it will bring from other sections of the country to the coast.

The Boston & Albany Railroad is a subsidiary of the New York Central. We have had very considerable arguments at various times as to whether the New York Central was not favoring New York City at the expense of Boston. In recent years, in broad general terms, I believe that the New York Central has been very much more concerned with the port of Boston and with New England, and has brought more freight down into our section than into the city of New York.

Our third railroad is the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, which is still in bankruptcy but whose business, of course, has enormously increased during the war-times. It perhaps will not be so much affected by the St. Lawrence waterway as will be the Boston & Maine and the New York Central through its subsidiary, the Boston & Albany.

Those considerations mean jobs, the jobs of the stevedores in the port of Boston, of the railroad men on those two or three railroads, and what we want to do is keep up those services, improve them as much as we can, because we are so dependent in that northeastern section on transportation. \* \* \*

On the matter of cost. \* \* \* A substantial amount \* \* \* is going to be paid for by New England, and this proposition is going to do nothing but hurt New England. \* \* \* You are asking New England to pay a substantial amount for this improvement, which other people will argue to you on technicalities is beneficial to the country as a whole, and it will have directly the opposite effect, as I see it, on Massachusetts and New England. \* \* \* We are dependent on transportation, and this will have the effect of interfering with our port of Boston, interfering with our railroads to a certain degree, perhaps making our airfields less desirable because of the smaller numbers of possible passengers, and at the same time losing the jobs that go with these various industries.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I mention this because it is the real issue. It is not local to Boston, but is generally raised in all the eastern and southern ports and the media of transportation in between. The senior Senator of Massachusetts has rendered a real service in defining it so simply and eloquently.

Let us, then, confront the two main issues and analyze them to see whether there is some common meeting ground.

First, as to the need for power. This seems to require no proof at present, since no opponent of the project has raised it. That the country needs and can use more power, in fact, all kinds of energy, is impressed upon us in our daily experience. The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has given specific proof that the Northeast is suffering from power shortage. It is also true that this condition is not recent, but has existed ever since 1942-43, when the War Production Board had to place an informal embargo on the expansion of new war plants in the New York area because of power shortage.

The reason is that we have all underestimated the energy needs of our expanding economy. In 1938 the total consumption of power in the United States was 140,000,000,000 kilowatt hours. In 1945 it reached 233,000,000,000 kilowatt hours. During the war there was a prevailing opinion that there would be a recession in power consumption when war plants are shut down. This prediction was utterly erroneous. What do we find now? In 1947 power consumption reached 300,000,000,000 kilowatt hours, 25 percent over the wartime peak. The generating facilities in the country are strained to the utmost and there is no adequate reserve capacity in case of a major break-down, sabotage, or coal strike. If one or two large generating units should go out of commission for any reason in New York, Boston, Buffalo,

or Detroit, it would result in a serious dislocation of the whole economy. The same situation exists in Canada.

To permit a major area of our country to get into this tight fix does not do credit to the foresight of either Government or private management. This project, which will create enough electricity to surpass the total output of the whole of TVA in 1945, has been before Congress in 1934, 1941, and 1944. Those who always find reasons to stop its construction must bear some of the responsibility for the present energy shortage.

I am quite aware that there are those who say, "Let us build the project only for power and drop the seaway." That is like advocating an operation to separate Siamese twins and expecting either one to survive. Let me make this quite clear: In spite of the desire of the State of New York to construct this project as a source of power for their very own, they will never achieve it, and the people of New York will be misled if they entertain the illusion that they can have their cake and eat it, too. I had thought that it was well established in national policy that river basins would be developed to extract the fullest benefit, and that where a river lends itself to multiple uses we should have multiple-purpose projects. This is the policy adopted in the West. We try to develop each project for navigation, power, irrigation, and any number of other uses to which the river is adaptable. At Bonneville the Army engineers built a huge lock for navigation, though the present commerce would not justify it. It was an investment in the future of the region. At Grand Coulee, 5 of the 18 generators, with a capacity of 540,000 kilowatts, over 25 percent of the potential power in that gigantic development, are set aside for irrigation of 1,000,000 acres of desert land, and this phase of the project may not be completed for 50 years.

Why, then, when we come to the St. Lawrence, do we hear the odd suggestion that this greatest navigation project of them all, giving access to the seas for half of the continent, should be forever blocked because the ports of Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans do not like it? Is that adequate reason to throw overboard established national policy in river-basin developments, to ignore the best scientific advice of a long and illustrious line of engineers, to thwart the hopes and ambitions of half the people of Canada and the United States?

I say that the suggestion to separate power from navigation violates the established policies of this Government for multiple-purpose development of our rivers. It also violates the constitutional authority of the Congress, for it is well established in the Constitution that the authority of the Congress to authorize the construction of power projects derives from its constitutional power to regulate commerce over navigable rivers. The power projects are only byproducts of navigation.

The suggestion to separate power from navigation violates the solemn commitment of this country to Canada in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which established the policy that in the devel-

opment of boundary waters navigation should have priority over power—article IV.

Even if it were a practical suggestion, which I do not think it is, it would be an economic and financial folly to develop the St. Lawrence River for power alone. The people of New York should be told that the cost of the power project would be about \$100,000,000 more if the development were confined to power alone than if it were developed as a dual-purpose project. As proposed in this resolution, the users of navigation would pay part of those costs through tolls. As a single-purpose project, the customers of power must pay all the costs.

Finally, let me present a practical reason why those advocating separation of power and navigation are misleading the public on the east coast. The Congress, the President, the State Department, and the Canadian Government would never agree to a proposition to build the power project alone. No President, no Prime Minister, could hope to hold office long by selling the whole mid-continent of America down the St. Lawrence River for the sake of pleasing a few isolated interests in New York and Boston.

Mr. President, the country is suffering not only from an energy shortage, but it is laboring also under a transportation shortage. Our railroads have less rolling stock and motive power now than they had in 1920. They are called upon to carry enormously increased loads. They have done well, within the limitations of their capacity. But it has not been entirely adequate. Witness the fact that each year during the peak of the harvest season they are unable to supply the transportation services expected of them.

It is supposedly the established policy of this country to develop each transportation medium to its fullest. That is the expression of policy in the Transportation Act of 1940. It does not help the transportation system of the country at all to insist that every type of cargo must use the rails. There are many types of cargo, such as grains, coal, petroleum, iron ore, bauxite, and many others, for which rail transportation is too expensive; and it is an added burden to the rails and to the consumers to insist that such traffic must use the rails. The St. Lawrence seaway is best suited to meet the needs of the Middle West in carrying such cargoes, and thereby to free rail equipment during the peak traffic months of the late summer and fall so that no man who has grain or coal to ship overland will be without facilities.

Mr. President, to insist that the eastern roads and eastern ports should retain a monopoly on the business of the Middle West is "featherbedding" on a national scale, for it means doing our work in a more expensive and laborious way. We cannot increase our total national output of goods and services if we give legislative sanction to a policy of doing the Nation's business in roundabout and expensive ways. Let me cite some examples. It is 5,200 miles from Omaha to Liverpool. It is 5,300 miles from New Orleans to Liverpool. Between Omaha and New Orleans there is an

added distance of 1,500 miles. It has been said here that Nebraska should ship her grain down to New Orleans and thence to Liverpool, a distance of 6,800 miles, as against 5,200 miles via Chicago and the Great Lakes. Mr. President, all the labor that goes into carrying that wheat 1,500 miles over land and river is wasted, and reduces the national productivity. It is "made work." It is "featherbedding."

Another example: During the war, we built ships on the west coast, on the Gulf, and east coasts. To build those ships we had to carry the steel and the machinery from the Middle West by rail, using equipment, manpower, and fuel, which in turn had to be extracted and transported by additional manpower. We had to build new communities, schools, and housing. We had to send skilled labor many hundreds of miles from their homes. This all added to the cost of our shipbuilding program.

The few large ships and submarines that were built on the Great Lakes had to be floated down the Chicago Canal and the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers on pontoons, again at added expense. All this was paid for by the taxpayers, because we refused in 1934 to start this project. Again, Mr. President, we indulged in a made-work program in the midst of war, because we had not had the forethought to do the rational thing. Every taxpayer in every part of the country paid his share of the cost of that kind of featherbedding.

We could multiply this many times, Mr. President. John L. Lewis' opposition to this project is simply an opposition to the use of waterpower, for the seaway can never be a threat to our efficient coal mining. Lewis' opposition to waterpower is also a featherbedding program. He, in effect, says to the St. Lawrence River, "I don't want you to do man's work, because I want to keep the miners underground digging coal." In what way could this country be hurt, Mr. President, if we made it possible for the sons of these miners to take jobs on ships plying the St. Lawrence, or at the controls as operating engineers of waterpower stations?

Mr. President, I stated at the beginning that the only two valid questions in connection with the pending resolution are: Do we need the power and navigation, and will it hurt existing ports and transportation facilities?

The answer to the first part is definitely affirmative. No one, in fact, has seriously denied the need for waterpower and low-cost water transportation. No one can, in the light of our daily experiences.

The second part of this proposition, the effect on ports and railroads, is the more debatable.

If the St. Lawrence seaway were opened with the beginning of navigation in April 1948, I would say, in all candor, that some traffic that now goes via New Orleans, Baltimore, or New York would be diverted. In fact, some of these ports—such as New York—are now so congested that traffic is looking around for alternative outlets. With considerable relief to the shippers in the Middle West, and to



the recipients of our aid abroad, ships would go directly into the Great Lakes to pick up their cargo. We are not dealing entirely with commensurable elements, and it is difficult to say whether that would be a good thing for this and other countries. It is certain that the prospect of speeding up shipments and deliveries through the St. Lawrence would be greeted with a sigh of relief in many parts of the world, even if it is not so greeted in the eastern and southern ports.

The fact is, however, that there would be no immediate diversion. Immediate diversion is not the proposition before us. What we are considering is a new route of transportation that cannot be opened before 1955, at the earliest, and which will not be fully utilized perhaps until 1965.

What will be the effect of the seaway upon our ports and the trunk-line railroads by that time? That is the question. Those who arouse the fears of unsuspecting citizens that their jobs are immediately at stake do not serve the cause of public enlightenment.

Mr. President, it is difficult to predict that far in advance the economic situation of the United States; but there are some fundamental trends that can be anticipated, barring a catastrophic war in the meantime. First, our population will have increased by fifteen or twenty million.

Second, productivity per man-hour, which has been increasing at the rate of 2 percent a year by the use of electrically motivated mechanical devices, will also have increased, probably by an additional third over what it is now. This is the estimate of the Twentieth Century Fund, in its study, *America's Needs and Resources*, page 24. The same study also estimates that our total national production in 1960 will be two-thirds again as much as in 1940, page 23.

So, Mr. President, I submit that it is for an older, larger, and more productive America that this project is designed to help with supplies of low-cost power and water transportation. Under those conditions, there is not a person in the Senate or elsewhere who can say that the livelihood of any presently living citizen will be adversely affected.

There is another aspect of this proposal that diminishes the danger of diversion of traffic. Before the two Governments accepted the principle of charging tolls on the seaway, it was said that this project would create competitive transportation facilities subsidized by taxpayers. The fact that navigation facilities on all other waterways and ports are subsidized did not diminish the vehemence of the protest against the St. Lawrence seaway. Taking this criticism in good faith, the proponents went to work to eliminate this source of criticism, by accepting the principle of tolls to make the seaway self-liquidating.

I shall not dwell here on the legality of charging tolls on this waterway. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has already adequately covered that point. He has proved, first, that this is an international waterway, partly located in the United States, partly in Canada, and that the ships of all na-

tions will use it on a basis of equality; secondly, that article I of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 sanctions tolls, and that Canada has already expressed its willingness to accede to the principle of self-liquidation; third, that the agreement does not come into force until the Canadian Government agrees to tolls; and, finally, that in case we fail to agree, under the Boundary Waters Treaty there is sanction for us to charge tolls at the International Rapids section, where the canals will be on United States soil. This gives us a leverage; but as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] explained, there will be no necessity to use this leverage, because Canadian interest is identical with United States interest in making self-liquidation succeed.

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to put into the RECORD the views expressed by a large number of American citizens and organizations endorsing the principle of making the seaway self-liquidating.

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

OPINIONS OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION ON THE SELF-LIQUIDATING ASPECTS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

IN FAVOR OF SELF-LIQUIDATION

John C. Beukema, secretary, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Michigan, Muskegon, Mich. No statement submitted. Communicated his views directly to Senator VANDENBERG.

Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, secretary, Great Lakes Harbors Association, Milwaukee, Wis. Recorded as consenting to self-liquidation in a communication directly to Senator VANDENBERG.

Manfred Burleigh, president, American Buslines, Detroit, Mich.: "This project, in my opinion, need not be entirely self-liquidating. If it is 50 percent liquidating, the project is well worth while in the public interest." (February 11, 1947.)

E. B. Crosby, Northern Federation Chambers of Commerce, Messena, N. Y.: "I want to assure you that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the proposal to charge tolls on the St. Lawrence Waterway \* \* \* because I believe that it is economically sound and for the best interests of both countries." (February 18, 1947.)

Roy W. Gifford, vice president, Norge Division, Norge-Warner Corp., Detroit: "I believe, in general, that any Government project is far more desirable if it can liquidate itself over a period of years. I appreciate, of course, this would not be the case in earlier years, but if it was the ultimate goal, it seems reasonable. Therefore, I see no reason why we shouldn't shoot toward this goal." (February 5, 1947.)

Daniel W. Hoan, president, Great Lakes Harbors Association, Milwaukee: "While attending the conference of mayors in Washington, Mr. Hoan organized a group of 14 mayors and 11 other officials of city government in the Lake States, who called upon Senator VANDENBERG on January 22, 1947, in the interest of St. Lawrence legislation and concurred in the principle of tolls."

Rollo F. Hunt, president, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota, Duluth: "Unqualifiedly approve insertion of self-liquidating provisions applicable to foreign commerce in agreement with Canada." (January 17, 1947.)

Perry W. Jenkins, Wyoming director, National Reclamation Association, president, Colorado River Water Users Association, Salt Lake City, Utah: "I agree \* \* \* that the measure, providing for the construction of

the St. Lawrence seaway, should carry a provision for the self-liquidation of the project. The term of amortization can only be determined from the estimated tolls collected on foreign carriage through the canals. Of course this provision will have to be concurred in by Canada.

"I do not advocate or support any improvements on the Colorado River, of a commercial nature, that are not self-supporting and self-liquidating. The Congress should not hesitate to support national loans, at a reasonable rate of interest, for the construction of an interstate project that is too general or too large for private capital to handle. \* \* \* I shall be glad to help in any way when the time comes for action." (February 18, 1947.)

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., former president, United States Chamber of Commerce: "I feel that it would be entirely satisfactory to have tolls charged on the St. Lawrence project in order to provide liquidation of the investment involved. I believe that self-liquidation of the project through tolls and power development would be the feasible method of construction of this great project." (February 6, 1947.)

D. S. Kiskadden, vice president and general manager, Buhl Land Co., Detroit: "I am writing to go on record that I favor the principle of self-liquidation through charging tolls if that will result in getting this project under way. If we are consistent with the current demand for economy and a lower budget, we should agree with Senator VANDENBERG on the question of making this project as nearly self-liquidating as possible." (March 17, 1947.)

Henry La Liberte, president, Outler-Magner Co., Duluth: "Has expressed himself personally to Mr. Julius H. Barnes that he favors the principle of self-liquidation for the St. Lawrence project."

William Loeb, publisher, Manchester Union-Leader, Manchester, N. H.; Burlington Daily News, Burlington, Vt.: "The idea of having the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating is an excellent one, and I can see that with that clause in it should pass, since this removes any objection that the shipping people are getting a free ride at the taxpayers' expense." (February 20, 1947.)

Col. Charles H. Maltby, vice president, Lincoln National Bank & Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y.: "I should like to state that I am in sympathy with this proposal to make the waterway self-liquidating, providing a suitable arrangement can be worked out for both Canada and the United States. As to the present nonuse of tolls on existing Canadian canals, I fail to see where that need have any bearing on this discussion, as the proposed tolls would affect only those canals jointly owned. The Panama Canal toll system has proved successful and workable as a self-liquidating waterway project. Certainly the application of tolls on St. Lawrence seaway foreign traffic should eliminate the opposition's major objection to the project's construction. The principle of self-liquidation, properly organized, of this subject, certainly greatly strengthens the case for the early passage of the St. Lawrence River project legislation." (March 3, 1947.)

Seth Marshall, president, Marshall-Wells Co., Duluth, Minn.: "As to making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating by adequate charges on traffic, would advise that as far as I know there would be no objection to this in Duluth." (February 24, 1947.)

Julius Meltzer, Springfield, Mass.: "I believe that a toll charge should be made on all ships carrying freight except those of American and Canadian ownership. The details concerning the charges on cargoes should be left with the officials representing both Canada and the United States, and since both nations would benefit by the St. Lawrence seaway they would very readily arrive at a fair decision."

"The period of liquidation should extend for not less than 50 years and possibly longer and the interest rate on the bonds, if possible, should not exceed 2½ percent. I am in favor of a self-liquidation program on the St. Lawrence seaway and would like to be recorded accordingly.

"Development of the St. Lawrence as a seaway would directly affect New England because the water power would develop low-cost electricity, which would be used by many industries in New England, and this would have a direct effect upon stabilizing business. Many firms who in the past have moved to other areas because of low-cost power would remain in New England, and much of the raw materials needed in this area for production could be left at the ports of Boston and Providence." (February 18, 1947.)

Hon. Charles Poletti, former Lieutenant Governor and Governor of New York State: "I certainly would be in favor of accepting the principle of self-liquidation for the seaway. Here's hoping that it will be possible to pass legislation for a self-liquidating project." (February 17, 1947.)

F. A. Seiberling, chairman of board, Seiberling Rubber Co., Akron: "You may record our company as very much in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project and we think it is entirely practicable to put it upon a self-liquidating basis through adequate charges on traffic." (February 18, 1947.)

Hon. George F. Shafer, attorney, Bismarck, N. Dak., former Governor of North Dakota: "I am glad the idea of self-liquidation is being favorably considered by the sponsors of the proposed enabling legislation, because I have long favored it as a sound principle of public policy. The principle of self-liquidation has always seemed to me to be correct in connection with the Government construction and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric power projects. In view of the large expenditures which will be necessary in order to service the national debt and to provide for the national defense for a long time to come, I think it is wise for the Government to develop its waterway improvements wherever feasible upon a self-liquidating basis.

"Furthermore the adoption of the principle of self-liquidation for navigation, as well as power projects, should tend to meet the objections of those who are opposing this project on the ground that the benefits to be derived therefrom will be regional rather than national in extent, although I have always felt that this project, like the Panama Canal, should be regarded as essentially a project of continental rather than of local importance. Hence you may quote me as being wholeheartedly in favor of incorporating the principle of self-liquidation in the enabling legislation to be submitted to this Congress for its approval in connection with the advancement of the St. Lawrence seaway development." (February 18, 1947.)

Sidney A. Smith, president, Anchor Storage Co., Chicago, Ill.: "Re the matter of tolls on foreign commerce on the St. Lawrence. I can see no reason why this should not be done, particularly since this practice is in force on most of the other international canals, including the Panama Canal. Certainly we do not want any special favors, although I do think we should make certain that the conditions which will be imposed will not be less favorable. For this reason the divisions between navigation and power should be carefully scrutinized and proper allocations made. It seems to me that, in view of the importance of this project from the standpoint of national defense, at least some portion of the cost might very properly be allocated accordingly. My own view is that, if it is found that tolls are necessary, by all means let us impose them, but let us get on with the job of building the seaway." (February 17, 1947.)

J. David Stern, publisher, Philadelphia Record: "I agree with Senator VANDENBERG that the St. Lawrence project should be self-

liquidating. I think self-liquidation is not only politically expedient but the only proper course as a matter of principle." (March 5, 1947.)

W. A. Stinchcomb, director secretary, Cleveland Metropolitan Park District, Cleveland, Ohio: "I have always considered the seaway as being highly justified on an economic basis. As a national policy I can see nothing wrong in the imposition of tolls, providing agreement is reached with Canada and the rates fixed are reasonable.

"The construction of the seaway will confer a special benefit on the shipping using it, and there is no reason why that business should not carry its portion of the cost of amortizing the investment in that part of the improvement properly chargeable to its use and also its share of operational costs.

"In fixing rates, however, it must be borne in mind that the normal flow of this commerce will not soon be reached; that to reach that normal, changes not only must be made in harbors, docks, and warehouse facilities along the Great Lakes, but foreign trade routes and customs will change and develop themselves to adjust to this improvement; this will take time. Fixing fair and reasonable tolls will invalidate claims of inequity by those interested in other forms or methods of transportation. I, therefore, have no objection to the establishment of equitable charges against the shipping using this seaway, if the conditions herein suggested are satisfied." (February 18, 1947.)

Hon. Murray D. Van Wagoner, former Governor of Michigan, consulting engineer, Detroit: "I am still very much interested in the St. Lawrence seaway. Self-liquidation of this project meets with my hearty approval, and I feel that this proposal may have a favorable effect on its acceptance by a greater number of interested groups. The question of tolls for foreign commerce, I believe, would not be an objection, since the main benefits would, of course, first be realized in intercoastal commerce of the United States and Canada. Its construction would at once offer such advantages that foreign commerce could utilize the project." (February 5, 1947.)

O. S. Warden, publisher, Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont.: "I do not think there has ever been collected any consensus of opinion in Montana upon the subject of self-liquidation. There is no question but that the majority of our people are in favor of the seaway and always have been. It would seem that those who have been handling the legislative enterprise in Washington are qualified to decide what would be best to ask for in the way of attitude on the part of Congress. The inland States have always been pretty much of a unit in the opinion that this waterway, reaching into the center of the Nation, would in the long run be a country-wide blessing. Therefore, I think the National St. Lawrence Association should pass upon this plan of self-liquidation, and I am sure that the conclusion would be better than anything that could be collected in a miscellaneous way.

"I believe in the national economy. The St. Lawrence seaway, if built, will work itself out into a distinct national advantage in all the years to come." (February 24, 1947.)

James B. Webber, Jr., vice president, the J. L. Hudson Co., Detroit: "It seems to me that it would be desirable to present the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway as a self-liquidating project, in view of our present economy-minded Congress. The main thing is to get the job done without further delay." (February 6, 1947.)

Joseph Winterbotham, president, Champlain Valley Council, Burlington, Vt.: "I wish to record my hearty endorsement of the self-liquidation features of the St. Lawrence project, and, as a director of the National St. Lawrence Association, will lend all my efforts to bring about the results. As a suggestion, may I ask consideration of increasing the

time of amortization from 50 to 70 years." (February 23, 1947.)

Mrs. Louise Wright, director, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Ill.: "I see no objection to making the St. Lawrence project a self-liquidating one if this is agreeable to those who are carrying on the negotiations for Canada and the United States. If it would expedite the fulfillment of this project, I would be glad to accept the principle of self-liquidation for the seaway." (March 6, 1947.)

Fred Young, president, Young Radiator Co., Racine, Wis.: "After careful discussion on the matter of self-liquidation for the seaway \* \* \* the same as we have on the Panama Canal \* \* \* I believe that this very definitely should become a self-supporting and self-liquidating proposition. I submit this to you with the deep feeling that this matter should come before our Congress for passage soon." (March 12, 1947.)

#### OPPOSED TO SELF-LIQUIDATION

Harold B. Johnson, publisher, Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N. Y.: "I feel it would be a grave mistake to incorporate such a provision (self-liquidation) in the new seaway bill. I feel that it would alienate, rather than foster, support of the project. \* \* \* The system of canals connecting the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, itself, have traditionally been free of tolls. Senator VANDENBERG, himself, emphasized this point at one of the meetings of foreign ministers in London. I feel any attempt to depart from this traditional policy would be a mistake. \* \* \* I hope that Senator VANDENBERG will decide to sponsor a bill similar to that introduced and reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate last year." (February 23, 1947.)

Edward J. Noble, chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co., Inc., 30 Rockefeller Center, New York, N. Y.: "I feel it would be a mistake to incorporate in the seaway measure soon to be introduced in the Senate the principle of self-liquidation. For one reason, it is contrary to the whole tradition of St. Lawrence navigation. Tolls have never been charged and the river has always been free to the navigation of all nations as Senator VANDENBERG, himself, set forth at a recent conference of foreign ministers in London. \* \* \* I would prefer a St. Lawrence seaway bill similar to that introduced in the last Congress and which was favorably reported by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate. As you well know, this bill contained a provision authorizing a study of this matter of tolls by an impartial body. The first thing, it seems to me, is to get authorization to construct the seaway. Then, if sometime in the future, it seemed advisable to work out a system of tolls, that could be done. I repeat, however, that in my judgment the seaway project would lose rather than gain support if provision for making the project self-liquidating were contained in the bill itself." (March 18, 1947.)

#### OPINIONS OF OTHER SUPPORTERS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT ON THE QUESTION OF SELF-LIQUIDATION

##### IN FAVOR OF SELF-LIQUIDATION

American Farm Bureau Federation, J. Don Parel, Washington, D. C.: "You are acquainted with the position of the American Farm Bureau concerning the St. Lawrence agreement with Canada. As to the question of making the project self-liquidating, the federation has no position. It is planned, however, that this problem be placed on the agenda for consultation by our board of directors at our next quarterly meeting." (February 11, 1947.)

Donald Kirkpatrick, general counsel, Chicago, Ill.: "American Farm Bureau leans rather kindly to national association's idea of tolls for St. Lawrence Basin. Insist, however, more careful and intensive study be



made by AFBF staff before final action. Matter will be presented to board in June." (April 15, 1947.)

Americans for Democratic Action: Two hundred delegates of nine Midwest States assembled in Chicago, Ill., March 1, 1947, passed a resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway with self-liquidating provisions.

John D. Babbage, president, Rutland Railroad Co.: "I am decidedly in favor of the self-liquidation viewpoint in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project." (February 7, 1947.)

Hon. John L. Bohn, mayor of Milwaukee, Wis.: "I am in full accord with your letter and will be most happy to help it along. I sincerely hope that the seaway will gain some momentum by adopting this program of self-liquidation."

John Carson, director, Cooperative League of the United States of America, Washington: "Through our cooperative congress, and also through actions taken by our board of directors, the Cooperative League of the United States of America has pledged its approval of the plan to develop the St. Lawrence waterway. The league did not have before it any specific proposal. Therefore, it would not be possible for me to attempt to commit the league, or even to express an opinion for the league, as to the plan to make the St. Lawrence a self-liquidating project \* \* \*. I am glad to advise you that I, as an individual and as the director of the Washington office of the league, shall report that I would hope that the league would approve of the amended project. I shall be happy to assist in this work as an individual." (February 4, 1947.)

Albert G. Clifton, legislative agent, Massachusetts State CIO, Boston, Mass.: "I feel so strongly that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be undertaken that I believe if measures to provide self-liquidation are necessary to pass the enabling legislation, that such a project should be sponsored and incorporated therein. This, of course, is my personal opinion, but I also believe it reflects the views of our State officers and as soon as they have acted on the matter, I will acquaint you with their actions." (February 5, 1947.)

A. A. Couch, president and legislative representative, Iowa State Federation of Labor, Des Moines: "I have discussed the question of self-liquidation of the St. Lawrence seaway with members of our board, and they are of the unanimous opinion that our federation would support and feel very strongly for a program of self-liquidation of this great national improvement." (February 14, 1947.)

John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America: "The Textile Workers Union of America would certainly support any practical proposal to set up the power and navigation features of the St. Lawrence project on a self-liquidating basis. Although we did not stress this particular point in our testimony on behalf of legislation needed to launch this essential undertaking, we had assumed that the contemplated power plants and navigation works would prove to be self-liquidating in practice. It is our conviction that the project is urgently required from many standpoints. The fact that it could be planned as a self-liquidating undertaking merely adds a particularly compelling argument to those already advanced for congressional action launching this great project." (February 20, 1947.)

Hon. Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington: "I am authorized to state that since this organization is interested primarily in the harnessing of the low-cost power potential of the St. Lawrence River at the earliest time possible, our support of the project will remain strong and unchanged by any attempt to make the seaway

phase of the development self-liquidating." (January 27, 1947.)

Hon. Leif Erickson, former member, Supreme Court of Montana; attorney, Helena, Mont.: "Generally speaking, I am in favor of making most projects like the seaway self-liquidating. This project, however, so closely touches the welfare of the whole country that there is little justification for placing the burden of its cost upon the shippers and upon the users of power. On the other hand, we have the practical matter of securing its approval. With Congress in its present frame of mind it is going to be extremely difficult to get any public projects built, no matter how important they are for the national defense or for any other reason. If making the project self-liquidating would aid in securing its approval, it would seem that you have no alternative but to present it in that form." (February 10, 1947.)

John F. Fahey, chairman, Home Owners Loan Corporation: "I have always been in favor of the St. Lawrence project. My views as to its necessity and its advantage to the country and to the world are in accordance with your own. I have never had any doubt as to its fundamental importance. I do not know enough about the controversial aspects of tolls to be quite sure on this point, but it seems to me the plan is unobjectionable if it will help in solving the problem." (February 5, 1947.)

Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary, CIO Maritime Committee, Washington: "In regard to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, we support this principle, particularly if it will speed congressional approval of the project. We have long been staunch supporters of the project in the belief that not only would it provide employment for thousands of maritime workers and foster the development of an expanded merchant marine, but that it would expand the horizon of international commerce, aid in the maintenance of a prosperous American economy.

"It is our belief that the St. Lawrence can one day be an outstanding trade route rivaling the Panama and Suez Canals in tonnage. We are heartily in favor of any action which will speed congressional approval for the project and begin the building of the seaway." (February 19, 1947.)

Clarence F. Hall, president, Consul-Hall Co., Clayton, N. Y.: "I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the proposed plan to make the St. Lawrence project \* \* \* self-liquidating. It seems to me a good idea, and particularly so because our present Congress is trying to curtail expenditures. Further, I believe our chances of approval will be greatly enhanced on such a basis." (February 15, 1947.)

K. W. Hones, State president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Chippewa Falls, Wis.: "I certainly would be willing to approve anything that was within reason as a compromise to get the project completed. \* \* \* However, there is a lot of merit in charging a reasonable amount of toll for the construction and development of such a venture.

"If the power projects would be developed \* \* \* on the same basis as TVA, I am sure that the returns to the Government would go a long way to take care of the cost over a period of 50 years." (February 11, 1947.)

Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States: "I should think that the determination of the amount of the toll should be made by the two countries after construction and completion, otherwise they will have no idea of what the actual necessary amounts are." (January 29, 1947.)

Tom Ireland, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio: "I am sufficiently committed to the wisdom and necessity of securing early congressional approval for this undertaking so that if the toll project will in any manner facilitate an

early enactment I would certainly be disposed to go along with such proposal at this time." (February 10, 1947.)

Hon. Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of Detroit, Mich.: "I have no objection to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. It certainly would be better than having none at all." (January 22, 1947.)

Hon. George W. Johnson, mayor of Duluth, Minn.: "The proposal to charge tolls on foreign commerce meets with my approval and no doubt by making the project self-liquidating should meet with enthusiastic support in Congress. Since municipalities are requested to have a group of projects ready in the event of any employment let downs, I feel that Congress also should provide a group of postwar projects and that the St. Lawrence project should be No. 1. I am of the opinion that money now set up by Congress for postwar projects for the various subdivisions of the Government could be used by the War Department or some other agency, or even the State of New York, in developing the plans at the present time." (February 6, 1947.)

Hon. Edward J. Kelly, mayor of Chicago, Ill.: "It seems to me that the interests of national defense should be the controlling element in determining the immediate need for the St. Lawrence seaway. It undoubtedly would have paid for itself in the recent World War, if it had been built. I do not feel that I am in a position to advise in detail on the economics of the seaway. Of course, I have no objection to its being made self-liquidating, if that can be reasonably accomplished. However, the need for the seaway in national defense is more important than whether or not its entire cost may be recovered." (March 6, 1947.)

Gust Kragseth, mayor of Two Harbors, Minn.: "My people up here are very much interested in seeing this project approved. It would mean a good thing for the Midwest. I would approve the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. My support of the project would be just as strong if it is made self-liquidating." (February 15, 1947.)

Leo Lerner, president, Howard Y. Williams, former executive director, Independent Voters of Illinois, Chicago: "We both agree that the self-liquidating provision is possible and desirable. Over a period of 50 years, the project could be amortized and would constitute a real investment. You can count on us to support the project in this way to the limit." (March 4, 1947.)

Frank X. Martel, president, Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.: "If the influence of the obstructionists who have successfully blocked the passage of legislation to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is strong enough to continue to do it unless the project is made self-liquidating, then I firmly believe we ought to push it through on the latter basis. It is indeed most unfortunate that the selfish interests who have followed obstruction tactics have been successful in deluding the American people, or at least their representatives in Congress, with their false propaganda on this most worthy public improvement, one that would have been of inestimable value in the war effort, had it been completed prior to 1941." (February 27, 1947.)

John W. Miller, director, Central Cooperative Wholesale, Superior, Wis.: "We are not only personally interested in the St. Lawrence project but speak for approximately 60,000 cooperative families in this area, all of whom share in our interest. \* \* \* In the Cooperative Builder this week, there is a front-page article explaining how the St. Lawrence seaway project can be made to pay its own way in a matter of 50 years. This plan was clearly expressed by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, before a delegation of

Midwest mayors in Washington. It gives new hope to a project which, for too long, has been battered around by political-minded men and by those who do not want cheap power belonging to the people." (February 5, 1947.)

Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union, Washington: Expressed agreement in person, February 17, 1947, to N. R. Daniellian, vice president of the National St. Lawrence Association, on the principle of self-liquidation.

J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, National Grange: "We again affirm our wholehearted support to the completion of the St. Lawrence project and especially when it is put on a self-liquidating basis as is now proposed." (March 7, 1947.)

Dr. R. A. Newton, mayor of Massena, N. Y.: "I would be in favor of supporting any proposition that would result in the development and completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. For 25 years or more northern New York has been hoping that this project would get congressional approval. \* \* \* My personal opinion is that if the project is presented to Congress as a self-liquidating proposition, the objectionable feature of the cost of the project, which the opposition has misrepresented, could not be sustained any further as an argument against the development. \* \* \* In conclusion, I wish to positively state that I am fully in accord with your suggestion that the project be presented to Congress as self-liquidating." (February 7, 1947.)

Irving Richter, national legislative representative, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Washington: "We can see no objection whatsoever to charging vessels securing passage on the St. Lawrence seaway for the costs of the project. Of course, a good deal will depend upon the absolute amount of such charges on shippers." (February 12, 1947.)

Robert H. Smith, traffic commissioner, Duluth Chamber of Commerce, Duluth, Minn.: "For my own part, I can see no objection whatsoever to making the navigation phase of the St. Lawrence project self-liquidating. I think that step will remove in great part many of the arguments as to the project subsidizing water transportation to the detriment of rail transportation. Our chamber has taken no official action toward approving the self-liquidating feature, but \* \* \* I think you may take it as a foregone conclusion there will be no objection." (February 10, 1947.)

Hon. Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota: "I am entirely agreeable that the St. Lawrence seaway be taken up on a toll self-liquidating basis." (January 27, 1947.)

Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, Madison, Wis.: "As you probably know, our Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative has been strongly in support of the St. Lawrence deep-sea waterway \* \* \* whether or not I would approve making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, my answer is yes, certainly, if it can be done without creating too great a burden on the transportation industry and if such a policy would not indefinitely postpone action on the project. \* \* \*

Our organization will welcome the opportunity to support a program that can and will be self-liquidating. While I have not had a chance to place this proposition before our group, I am sure I can say without fear of contradiction that our organization will be even stronger in its support of the St. Lawrence deep-sea waterway under such a program than we would be if it were not self-liquidating." (February 6, 1947.)

E. A. Syftestad, general manager, Farmers Union Central Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.: "Resolution adopted February 20, 1947, at annual meeting of stockholders of FUCE: 'We again urge that every effort be put forth toward obtaining the approval of the Great

Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway by this session of the Congress. We urge that self-liquidation of this project be carefully studied as a means of financing so the people of the United States and Canada may utilize this important means of transportation as speedily as possible.'" (March 25, 1947.)

Hugh Thompson, regional director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Buffalo, N. Y.: "I have been checking up on the cost of tolls on canals and rivers throughout the world and find that some of them are very profitable and definitely are self-liquidating. I am not familiar enough to give an opinion as to the feasibility of this being done on the St. Lawrence seaway. However, I do want to assure you that I am for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project whether it be self-liquidating or otherwise and the sooner we proceed to develop this waterway and harness the tremendous power that can be developed from it the better it is going to be for America. Again I say I am heartily in accord with the proposed development \* \* \* whether it be self-liquidating or otherwise." (March 10, 1947.)

Frederic H. Umhey, executive secretary, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, New York, N. Y.: "While I have had no opportunity of getting the opinion of our board, which previously went on record in support of this project, I do not believe that the fact that this was made a self-liquidating project would in any way affect our previous decision to support the same." (February 6, 1947.)

Eugene I. Van Antwerp, councilman, city of Detroit: "My support of the St. Lawrence seaway project should be much stronger and more enthusiastic if the proposal is to have self-liquidating provisions. I can see no real objection to the assessing and collecting of tolls on foreign ships making use of such seaway." (February 18, 1947.)

#### OPPOSED TO SELF-LIQUIDATION

Elmer W. Cart, director, tax research and traffic, North Dakota division, Farmers Educational Cooperative Union, Jamestown, N. Dak.: "I cannot see any good reason why this project should be constructed on the basis of self-liquidation as far as the investment is concerned. The Congress has for many years appropriated money for development of rivers and harbors and also for maintenance, such as dredging after the facilities were built. Why should this particular project be treated differently?" (February 11, 1947.)

William T. Field, consulting engineer, Field, Emerson & Morgan, Inc., Watertown, N. Y.: "Generally, I would normally strongly support a move to make any project self-liquidating; however, in reference to the St. Lawrence project, I question whether at this time it would be wise or expedient to attempt to change the basis of procedure. \* \* \*

"Frankly, if I wanted to pose as being a supporter of the St. Lawrence project, but really desired to delay or defeat the project, I might be willing to offer to support such a change at this time. I may be wrong, but I gravely question the wisdom of making a change at this time." (February 7, 1947.)

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, these views, representing both farm and business interests in the Middle West, indicate that the people of this area are so anxious to have this waterway, and so convinced of its economic value, that they are willing to pay for it, through tolls on freight moving through the seaway. It is obvious that with tolls, the danger of subsidized competition is eliminated. One would have thought that this provision would have been greeted with joy by those who feared such competition. For a fleeting moment it appeared that success was at hand, for when Dr. Parmelee testified before the subcommittee of

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last June, he said:

Senate Joint Resolution 111, now before your committee for consideration, lays down a policy of self-liquidation for the St. Lawrence project. In this respect it is a distinct advance over any previous approach to the matter. The railroads have taken the position for many years that waterway improvements should be made self-liquidating, and have said that if that were done the railroads would not oppose any sound improvement project. There has been no change in their position (p. 197, Hearings on S. J. Res. 111).

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the hope that, in view of the self-liquidation feature, the railroads would withdraw their opposition to this project has not been realized. The eastern trunk lines and seaports have redoubled their opposition. One can come to no other conclusion than that they consider the seaway would be a success, even with tolls, and they are not willing to risk even fair competition.

Mr. President, it seems to me that many of the arguments and fears about this seaway project are similar to those which I heard a score of years ago when the building of a 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River was being considered. At that time the railroads and the coal interests were most vigorously opposed, and we heard from them very much the same kind of arguments we have heard in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. Obviously they were afraid that the 9-foot Mississippi channel would cut into their business and their revenue. But what has been the experience, Mr. President? The experience has been just the reverse. It has been true of every great project developing new and cheaper methods of transportation, that it has created so much more industry and commerce that all means of transportation have enjoyed increased business. That was true of the Panama Canal and it was true of the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi.

I may say that during the present winter if it had not been for the stocks of oil which were moved up during the previous summer by means of that channel, the Twin Cities and other sections of my State in that area would be in a very desperate situation so far as fuel is concerned. It has been a godsend during the current cold winter and shortage of fuel that we have had that means of transportation available; and if we can open the navigation system a little earlier this year than we have been able to open it in the past, our troubles in respect to the shortage of fuel will be over. But what I want to emphasize is that the fear of the coal industry, of the ports, and of the railroads that the development of a great transportation project such as the St. Lawrence seaway would divert business from them, has always proved groundless in the past, because lower-cost transportation develops so much more industry and commerce that, in the final analysis, there is more business for every means of transportation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Longe] in opposing Senate Joint Resolution 111. I justify myself in making a statement at this time because



I have worked on the subject for the past 4 years. I believe there are many questions that should be answered by this honorable body before agreeing to the resolution. I realize that a great many speeches have been made by able Senators on both sides. My purpose in speaking today is to try to consolidate in one effort the questions which I believe should be answered before the matter is considered further by the Senate.

I call attention to the blown-up map prepared by the Army engineers which I have had placed on the wall. It is blown from a small map which was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee when Army engineers were testifying. I believe the map is of value in that it shows in different colors the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence. It shows in green the amount of new excavation required, and it indicates, I think, more effectively than words, how much work must be done at this particular location in addition to building a dam for power plants. If I may borrow the words of the President pro tempore which he uses so effectively at various times, I desire to make two points crystal clear.

First. I am opposed to the navigational features of the St. Lawrence seaway as provided in this joint resolution.

Second. I am in favor of getting more and cheaper electrical energy.

This project has been advocated by several Presidents, considered by engineers and debated many times in Congress. Put before the Senate as a treaty, it was rejected. Put before the Senate as an amendment to a rivers-and-harbors bill in 1944, it was rejected. Now it comes before the Senate as a resolution to approve an agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada, dated March 19, 1941, with the exception of article 7, article 8, section (c), and article 9 of that agreement. As the majority report states, article 8, section (c), is permanently deleted, but article 7 and article 9 are expressly omitted because they require the negotiation of treaties.

This agreement is based upon article 13 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 which provides for special agreements between the two Governments. I question whether this agreement comes within the intent of that article. I believe it should be the basis of a treaty. I do not believe this is the type of agreement that can be negotiated between our countries without exercising the treaty-making powers and requiring confirmation by a two-thirds vote in this body. However, I shall not press my objections on these constitutional grounds at present, except to say that I wholeheartedly agree with those who consider it to be a subject for a treaty.

I prefer rather to press my objection on grounds of the seaway's practicability and its possible usefulness in the defense of our country.

#### POWER PHASE

First, I would like to discuss for a moment the proposition of getting more and cheaper electrical energy. I shall then dwell much more fully and more specifically on my reasons for opposing the navigational features.

I do not oppose it as a power project. I do, however, believe that if the power project is to be built, it should be built solely as a power project at a much reduced figure. The power project, in my opinion, cannot properly be considered a supporting argument for building the seaway. The seaway involves much more work and much additional cost. The power facilities can be properly divided by the two countries or their respective States and Provinces without reference to the deepening of channels and the building of locks and harbor facilities required for a deep-water seaway.

I am in favor of getting more and cheaper electrical energy. If a dam can be built on the St. Lawrence to utilize this natural resource and provide more hydroelectric power to the northeastern section of the country at a fair price, I am in favor of it. Various proponents have stated in recent years that the navigational features and the power features could not be undertaken separately. I am not an engineer, but I cannot believe that this is true. Obviously, the development of the navigational features will be different from the creation of a project to develop power alone. For instance, among the conclusions of the engineers reported to the International Joint Commission, created by the boundary treaty of 1909, the report having been made about 1921, it was stated:

The sound method of procedure is to improve for navigation alone those reaches where wide canals and locks can most economically be used and where the development of the power at some future time is not interfered with by the proposed improvement and in that part of the river where the construction of locks and dams offer the most feasible means of improved navigation to provide for the development of the incidental power available as a result of the heads created by the dams.

Then in a document prepared for the Montreal Board of Trade in 1929 this statement appears:

It has generally been accepted that the development of power is contingent on the improvement of navigation, but this is not so, unless it is desired that navigation should bear part of the cost of power development, and there appears no reason that it should do so.

Again, from the same publication:

Were navigation and power development in any way allied or dependent on each other economically, there might be an excuse for considering them together, but the circumstances seem to demand that each be considered on its own merits, and only incidentally could any combination be considered.

I now quote from the New York Times of January 28, 1948:

It is necessary to distinguish within the maze of controversy the important fact that these are really two projects, and not one. The seaway which would provide passage through locks to Great Lakes ports of ocean-going vessels for about 7 months of the year is one of these; the power project is the other, and it should be divorced completely from the seaway in deciding the issue whether either is to be built.

Under the present terms of the power development, the works for power will be turned over to and paid for by the State of New York and the Province of

Ontario. I seriously question that power developed from a national resource of this character should be turned over entirely to one State for administration, distribution, and management. Why should not the Federal Government operate it for the benefit of all the neighboring States? I ask this because I come from New England. As a Senator from Massachusetts, I want to know what we are going to get in the way of power. It is true that the pending joint resolution provides:

The President is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the government of the State of New York for the transfer to the appropriate agency of that State of the power facilities—

And so forth. It further provides—

That such arrangement is consistent with the laws of the United States and protects the interests of the United States and of other States: *And provided further*, That such arrangement will be effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of New York.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will permit me to finish my remarks under this heading, then I shall gladly yield.

Mr. IVES. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will kindly indicate when the Senator from New York may interrupt him, it will be appreciated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to do so.

I should like to point out that such an arrangement has not yet been negotiated. It is not before the Congress, and there is no way of possibly knowing just what protection it will provide to insure a fair distribution of the power to the New England States. There is no way of knowing how the cost of such power would be distributed. There is no way of knowing what the costs of the power lines would be or where they would run. A very interesting map showing concentric circles of 100 miles, 200 miles, and 300 miles from the site of the dam at the international rapids, covering New York and New England, was introduced in the hearings. But, power lines do not always run in straight lines, and it seems perfectly obvious that even large block of power is not sufficient to cover all the territory which its proponents would claim.

There is just one historical fact which we do have before us, the wording of the 1933 joint recommendation of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Power Authority of the State of New York; this is the document which will be used as a basis in determining the cost of these power facilities. That document says:

The above recommendations are based on the assumption that the State of New York shall have the right to utilize for power all the flow of the St. Lawrence in the International Rapids section allocated to the United States by the treaty, other than that required for navigation, together with the title to the power works and land upon which they are situated and which may be necessary and convenient for their operation.

I wish to emphasize again the words: "right to utilize for power all the flow of

the St. Lawrence." That provision clearly leaves New England in the hands of New York.

I have tremendous respect for all our sovereign States but as a representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I can see no reason why negotiations, arrangements and agreements cannot be made prior to the passage of this resolution so that we in New England may know just what kind of a check we are signing. Now we are asked to hand out a blank check for building this power dam. I want to know what is going to be the cost of this power delivered at points in Massachusetts, with all the figures which should go into the power project included, without any figures which should be attributed to power being paid for by navigation or by the taxpayers. I want to be sure that the power we would receive would be economical and reasonable and the cost to produce it fully estimated as of 1948. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I recently went into certain figures of the TVA. I think there is much merit in a recent Reader's Digest article which said, in effect, "How can you produce a yardstick for electricity when you only use a 2-foot rule?" I want to be sure this cannot be said about the St. Lawrence power project.

I repeat, I am in favor of getting more and cheaper electrical energy, but I ask, I think entirely legitimately, what businessman would go ahead with any such undertaking before he knew the terms that were of vital interest to himself?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise not to take issue with the statement now being made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, though I may observe that I am sure that in any development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River, New York State would be fully considerate, as considerate as any of its neighboring States, were the project left to the State of New York to do as has been proposed by myself. So I think the fears which are now being expressed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts are really without foundation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator in reply that if everyone were as considerate and as reliable as is he I should have no doubt, but I should prefer to know what the agreement was before I would approve the resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator takes me at a distinct disadvantage by that statement, and I shall not pursue the argument further along that line. However, I did not rise for that purpose. I have something else in mind, if the distinguished Senator will permit me to interrupt him for only a few moments.

On February 4, at a time when I happened to be speaking on this subject before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] raised a question as to legislation enacted in the State of New York in the year 1931, and indicated in the question he asked me that in all probability New York had thereby endorsed the seaway project. At the moment I did not happen to be able to place the particular legislation to which the Senator was referring, but

I assured him in my remarks, which I shall not repeat here because they are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 1055 and 1056, that whatever the State of New York may have done it was not endorsing or in any way supporting such a project as is proposed by the resolution now under consideration. It will be found that the position expressed in my remarks has been consistent throughout.

On February 11, in the following week, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin stated for the RECORD that he had checked the matter of the legislation in New York and found that it was the New York Power Authority Act of 1931 to which he was referring. Then he went on in his remarks and said:

I stated that the New York Legislature looked for the development of the seaway and power project as an integrated unit.

Subsequently he inserted in the RECORD several sections of the New York Power Authority Act of 1931.

Mr. President, my purpose in rising is to point out that there is nothing in the New York Power Authority Act of 1931 which in any way, shape, or manner indicates that the State of New York has supported the seaway. To be sure it describes the improvement of commerce and navigation on the St. Lawrence, it refers to the international rapids and improvement in connection therewith, but all in conjunction with the development of the power of the St. Lawrence River, and ostensibly for no other purpose at all.

I happened to be a member of the legislature at that time, and I still recall the debates and discussions which occurred when the matter was under consideration. It was definitely the feeling of the legislature at that time that New York was not in favor of any such seaway proposal or any undertaking of that kind. However, as we all know, the present St. Lawrence development has a channel and locks through which, it is my recollection, approximately 9,000,000,000 tons of shipping have been handled. Naturally, if power development is to be established across the St. Lawrence River, anywhere along the channel, something must be done to take care of the shipping, the channel, and the locks which thereby might be impaired insofar as their usefulness might be concerned in the case of such a project. But this does not at all mean in any way, shape, or manner that it is to be a seaway project undertaken in conjunction with the government of the State of New York or the New York State Power Authority.

I want to read a few words from the sections which were inserted in the RECORD. Subdivision 2 of section 5 provides that its purpose is—

To negotiate—

I now speak of the Power Authority—with the appropriate Canadian authorities and agencies respecting the improvement and development of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

Subdivision 3 of the same section provides:

To apply to the appropriate agencies and officials of the United States Government and/or of the Dominion of Canada or its

provinces, including the International Joint Commission—

And so forth.

Mr. President, there is nothing here whatever which can be construed as an endorsement of the proposed undertaking, official or otherwise, by the State of New York.

In that connection, I point out further that if there be any doubt in the mind of anyone as to what the purpose of this act was, its title is "The New York Power Authority Act of 1931." There is nothing in it about commerce or navigation or anything else, so far as the title is concerned. Those things happen to be byproducts of the whole undertaking, byproducts which are a part of the natural development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River.

In order that there may be no mistake as to the attitude of the legislature regarding this matter, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of a joint resolution adopted unanimously by the New York Legislature in 1944, which rather definitely expresses the attitude of the Legislature of New York.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

TEXT OF RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE, MARCH 15, 1944, AND BY THE ASSEMBLY, MARCH 16, 1944

Whereas there is an ever-increasing need in the State of New York for cheap hydroelectric power not only to attract new industries to the State but also to retain those which are already established; and

Whereas the State of New York has no cheap hydroelectric power to offer to any new industry and already the lack of this cheap power has sent countless industries elsewhere; and

Whereas the development of the water powers of the St. Lawrence River will directly benefit the more than 4,000,000 small commercial users, farm homes, and domestic consumers of electricity in this State, comprising the greatest potential market for low-cost electricity in the world; and

Whereas, unless the State of New York indicates its willingness and desire to bring to the people the untold benefits of cheap hydroelectric power and takes effective steps to this end, this New York State power will remain the only important hydroelectric power undeveloped in the entire United States; and

Whereas the Province of Ontario, through the chairman of the Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission, has expressed a desire to proceed at once with the development of this power resource in cooperation with the State of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of New York that prompt measures should be taken to provide for development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River with adequate provisions to safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the State of New York in these resources, under the inalienable ownership of the people.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when the distinguished



Senator from New York began his statement, but I think I got the gist of it. I cannot agree with his interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon language contained in the very act he has read. He is entitled to his interpretation, of course, and I am sure I am entitled to mine, in reading the plain English. On the other hand, great New Yorkers—such as President Roosevelt, Secretary Hughes, Secretary Stimson, and Mayor LaGuardia—have indicated that the people of New York at least had an idea as to the value of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway different from the Senator's idea.

I call attention to the language of section 1:

That part of the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the State of New York is hereby declared to be a natural resource of the State—

Now, listen to this—  
for the use and development of commerce—

This is in the first section of the act—  
for the development of commerce and navigation in the interest of the people of this State and of the United States, and—

Listen to this; it does not say "or," it says—

and for the creation and development of hydroelectric power.

Let us then go to section 5:

Forthwith upon the appointment and organization of the trustees and subject to the conditions and limitation in this act contained, the power authority, in cooperation with the proper Canadian authorities and those of the United States as hereinafter directed, shall proceed with the improvement and development of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River—

Which is defined—  
and for the development—  
"And for the development"—  
of the hydroelectric power inherent therein.

Then it repeats in subsection 1 that language, and again, speaking of commerce and navigation along the St. Lawrence River, says:

It shall be so planned and constructed as to be adaptable to the plans of the United States therefor.

It was not only contemplated, as by the language indicated, that the New York Power Authority, so to speak, was to enter into arrangements for the development of electric power, but it was contemplated that it should enter into negotiations with the Canadian authorities and with the appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States, for the benefit of commerce and navigation."

While the Senator from New York cannot read in the language any provision as to navigation or commerce, to me that language indicates clearly that those who wrote the act had the vision spoken of by the Senator from Minnesota today so dynamically when he mentioned the growth of America, the future of America, and the development of America.

Mr. President, while I grant the Senator the privilege of seeing nothing in the document relating to commerce and navigation, I have only read the language as it is in the act.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, and then I shall be glad to yield further to the Senator from New York, if he will not take too long on this point.

I repeat what I just stated about the uncertainties of the situation, because the failure to have any negotiations with the State of New York regarding the use of this power is very clearly brought out by the discussion between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New York.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York thanks the Senator from Massachusetts for his courtesy in allowing him to appear in the discussion.

I point out that there is nothing which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] just stated which was at all at variance with my previous remarks. They were to the effect that in no sense, by the Power Authority Act of 1931, did the State of New York go on record as favoring the seaway. That is the position I have taken right straight through.

The Senator speaks about improving commerce and navigation. Of course, those matters have to be considered in the passage of an act of the kind to which I have referred, which has to do particularly with the improvement and development of power resources on the river.

As I indicated, the shipping which was already using the channels, and which would use it, totaling, I believe, 9,000,000 tons at the present time, would have to be taken care of. If a dam of the size of that contemplated were actually built, naturally improved commerce and navigation have to be included in the whole project as contemplated. But that, as the act itself indicated from its very title, was not the primary purpose of the act.

If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had been where he could have heard the debates going on at the time the act was passed he would have ascertained that what I am saying is the actual fact.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for allowing me to interrupt him a second time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I call attention to the fact that on March 15, 1944, the New York State Legislature adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress for the development of hydroelectric power through the seaway power project, and while the concurrent resolution did not specifically endorse the St. Lawrence seaway resolution then pending in the United States Senate, the author of the resolution stated on March 16, 1944, in the New York State Assembly:

Passage of the resolution by both houses of the legislature means that we have successfully answered the charge of St. Lawrence project opponents that the State of New York is opposed to this great development.

The authors of the resolution referred again and again to the seaway resolution then pending in the Senate and specifically directed to the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], and Representative Pittenger, and other supporters of the St. Lawrence project, the fact that this concurrent resolution and all that it implies had passed the State legislature.

Let all who have eyes to see—see.

I do not care to repeat in any detail the incontrovertible fact that the St. Lawrence seaway and the St. Lawrence power project are one. They cannot possibly be developed separately. In the words of a former Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers, General Robbins, "It would be a crime" to develop them separately, even if that could be done, and I repeat, it cannot be done.

Finally, in this connection, I ask that there be included at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which I received from the distinguished chairman of the New York State Power Authority, Gen. Francis B. Wilby. I ask, moreover, that following his letter there be printed the text of the brief statement which he included.

I respect the judgment of the junior Senator from New York, but I respectfully submit that the people of New York State, like the people of every other State in the Union, are behind the integrated seaway and power project. Moreover, I respectfully submit that in taking the stand he has taken, the junior Senator from New York unfortunately does not represent, as I humbly see it, the overwhelming opinion of his constituency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

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

THE POWER AUTHORITY OF  
THE STATE OF NEW YORK,  
New York, N. Y., February 17, 1948.  
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: For your convenience, I enclose a concise summary of factual data on the St. Lawrence project presented by the power authority at public hearings, July 16, 1947, and contained in our annual report of January 19, 1948. We believe that the facts stated in this summary have been clearly established in the record of the hearings and that they support the favorable action recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Joint Resolution 111.

We wish to emphasize that the pending joint resolution, while authorizing the project in general accordance with the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941, makes no appropriations at this time for the works described in the enclosed statement. Appropriations will be spread over the construction period of 6 or more years.

Congress will thus exercise full discretion and control in approving and scheduling the installation of the various works to meet actual power and navigation needs and budgetary requirements as they develop over the construction period.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. WILBY,  
Chairman.

**FACTS ABOUT THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT**  
(Condensed from statement presented at public hearings on the project, July 16, 1947, by the Power Authority of the State of New York and reprinted in its annual report, January 19, 1948)

The major works authorized under the agreement of 1941 and the pending legislation are to be constructed in the International Rapids section, a 48-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence River forming a part of the boundary between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. Through this section of the river passes the entire outflow of the five Great Lakes, which serve as a natural reservoir and provide an average flow of 230,000 cubic feet per second for power development. Because of the even flow, an unusually high percentage of the power to be developed in this section, a minimum of 70 percent, will be continuously available firm power.

The installed capacity of the power development on both sides of the river, under the plans completed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, will be 2,200,000 horsepower or 1,640,000 kilowatts (1 horsepower equals .746 kilowatt). The theoretical capacity of the New York State power project is 820,600 kilowatts, calculated from turbine capacity (1,100,000 horsepower) at 81-foot head. Actual installed generating capacity will be 940,500 kilowatts.

The power authority has recently completed a comprehensive review of postwar electric power requirements and supply in New York State, and adjacent areas, including also consideration of the expansion of hydroelectric power capacity in other areas, outside the Northeast. New York State and New England combined, with about 20 percent of the population of the United States, today are wholly lacking in developed reserves of hydroelectric power to help meet growing demands for electric energy which, in 1946, rose above wartime peaks in this area.

The consumption of oil, coal, and other exhaustible fuels approached a record volume during the same year, placing a heavy strain upon both fuel supplies and transportation facilities in the Northeast.

The shocking waste of latent resources of hydroelectric power on the St. Lawrence River, in the midst of a populous area which produces no coal or oil in quantity, is wholly incompatible with any sound policy of national economy or national defense.

Engineering studies, independently made by the power authority from 1931 down to date, show that St. Lawrence power can be generated and transmitted to load centers throughout the Northeast at delivered costs far below those of the most efficient steam plants now operating in New York State or elsewhere.

The St. Lawrence seaway will, when completed, provide access to the Atlantic Ocean and to existing American and foreign ports from ports in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River system, for ships not exceeding 766 feet in length and 80 feet in width, loaded to a draft of about 25 feet in salt water. The project depth of 27 feet means that all channels will be deepened to at least 1 foot over 27 feet, with 30 feet over lock sills, permitting the project depth to be increased to 30 feet at a relatively small cost at a later date, if warranted by the demands of commerce.

It will include seven locks between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, in addition to the existing eight Canadian locks on the Welland Canal and the United States lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., already completed and forming part of the proposed seaway.

The dual-purpose project in the International Rapids section will also develop 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy, the second largest power development in the

Western Hemisphere. Half of the power project will be located in the State of New York, the other half in Canada. The entire State of New York and parts of New England, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey are within economic transmission distance of the project.

#### SEASONAL OPERATING PROBLEMS SOLVED

Climatic conditions on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, particularly the freezing over of channels and the effect of ice on the power project, have been thoroughly studied and fully met in numerous surveys and hydraulic tests and in the engineering plans now ready for use.

The seaway will be closed due to freezing for a period averaging 4 months and 10 days each year during the winter (or 36 percent of the time), the same as is now the case for the port of Montreal and all shipping on the Great Lakes. This, however, has not prevented the port of Montreal from becoming one of the greatest ports in the Western Hemisphere, or the Great Lakes from carrying a total commerce of 184,000,000 net tons a year at the peak of war production.

So far as the power development is concerned, the project will operate the year-round, producing hydroelectric energy winter and summer in a populous, industrial area which produces no coal or oil and urgently needs low-cost power to meet steadily rising demands. In the Beauharnois power plant on the St. Lawrence, the Shipshaw power plant on the Saguenay, and in other large power plants located farther north than the International Rapids section, winter ice conditions have been overcome with complete success in the efficient operation of such plants.

#### EFFECT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT ON EXISTING PORTS AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

By providing low-cost power and low-cost navigation, the St. Lawrence project will create new wealth, stimulate growth of industry, and thus add to the sum total of production, trade, and freight tonnage available to existing ports, canals, railroads, trucks, and other transportation agencies.

Completion of the project will, in effect, create 3,576 miles of new coastline for the United States, interconnected by deep-water channels with our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts. This will not only strengthen our defense but, as the United States Maritime Commission has reported to Congress, will also develop our merchant marine and expand our intercoastal trade.

Any small amount of traffic which might be diverted from existing facilities will be more than offset by new commerce created by the expansion of industry, agriculture, and trade resulting from the St. Lawrence development. The completion of the seaway will make it possible to move finished goods and commodities which cannot now be shipped to market at a profit. Year-around operation of the power project will develop new industries and create traffic which cannot be handled by the seaway during the winter and must increase the tonnage available for other transportation agencies.

Far from diverting any substantial amount of tonnage from the railroads, the barge canals, or ports like New York, Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New Orleans, it may be confidently expected that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will result in net gains in the commerce handled by such existing agencies.

#### A NATIONAL PROJECT

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been designed for the benefit of the whole Nation, and will serve directly about one-third of our population in an area of more than 300,000 square miles, one of the most productive and highly industrialized regions of the United States. The conclusion that a project which serves such a large proportion of our population will benefit the whole

country is borne out by experience throughout our history.

Because of their natural advantages and their highly productive tributary areas, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and other magnificent harbors on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts are bound to remain leading ports of the United States. With all their natural advantages, however, none of these great harbors would be available today, to serve our industries, our railroads and our shipping, unless the channels had been progressively deepened and maintained by the Corps of Engineers. These improvements in our harbors and projects to develop our inland waterways have cost billions of dollars. In the aggregate, they have returned their cost manyfold in the creation of new wealth, in direct stimulus and aid to our system of free enterprise, in low-cost transportation and low-cost power for the benefit of the whole Nation.

The great waterways and harbors of the United States have heretofore been authorized by Congress, developed, and modernized, as needed, to keep pace with the growth of commerce and the increasing draft of ships. These improvements have been made in all parts of our country, consistent with the sound policy that such projects increase our national wealth and strengthen our economy in war and peace. It would be highly discriminatory and directly contrary to the public interest to exclude from the benefits of this well-established national policy Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego, Duluth, Superior, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, and other ports in the immense area served by a natural waterway so capable of improvement for ocean navigation as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

The St. Lawrence project has already been largely completed after having been approved by every official board of engineers which has investigated its deep-navigation and power potentialities over the last three decades. Since the United States and Canada signed the pending agreement of March 19, 1941, to complete the entire project, it has been repeatedly recommended to Congress by the principal agencies of our Government charged with the national defense, the improvement of rivers and harbors, the development of the merchant marine, and the fostering of agriculture, industry, and domestic and foreign trade.

It is the conclusion of the Power Authority that the need and value of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project have been so clearly established by the overwhelming weight of evidence that the development authorized by the United States-Canadian agreement and the joint resolution should be carried forward without further delay.

**Mr. IVES.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for the third time? I am very sorry to feel obliged to ask the Senator to yield, but I should like to reply to the Senator from Wisconsin.

**Mr. SALTONSTALL.** Will the Senator reply very briefly?

**Mr. IVES.** As briefly as can be done. I well recall what occurred at the time of the reading of the statement from which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has quoted. I regret that I do not have with me my own statement which was made at that same time, which voiced unquestionably the majority opinion of the members of the legislature. My statement was along the exact line that I have been indicating in the discussion this afternoon, and that is that in no way was the resolution to be construed as endorsing the seaway project at all. The resolution, the Senator will observe, merely applies to power.



Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I simply repeat, as I leave this aspect of the subject concerning power, that obviously there is great uncertainty as to whether or not New York is even in favor of the project, and certainly it is clear that they have not made any agreement or even come to a tentative understanding with the National Government as to how the power project should be carried out, and I say again that such an agreement should be entered into, or at least or even come to a tentative understanding, before we pass the joint resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. If I understand the Senator rightly, he is contending now that one of the reasons why we should not pass the joint resolution is that there is no definite, concrete understanding with the New York authorities in relation to the construction of the power project. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct insofar particularly as it concerns us in New England.

Mr. WILEY. Of course the Senator realizes that one of the purposes of the joint resolution is to bring the negotiations under way. The Senator realizes that, does he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say that before the honorable Senate passes the joint resolution which will commit the Federal Government to start the construction of the power dam and begin building the seaway we should have some knowledge of the agreement which is going to turn over the power facilities or contemplated power facilities to the State of New York.

Mr. WILEY. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator would support the project if there were such an agreement?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May the Senator from Massachusetts answer that question at the conclusion of his remarks, if the Senator from Wisconsin still desires an answer to the question at that time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a statement so as to keep the record clear. As was suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] today, and it should be repeated again and again in the present debate, the joint resolution provides only an authorization. An authorization for what? First, it would authorize the President to enter into a treaty. The treaty would have to come back to the Senate for ratification. The treaty would provide for perpetual mutual rights of navigation between the citizens of the two countries.

Second, the joint resolution provides that the President shall enter into an agreement in relation to what tolls, if any, shall be imposed upon the traffic upon the canal. That agreement would be with the Canadian Government, and the agreement would have to come back to both Houses of Congress for ratification.

Third, the joint resolution provides, pursuant to the plans which have been paid for—and some one and a half million dollars have already been expended by our Government upon those plans—that arrangements will be made with

New York and negotiations entered into with the Canadian Government in relation to the plant construction.

Then, Mr. President, it must be borne in mind that not one step of construction can be undertaken until again the whole matter has come before the Senate and the House and appropriations have been made for construction.

Therefore, the bugaboo which has been thrown into this picture that it is likely that some useful material needed for building plants in Europe or for building ships in America will be needed in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is all out the window.

It must be clear, Mr. President, as the Senator from Minnesota said, that, assuming the preliminary steps have been taken, 5 or 6 years will elapse before the project can be gotten under way.

In view of that, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not perfectly feasible that we proceed with the steps provided in the joint resolution and not attempt to delay further along the line the Senator suggests?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall make my answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in the last section of my discussion, in which I take up the very points he has just mentioned.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

I now turn briefly to the seaway as an adjunct to our national defense. Will it be a vital factor in our future security? Senators have heard my colleague give a very thorough and authoritative discussion on this question. I, therefore, do not intend to dwell in detail on this vital problem. But I would like to ask this question: If the seaway, with its complicated network of locks, is to be considered a national defense undertaking, why does it fly in the face of the expert opinion of the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, General Mehauffey, who has just submitted to Congress a study of the Panama Canal entitled "Isthmian Canal Study—1947"? That study emphasizes in its conclusions the need for converting the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal at a cost of two and a half billion dollars.

In summarizing his case for a Panama sea-level canal, General Mehauffey said on page 86, part 7, of his report:

A sea-level canal requires only the maintenance of a clear channel for its operation. While tidal-regulating and flood-control structures would be provided, they would not be essential to the operation of the waterway, and their loss would not prevent its use. The channel could not be blocked by the largest foreseeable conventional weapon but could be closed by an atomic bomb, in which event the canal could be reopened to traffic a few weeks after the necessary equipment and personnel were available. More powerful atomic bombs would increase the time of closure. Additional security of the sea-level canal could be obtained at any time by widening and deepening the channel, and this could be accomplished without losing any original investment.

By contrast, a lock canal, no matter how strongly protected, could be put out of operation for periods of 2 to 4 years by conventional or atomic weapons.

The proposed seaway by necessity must be built with locks to lift a ship from sea level to the Great Lakes, a total rise of 600 feet.

Testimony of General Mehauffey would appear to eliminate this seaway as a reliable artery for national defense.

I may add, Mr. President, my own personal observation of the locks at Antwerp, Belgium. The Germans failed to eliminate the last lock in the canal. Their failure to do so proved of supreme importance to us in the latter phases of the war. It helped make possible early victory over Germany. Had the lock been blown up by the Germans we would have encountered considerable difficulty and delay. Observation of the situation at Antwerp proves to me very clearly the importance of having a sea-level canal if we are to consider the importance of the proposed waterway in time of war, and the need for its defense.

I briefly mention several other reasons why I believe the security value of the seaway has been overstated. In this age of atomic weapons, of planes capable of flying faster than the speed of sound, and supersonic weapons, every military expert agrees that if we are attacked, the attack will come without warning and through the air. Therefore, the Great Lakes area no longer can enjoy its traditional immunity to hostile attack. In fact, one might say the reverse is true. The great-circle course to the Great Lakes—the so-called polar concept of attack—is nearer to our potential enemies than the Atlantic seaboard. This polar concept also weakens another defense argument of the proponents: that the seaway would give us an alternate and more sheltered shipbuilding center. If the seaway can be put out of action for some 2 to 4 years, that completely eliminates it as a reliable and continuing artery for commercial or naval purposes in wartime. Furthermore, only the smaller man-of-war could move safely through the seaway because of the draft of the modern carriers or battleships.

I ask now two final questions on the subject of national defense: Does it provide better protection to our country to build an expensive link to localities which are admittedly icebound between 4 and 5 months a year rather than to improve our existing transportation facilities that connect with ports which operate on a year-round basis? Cannot we more advisedly, in the interests of national defense, spend our available funds in the improvement of these ports that are open 12 months in the year? We must think of these questions in light of the cry of many nations for ice-free ports and especially of Russian demands for Mediterranean harbors.

So far I have discussed the power features of the seaway as a potential asset in our national defense. Now I would like to discuss it as a practical proposition in time of peace. Let us consider ourselves the owners of an oceangoing freighter and see what practical considerations arise.

#### LIMITING DEPTH OF SEAWAY

One of the most important, in fact I believe the most important, practical factor in discussing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is the question of the depth of the channel. What types of ships can use it, and, will they use it? The agreement referred to in this resolution calls for a 27-foot channel from Montreal to Duluth.

Just how much water a ship can draw and still get through the channel is a contentious point, yet the differences of opinion only amount to a couple of feet. Let us consider a Liberty ship because I think a Liberty ship, by name at least, is known to most people. They were built, as we all know, during the war when we were in vital need of shipping. They did a great job. They were a vital factor in winning that war, but today they are out of date. This was clearly shown before the end of the war when the faster Victory ships were built.

A Liberty ship draws about 28 feet. This figure is what is termed "mean draft"; in other words, the average draft of the loaded ship, not in motion and in calm water. If one asks an experienced captain, or a man who has had experience in loading these vessels, he will find that this ship drawing 28 feet requires as much as 32 feet fully loaded and under way. I believe that it is self-evident that when a ship is propelled through the water there is what the mariners call "squat"—that is to say, the stern is forced down and the bow up. The amount of "squat" increases with the displacement of the vessel and the speed of the vessel. Furthermore, the movement of waves is bound to affect the depth required to float any given ship. Finally, the draft of a ship is greater in fresh than in salt water. Vessels which clear Montreal for the voyage down the St. Lawrence are required to have a clearance in the dredged channel of 2 feet 6 inches. I mention these various factors because it is clearly evident to anyone that a vessel drawing 28 feet cannot go through a 27-foot channel. I do not believe that, on the average, we could safely take through a ship drawing more than 24 feet. Southworth Lancaster, traffic manager for the Port of Boston Authority, who has had a great deal of experience testified:

There emerges the more practical picture of the small freighter drawing not over 23 feet with a length of about 400 feet.

Some of the proponents state that a ship drawing 25½ feet will be able to go through this 27-foot channel. For the moment let us concede this is so. In a publication entitled "Public Affairs Bulletin No. 58, July 1947," the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress gives certain statistics. These statistics they obtained from the United States Maritime Commission as of September 30, 1945:

The freighters in the United States fleet with maximum loaded draft of 25 feet or less number 646. This represents 9.4 percent of the total tonnage of the United States fleet. Tankers—in the same category—total 51 or 2.3 percent of the total tanker tonnage.

I think those are substantially the figures given by my colleague.

Now let us look for a moment at the world fleet: The same statistics for the world fleet for freighters amount to 20.8 percent of the tonnage; tankers 6.6 percent of the tanker tonnage.

I readily admit that a ship which is not fully loaded could go through, but it seems perfectly clear to me that in planning a navigational channel it should be planned for boats which are fully loaded.

Certainly, no steamship company is in business to run its boats partially loaded if they can carry a full load. This is simple business arithmetic.

In 1929 the Brookings Institution of Washington published a book entitled "The St. Lawrence Navigation and Power Project." The statistics in that book have been attacked, but I think everyone will admit that the trend has been for larger and faster ships since 1929. Page 53 of the Brookings report states, "The trend in ocean shipping is toward larger and deeper draft vessels." Their prediction in this case has certainly come true. The Second World War accelerated the demand for new dry-cargo ships and put emphasis on greater speed and more tonnage. After pointing out that a 27-foot channel is "limited to vessels drawing less than 24 feet 6 inches" and after discussing the possibilities of a 30-foot channel, they state:

A channel depth of 33 feet is a minimum requirement if the St. Lawrence seaway is to serve the purposes for which it is advocated. Such a depth would permit the passage of loaded vessels with salt-water drafts of approximately 29 feet 9 inches. It would thus accommodate nearly all of the steam- and motor-driven cargo ships now in existence. It would also accommodate the larger grain boats engaged in the Montreal-European trade. It should be observed, however, that even with a depth of 33 feet, the St. Lawrence waterway would not be what might be called a genuinely first-class shipping route.

Remember this was stated in 1929.

Let me mention another comment stated on January 8, 1897, in a report of the Deep Waterways Commission appointed by the President of the United States and the Government of Canada:

It will be wise to provide for securing a channel of a navigable depth of not less than 28 feet.

That was the engineers' opinion more than 50 years ago.

Let us look at a very recent report submitted to the President by his advisory committee on the merchant marine just 3 months ago. This report, after urging the building of 46 passenger ships, the draft of which will be between 32 and 35 feet, states that:

It appears to the committee that the national-security consideration requires that this program be supplemented by the building of a number of prototype high-speed dry cargo and tanker vessels.

The proposed draft of these prototype fast tankers is 32 feet. The proposed draft of the fast cargo ships is 29 feet 6 inches. Here is clearly another indication of the type of vessels required to meet marine demands today. It is simply another conclusion that adds up to a legitimate question: Why consider building a navigable project which is obviously out of date before it is started?

There is a type of ship which might use this channel. Large lake boats can be built to move downstream to Montreal. Their cargoes would then have to be transferred to ocean-going vessels. Such an operation would be, in my opinion, largely to the advantage of Canada—not to the United States—as it would build up Montreal to the loss of business in United States harbors. Our harbors al-

ready have been built up at great national expense with many people in many communities depending upon their increased use. The Canadian Government is dredging the channel from Quebec to Montreal to a depth of at least 35 feet. It seems to me that that clearly answers the question asked of the junior Senator from Massachusetts by the senior Senator from Vermont today.

A recent document of the Department of Commerce entitled "Domestic Transportation, August 1947" gives an economic appraisal of the St. Lawrence seaway project. It states on page 40:

The low cost of operation of the lake freighters also appears to exclude the possibility of the major movement of ocean vessels upon the seaway for the purpose of hauling grain.

The same publication states, concerning the possible traffic in iron ore:

It is true that oceangoing vessels will be able to ascend the seaway, but the depth limitations are such that very large ore carriers would be unable to carry full loads. Bethlehem Steel Co. has found that the most economical water transportation for ore can be achieved through the employment of huge ore carriers capable of carrying nearly 25,000 tons of ore and drawing 34 feet of water. Such vessels, because of the capacity, are much more economical on a per-ton basis than the smaller 8,000 to 10,000 ocean tramps. The Bethlehem boats or boats of similar proportions draw too much water for successful use through the seaway. Accordingly, the shipment of ore, in vessels of great cargo-carrying capacity, from overseas sources into the Great Lakes would require either the development of a radically new type of ore carrier comparable in dimensions and draft to the lake carriers, and capable of withstanding ocean storms or, as an alternative, a transfer of the ore at Montreal or some other St. Lawrence River port.

Naturally, the Department of Commerce study went much further than just these quotations; but it is fair to point them out, for they confirm my statement that really modern oceangoing ships cannot profitably use this seaway.

Another question worthy of serious consideration was best expressed to me by a man with much shipping experience. He wrote me:

I have had a good deal of experience with the operation of ships on lakes, through the St. Lawrence waterway, and on the high seas, and I am convinced that you cannot design a seagoing vessel which will operate efficiently through the St. Lawrence River and canals and on the Great Lakes. The reason is that the requirements for rudder control through the waterway and on the Lakes are very different from what they are on the high seas.

Mr. President, if you will look on the wall behind me at this brief chart of the section through the International Rapids and if you will notice the turns which will have to be made and the points of current which will be thrown out by the islands, and so forth, you will see why it will be difficult to steer a deep-water ship through the canal at places where the current will run strongly. We have had similar experiences with the Cape Cod Canal.

#### LIMITING DEPTH FACTORS INSIDE GREAT LAKES

Once a vessel has gone through the St. Lawrence River—if it can get through—it arrives in Lake Ontario. The harbor on the Canadian side of Lake Ontario is



Toronto, with a 25-foot main channel and a 22-foot depth at the docks. On the New York side is Oswego, with an entrance depth of 21 feet and a basin depth of 16 feet. To enter Lake Erie the vessel must go through the locks of the Welland Canal. The Welland Canal has eight locks. As part of this project the Canadian Government agrees to dredge this channel to 27 feet. The locks of the canal lift a vessel from an elevation of 244 feet to 570½ feet above sea level. That is the difference above sea level between Lakes Erie and Ontario.

The first harbor which one might enter in Lake Erie is Buffalo. The depth of the north entrance is limited at 21 feet; the south entrance at 25 feet, but this south entrance is limited, as soon as you get inside the outer harbor, to 21 feet. I can find no dock that will support a vessel of more than 23 feet, with the exception of the municipal pier. That has 25 feet close to it, but there is a 21-foot spot close by. The next harbor in Lake Erie is the harbor of Erie—Presque Isle. This has a limiting factor of 19 feet into the harbor, except for a narrow channel of 25 feet to the Pennsylvania Railroad and canal docks. The rest of the docks are limited to from 19 to 21 feet. The Gulf Oil Corp. has a pipe line to a point off shore where the unloading position supports only 14 feet.

Going farther along Lake Erie we come to Cleveland. Here you have a limiting factor of 25 feet, not only in the entrance, but in the so-called west basin. I cannot find a pier in Cleveland that can float a ship drawing 25 feet. Studying the piers, I find that those served by rail vary from 16 feet to a possible 24 feet. Proceeding farther along the lake to Toledo, I find there is apparently a 25-foot dredged channel through Maumee Bay to the Maumee River for a distance of over 20 miles before you reach the New York Central docks with the limiting factor of 24 feet. I mention these distances because when it comes to a question of increasing these depths it is not, as some people will give you to suppose, a simple task.

In order to proceed from Lake Erie to Lake Huron, you must go through the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, and the St. Clair River. In the Detroit River there is now a limiting factor of 21 feet in the up channel and 25 feet in the down channel. Part of the project we are debating is to deepen these channels to 27 feet.

On entering Lake Huron, a ship may proceed through the Sault Ste. Marie, where the MacArthur Lock has already been completed. The United States is to deepen this channel to 27 feet. If you proceed through Lake Superior to Duluth, you find that while the entrance into Duluth-Superior Harbor is 28 feet, the Superior Harbor Basin is 25, while Superior front channel, the Minnesota channel, the South channel, and the North channel are all only 22 feet. The depths of docks vary, but in most cases they are around 21 feet, with a possible 27 feet at one of the Hanna coal docks. Let us now go back to Lake Huron and through the Straits of Mackinac down Lake Michigan to Chicago. In Chicago you have a limiting factor of 21 feet in the channel which leads to the Chicago

River. The best anchorage inside the breakwater area would appear to be limited to 24 feet, if not less. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has also referred to Milwaukee, Wis., and Muskegon, Mich. In both those harbors there is more than 27 feet of water in some places, but any vessels going into those harbors and needing that much draft would have to have the depths at the docks and piers increased in order to be safe, as well as the channels into Muskegon and Milwaukee Harbors.

At this point I wish to introduce a table taken from the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, 1944, showing the depths of the United States harbors in the Great Lakes, together with depths of entrance channels and total cost of each to June 30, 1944. I introduce these tables, Mr. President, because I should like to call to your attention that there is not a single harbor with a basin depth of 27 feet, and I think it is well to remember that a ship drawing 27 feet in salt water requires at least a foot and a half additional in fresh water.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the table which I identify as exhibit A.

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

## EXHIBIT A

Table showing depths of United States harbors on Great Lakes, together with depths of entrance channels and total costs of each to June 30, 1944 (from Annual Report, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, 1944)

|                                           | En-<br>trance<br>depth<br>(feet) | Basin<br>depth<br>(feet) | Cost to June<br>30, 1944 |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>LAKE SUPERIOR</b>                      |                                  |                          |                          |
| 1. Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis. | 32.0                             | 25-26.0                  | \$10,673,241.42          |
| 2. Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.                | 10.0                             | 8.0                      | 10,190.08                |
| 3. Ashland Harbor, Wis.                   | 21.0                             | 25.0                     | 1,201,806.17             |
| 4. Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.                | 17.0                             | 15.0                     | 962,786.79               |
| 5. Keweenaw Waterway, Mich.               | 28.0                             | 25.0                     | 8,062,473.89             |
| 6. Presque Isle Harbor, Mich.             | 28.0                             | 26.0                     | 1,011,948.91             |
| 7. Marquette Harbor, Mich.                | 26.0                             | 25.0                     | 1,465,012.64             |
| 8. Grand Marais Harbor of Refuge, Mich.   | 20.0                             | 18.0                     | 822,837.05               |
| 9. Warroad Harbor and River, Minn.        | 8.0                              | 8.0                      | 347,745.91               |
| 10. Grand Traverse Bay, Mich.             |                                  |                          |                          |
| <b>LAKE MICHIGAN</b>                      |                                  |                          |                          |
| 1. Manistique Harbor, Mich.               | 18.0                             | 17.6                     | 460,598.78               |
| 2. Menominee Harbor and River, Mich.      | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 902,412.56               |
| 3. Green Bay, Wis.                        | 22.0                             | 22.0                     | 2,653,477.32             |
| 4. Fox River, Wis.                        |                                  |                          |                          |
| 5. Sturgeon Bay Harbor, Wis.              | 23.0                             | 22.0                     | 2,547,234.15             |
| 6. Algoma Harbor, Wis.                    | 15.2                             | 12.0                     | 545,979.85               |
| 7. Keweenaw Harbor, Wis.                  | 20.0                             | 20.0                     | 965,426.49               |
| 8. Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.                | 18.0                             | 18.0                     | 806,140.17               |
| 9. Manitowish Harbor, Wis.                | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,421,849.51             |
| 10. Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.                | 25.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,586,700.27             |
| 11. Port Washington Harbor, Wis.          | 21.0                             | 18.0                     | 1,181,086.88             |
| 12. Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.                | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 7,119,645.83             |

Table showing depths of United States harbors on Great Lakes, together with depths of entrance channels and total costs of each to June 30, 1944 (from Annual Report, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, 1944)—Continued

|                                                 | En-<br>trance<br>depth<br>(feet) | Basin<br>depth<br>(feet) | Cost to June<br>30, 1944 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>LAKE MICHIGAN—CON.</b>                       |                                  |                          |                          |
| 13. Racine Harbor, Wis.                         | 21.0                             | 19.0                     | 1,549,737.12             |
| 14. Kenosha Harbor, Wis.                        | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 998,630.77               |
| 15. St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.                    | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,651,051.70             |
| 16. South Haven Harbor, Mich.                   | 21.0                             | 19.0                     | 1,114,843.20             |
| 17. Holland Harbor, Mich.                       | 23.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,507,640.44             |
| 18. Grand Haven Harbor, Mich.                   | 23.0                             | 21.0                     | 2,857,867.77             |
| 19. Muskegon Harbor, Mich.                      | 24.0                             | 21.0                     | 3,466,479.38             |
| 20. Ludington Harbor, Mich.                     | 18.0                             | 18.0                     | 2,502,838.18             |
| 21. Manistee Harbor, Mich.                      | 23.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,663,304.54             |
| 22. Frankfort Harbor, Mich.                     | 20.0                             | 18.0                     | 2,204,462.87             |
| 23. Charlevoix Harbor, Mich.                    | 18.6                             | 18.6                     | 464,905.24               |
| 1. Waukegan Harbor, Ill.                        | 18.0                             | 18.0                     | 1,602,950.04             |
| 2. Chicago Harbor, Ill.                         | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 5,746,569.75             |
| 3. Chicago River H, Ill.                        | 21.0                             | 21.0                     | 2,610,768.71             |
| 4. Calumet Harbor and River, Ind. and Ill.      | 26.0                             | 25.0                     | 8,980,366.31             |
| 5. Indiana Harbor, Ind.                         | 28.0                             | 26.0                     | 4,769,329.12             |
| 6. Michigan City Harbor, Ind.                   | 18.0                             | 18.0                     | 2,637,802.25             |
| <b>CONNECTING CHANNELS</b>                      |                                  |                          |                          |
| 1. St. Marys River, Mich.                       | 120.0<br>224.0<br>27.0<br>26.0   |                          | 62,933,167.34            |
| 2. St. Clair River, Mich.                       | 26-25.0                          |                          | 4,076,746.33             |
| 3. Lake St. Clair channels, Mich.               | 25.0                             |                          | 5,383,433.32             |
| 4. Detroit River, Mich.                         | 25.0<br>20.0                     | 20.0                     | 24,339,620.20            |
| 5. Saginaw River, Mich.                         | 21.0                             | 20.0                     | 3,798,978.17             |
| 6. Black River, Mich.                           | 20.0                             |                          | 402,634.14               |
| 7. Rouge River, Mich.                           | 21-25.0                          | 17.0                     | 1,350,876.02             |
| 8. Monroe Harbor, Mich.                         | 21.0                             | 18.0                     | 1,336,886.94             |
| 9. Toledo Harbor, Ohio.                         | 25.0                             | 18.0                     | 9,424,839.19             |
| <b>LAKE ERIE</b>                                |                                  |                          |                          |
| 1. Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.                       | 21.0                             | 22.0                     | 3,876,470.10             |
| 2. Huron Harbor, Ohio.                          | 26.0                             | 19.0                     | 1,763,757.26             |
| 3. Lorain Harbor, Ohio.                         | 25.0<br>26.0                     | 17.0                     | 3,537,448.77             |
| 4. Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.                      | 25-26.0                          | 24-21.0                  | 12,017,670.56            |
| 5. Fairport Harbor, Ohio.                       | 25-24.0                          | 24.0                     | 3,610,211.79             |
| 6. Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.                      | 28.0                             | 25-24.0                  | 4,040,591.23             |
| 7. Conneaut Harbor, Ohio.                       | 25.0<br>26.0                     | 20.0                     | 4,509,874.12             |
| 8. Erie Harbor, Pa.                             | 25.0<br>26.0                     | 21.0                     | 3,925,960.03             |
| 9. Buffalo Harbor, N.Y.                         | 20-27.0                          | 23-21.0                  | 11,689,565.92            |
| 10. Black Rock Channel, Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y. | 21.0                             | 16.0                     | 11,312,724.78            |
| <b>LAKE ONTARIO</b>                             |                                  |                          |                          |
| 1. Rochester (Charlotte), N. Y.                 | 20.0                             | 20.0                     | 1,472,843.52             |
| 2. Greatodus Bay Harbor, N. Y.                  | 22.0                             | 20.0                     | 1,155,919.58             |
| 3. Oswego Harbor, N. Y.                         | 21.0                             | 16.0                     | 6,136,266.45             |
| 4. Ogdensburg Harbor, N. Y.                     | 19.0                             | 21.0                     | 1,131,781.74             |

1 Up.  
2 Down.  
3 Controlling.

4 Soft.  
5 Hard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last October I wrote the United States Lake Survey, a division of the United States Army engineers, located in Detroit. This division is responsible for preparing the charts used on the Great Lakes. I asked them to send me the depths of the principal harbors in the Great Lakes. I also asked them this

question: "How many of these harbors can accommodate and berth an oceangoing steamship the length of a Liberty ship with a draft of 25½ feet?" Early in November, I received a letter in reply from General Wheeler, Chief of the Engineers, which I would like to quote in full:

Reference is made to your letter of October 7, 1947, addressed to the United States Lake Survey, Corps of Engineers, Detroit, Mich., which has been referred by the district engineer, Col. Frank A. Pettit, to this office for further reply. You ask for information as to the depths of the main harbors on the Great Lakes, how many harbors could accommodate and berth an oceangoing steamship the length of a Liberty ship with a draft of 25½ feet, and the number of such berths, if any, in each harbor.

I am pleased to furnish the following tabulation listing the main harbors on the Great Lakes and the adopted project depths at those localities. Actual controlling depths now prevailing conform substantially to the project depths shown:

*Federal project depths to outer docks*

|                                                                                                                                                                       | Feet      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Two Harbors, Minn.                                                                                                                                                    | 26        |
| Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.                                                                                                                                | 26 and 25 |
| Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.                                                                                                                                                | 21        |
| Chicago Harbor, Ill.                                                                                                                                                  | 21        |
| Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind.                                                                                                                                         | 25        |
| Indiana Harbor, Ind.                                                                                                                                                  | 25        |
| Muskegon Harbor, Mich.                                                                                                                                                | 21        |
| Bay City, Mich.                                                                                                                                                       | 21        |
| Detroit Harbor, Mich. (from Rouge River upstream to vicinity of Belle Isle) (natural depths generally in excess of 30 feet exist in main channel for through traffic) | 30        |
| Toledo Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                                  | 25        |
| Huron Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                                   | 25        |
| Lorain Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                                  | 25        |
| Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                               | 25        |
| Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                               | 24        |
| Conneaut Harbor, Ohio.                                                                                                                                                | 25        |
| Erie Harbor, Pa.                                                                                                                                                      | 21        |
| Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.                                                                                                                                                 | 23        |
| Oswego Harbor, N. Y.                                                                                                                                                  | 21        |

Existing Federal harbor projects on the Great Lakes have been developed to accommodate the heavy commerce thereon, consisting chiefly of bulk commodities, transported in vessels up to about 24 feet in draft. Project depths in the harbors served by the deeper draft ships are therefore 25 to 26 feet. Accordingly, none of the harbors on the lakes could at present accommodate and berth an oceangoing steamship of the Liberty type with a draft of 25½ feet, which would call for a depth of at least 27 feet.

As you know, present controlling depths are 14 feet in the St. Lawrence River above Montreal, 25 feet in the Welland Canal, with 21 feet in the up-bound channels and 25 feet in the down-bound channels of the Great Lakes connecting channels. The proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project as outlined in the agreement between the Governments of United States and Canada, executed March 21, 1941, provides for a controlling channel depth of 27 feet from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal, with power development in the International Rapids section. In this connection, I am pleased to enclose for your information and retention copy of a descriptive statement including cost estimates on the St. Lawrence project presented by the Chief of Engineers July 14, 1947, before the House Public Works Committee in connection with its hearings on House Joint Resolution 192, Eightieth Congress, first session, that would authorize the over-all development. House Joint Resolution 192 is a companion bill to Senate Joint Resolution 111, Deepening of the

principal Great Lakes ports to provide channel access facilities of 27-foot depth to the outer docks would involve comparatively small additional cost.

On January 29, I checked with the office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington to see if the information contained in the letter in regard to the controlling depths in Great Lakes harbors still holds. I was informed that General Wheeler's letter is correct in every detail, up to this moment.

General Wheeler says that actual controlling depths now prevailing conform substantially to the project depths shown. But a ship cannot sail unless it actually does conform. I will not argue this point except to say that charts which I have received and which I have studied do not conform to all these depths as now existing. I do want to emphasize again his statement:

Accordingly, none of the harbors on the Lakes could at present accommodate and berth an oceangoing steamship of the Liberty type with a draft of 25½ feet, which would call for a depth of at least 27 feet.

Let me add that actually a Liberty ship has a mean draft of about 28 feet, not 25½ feet. The reason I requested 25½ feet in my letter to General Wheeler was because this is the deepest draft which even the proponents admit can possibly go through the seaway.

General Wheeler also states:

Deepening of the principal Great Lakes ports to provide general access facilities of 27-foot depth to the outer docks would involve comparatively small additional cost.

In this connection I would like to quote from a letter I received from Gilbert R. Johnson, counsel for the Lake Carriers Association:

Mr. Sabin, vice president of the association, has given careful consideration to your letters of December 4 and December 5. Being a civil engineer and a former civilian engineer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and having had charge of the construction of the Sabin lock and the St. Mary Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Mr. Sabin is without doubt the best informed person on harbor and channel conditions on the Great Lakes. These facts are mentioned to explain the reason for my referring your December 4 letter to him rather than to an active Great Lakes master. The responsive comments to your letters are:

(1) As to your December 4 letter: With slight modification Mr. Sabin agrees with the

information furnished to you by General Wheeler, all of which is available in the printed records of the United States Engineers. The modifications noted by Mr. Sabin for some of the ports are:

**PROJECT DEPTHS**

Indiana Harbor: 25 feet to ore docks, 22 feet to oil docks up the canal.

Detroit Harbor: No project, generally deep water to lower portion of river but limited depth to coal docks below Belle Isle Bridge.

Lorain Harbor: 24 feet to ore dock up river.

Cleveland Harbor: 25 feet outer harbor, 21 feet Cuyahoga River.

Erie Harbor: 25 feet to ore dock, 21 feet to other docks.

Buffalo Harbor: 25 feet in southern part of outer harbor, 21 feet in Buffalo River.

Generally speaking, in times of high water such as has prevailed over the last few years, ships down-bound in those channels may load to a maximum depth of 24 feet, and ships up-bound to 21 feet. It is desirable to have clearance under the hull of about 3 feet in rock channels and about 2 feet in soft-bottom channels. Vessels underway squat a foot or more. In all probability it was this squat which Captain Saunders took into consideration in referring to practical depths.

On the Great Lakes the modern ore and coal docks have a concrete superstructure; the old docks are built of wood. These loading and unloading docks are designed to handle such bulk cargoes as iron ore, limestone, and coal. They are usually not suited for the handling of general cargo. To the extent that ocean ships would carry such bulk cargoes, lake docks would probably be suitable. There are few ports that have docks for the efficient handling of general cargo.

One of the arguments made is with respect to cargoes consisting of automobiles and cargoes of similar character from Detroit and surrounding areas.

In many cases it would be impractical to deepen alongside existing docks. In Mr. Sabin's judgment an entire rebuilding would be necessary. Many of those docks are located outside the limits of Federal projects. The cost of improving the channels to them and the cost of reinforcing or reconstructing these docks to make adjustment for deepened channels alongside have never been accurately calculated. Such costs, however, would be enormous and would not fall within the comparatively small additional cost characterized by General Wheeler.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD a table prepared by Mr. Sabin, marked "Exhibit B."

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

**EXHIBIT B**

*Great Lakes channel depths, recommended drafts, and type channel bottoms, prepared by Mr. Sabin*

|                            | Depth | Recommended draft | Material                               |
|----------------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <b>DOWN-BOUND</b>          |       |                   |                                        |
| St. Marys River:           |       |                   |                                        |
| Vidal Shoal.....           | 25.5  | 23.0              | Ledge rock.                            |
| North Canal, upper.....    | 23.5  | 21.6              | Do.                                    |
| South Canal, upper.....    | 25.0  | 23.3              | Ledge rock, being deepened to 27 feet. |
| Davis and Sabin locks..... | 23.1  | 21.8              | Concrete.                              |
| Lower North Canal.....     | 23.1  | 21.8              | Ledge rock.                            |
| Lower South Canal.....     | 25.0  | 23.7              | Boulders, being deepened.              |
| Below locks:               |       |                   |                                        |
| Bayfield Angle.....        | 25.0  | 22.7              | Boulders and clay.                     |
| Lake Nicolet.....          | 24.8  | 22.5              | Do.                                    |
| West Neebish:              |       |                   |                                        |
| Angles 5-6.....            | 24.8  | 22.3              | Ledge rock.                            |
| Angles 6-7.....            | 24.8  | 22.3              | Do.                                    |



EXHIBIT B—Continued

|                                         | Depth | Recom-<br>mended<br>draft | Material                 |
|-----------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| DOWN-BOUND—continued                    |       |                           |                          |
| Lower rivers:                           |       |                           |                          |
| Foot of Lake Huron.....                 | 25.5  | 22.6                      | Clay and stone.          |
| Lake St. Clair.....                     | 25.0  | 23.3                      | Soft.                    |
| Detroit River.....                      | 26.0  | 23.1                      | Boulders and clay.       |
| Livingstone Channel.....                | 26.0  | 23.5                      | Rock.                    |
| Livingstone Channel, lower.....         | 26.0  | 23.2                      | Boulders and rock.       |
| Channel to Lake Erie.....               | 26.0  | 23.1                      | Clay.                    |
| UP-BOUND                                |       |                           |                          |
| Detroit River: Amherstburg Channel..... | 21.0  | 18.0                      | Ledge rock and boulders. |
| St. Marys River:                        |       |                           |                          |
| Sailors Encampment.....                 | 21.0  | 18.5                      | Do.                      |
| Dike Course.....                        | 21.0  | 18.5                      | Do.                      |

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with the table, I call attention to the fact that in at least half the channels the bottom is ledge rock. It is one thing to dredge mud, it is one thing to dredge sand, and it is another thing to remove rock. In the St. Marys River, where there is a depth of 25½ feet, adequate to accommodate a ship of 23-foot draft, if there is ledge rock underneath, removing the ledge rock to make the channel deeper involves a heavy expense.

The table shows some present depths that Mr. Sabin considers would be a safe draft for a ship in these channels, and the type of bottom. I introduced this table because I particularly want to show that in many cases ledge rock must be removed in order to increase the depths of channels. In order to do this the expense of deepening is obviously greatly increased over mere dredging.

I have gone at considerable length into the question of channels and harbors of the Great Lakes. If they should be improved, and certainly they must be if this project becomes a reality, let us face the cost and let us find out just what we are talking about. Let us find out how much of this bill will be paid by private industry, the States, the cities, and the Federal Government. What may the cost be? Frankly, I do not know. I do not believe that anyone does. But the testimony of the Brookings Institution Report in 1929 includes a provision for the improvement of harbor and port facilities in the amount of \$250,000,000 and a provision for the improvement of the lake channels in the amount of \$90,000,000. That is the Brookings Institution Report made in 1929 based on costs as of that time.

These are 1929 figures, yet this reputable organization believed at that time it would cost more to improve the channels and harbors and port facilities than it would to improve the St. Lawrence River. They placed the figure for improvements on the river at \$257,000,000. We all know that costs have at least doubled since that time. Naturally, there have been improvements in both channels and harbor facilities since that time, but the Brookings Institution says:

There are at least 10 lake cities which would have to be included in the plan of harbor and port development, if the route were to serve adequately the commercial interests of Canada and the United States. They are the two upper lake ports, Fort William-Port Arthur and Duluth-Superior, and Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo,

Cleveland, Buffalo, Toronto, and Kingston. We believe that the cost of meeting the minimum requirements in the way of harbor improvements, port facilities, and terminal organizations would reach \$250,000,000 for each of these cities, if they are to become ocean ports in any sense of the word. This would make a total cost of \$250,000,000 for the 10 cities mentioned. To develop the lake ports to a point where they could handle the volume of commerce that is contemplated by the proponents of the project would undoubtedly require expenditures vastly in excess of this sum. (Improvement of lake harbors would, of course, also have advantages for purely lake shipping.)

Now, let me give the viewpoint of just one city. Mr. Elmer S. Stengall, assistant counsel of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., testified:

Our department of public works made a survey of the cost of adapting the port facilities of Buffalo to the requirements of vessels of 27-foot draft instead of the 21 feet which they are now designed for. Based upon 1941 prices that cost was approximately \$47,000,000.

If in 1941 the improvements for Buffalo were figured at \$47,000,000, it is obvious they are more than that today. I could go on quoting figures, both actual and theoretical, but I hope I have said enough to give an indication that the total cost of channel, harbor, and docking improvements to make the Great Lakes capable of handling oceangoing traffic is tremendous. The annual upkeep, too, will be vastly greater than it is today. I sincerely believe that an up-to-date study of this whole question of depths of channels and harbors is another reason why this resolution should not pass at this time.

#### I SHOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THE CAPACITY OF THE WELLAND CANAL LOCKS AND SEAWAY

The majority report in section K deals with the capacity of the seaway. There has been much discussion on this point, and many confusing figures have been stated. Without discussing the merits and demerits of these various figures, it seems to me that there clearly is a basis for determining quite accurately the eventual capacity of the seaway on account of the limiting factor of the various locks not only in the seaway but in the Welland Canal. I feel that this point should be cleared by an up-to-date 1948 survey before we are asked to pass this resolution.

The capacity stated in terms of tons of cargo of any given lock naturally depends on the average size of the cargo

in the vessels that go through it. The majority report states:

The Canadian Government estimates the theoretical capacity of the Welland Canal as 72,000,000 tons on the assumption of uniform offering of traffic during the season of navigation and 10,000 tons of cargo per vessel. The practical capacity on the basis of present conditions of navigation, they estimate at 30,000,000 to 35,000,000.

There is one big "but" in that figure. The channels of the seaway would not accommodate an oceangoing vessel capable of carrying 10,000 tons. Unquestionably, it would accommodate a boat similar in construction to a lake freighter capable of carrying such tonnage. On the other hand, in the Panama Canal the average load per oceangoing vessel from 1939 to 1946, inclusive, largely war years, was just under 5,000 tons. If this figure held true for the Welland Canal, how many boats could go through, taking the proponents' figures of 240 days as the average season of navigation? I am told there is a limiting factor of 28 to the number of lockages in any 24 hours in the Welland Canal. Accepting these figures, there will be 6,720 lockages during the season. The Army engineers estimate that 1.3 vessels are handled per lockage. This will permit 8,736 boats to pass through the canal. In 1945 it was testified that 6,291 vessels went through the Welland Canal. Five thousand one hundred and fourteen of these were Canadian. These vessels are engaged in traffic between the other Lakes and Lake Ontario, and between all the Lakes and the 14-foot canal in the St. Lawrence. It appears obvious that a very careful study should be made as to what would happen to these vessels if the seaway is built. How many of them are going to continue in business and how many will be displaced due to the building of the seaway?

A letter which I received from Mr. L. C. Sabin dated January 19, 1948, states:

The Corps of Engineers estimated the practical capacity of the Welland Canal at 25,000,000 tons, which is believed to be about right.

If 25,000,000 tons are to come through the seaway and the average load is 5,000 tons, this would use up 5,000 of the theoretical number of boats to pass through and leave additional space for about 60 percent of the vessels which used it in 1945.

I readily admit some of the figures I have given are theory, but others of them are cold facts. It seems to me perfectly reasonable to ask this question: Why cannot we have a thorough, up-to-date study to substitute reasonable facts for questionable guesses before we start to build the seaway and before we start to negotiate the tolls which are supposed to liquidate the seaway?

Mr. President, I should like to take up shipowners' comments.

I come now to the perfectly logical question: What do the leading American shipowners think about the seaway?

On May 8, last year, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] inserted in the RECORD letters from 32 large American steamship companies in response to an inquiry addressed to them by the late

Senator Bailey, former chairman of the Committee on Commerce. Senator Bailey's letter had asked these steamship companies whether they expected to utilize the seaway if it were built and what they generally thought of the entire project.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to finish the paragraph on shipowners' comments.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to wait.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The results of this inquiry are, in my opinion, extremely interesting and revealing. Thirty companies which operate oceangoing commercial vessels expressed strong opposition to the seaway project and said that their vessels would not use the seaway, even if it were constructed. One company said their vessels would use the seaway and another said it was unable to form an opinion on the matter.

To bring their reactions up to date, I recently wrote these same companies to ask them if they had changed their views from those expressed in their previous letters to Senator Bailey. To date I have received 22 letters and not one company has changed its mind. I do not intend to read these 22 replies to my letter, but because they seem so important I do wish at this point to insert them in the RECORD. My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] has already inserted in the RECORD the replies to the late Senator Bailey, so I shall not insert those letters, as I had originally intended.

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

#### EXHIBIT C

BOSTON, MASS., October 14, 1947.

DEAR SIR: On May 8 of this year Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, read into the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from you dated March 21, 1946, in reply to a letter from the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey concerning the St. Lawrence seaway.

As I expect this project will come up for debate on the floor of the Senate early in 1948, I am endeavoring to secure as much up-to-date material as I can.

I opposed the navigational features of it before the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee this spring, and shall continue to oppose them.

I would appreciate it very much if you would let me know if your views have changed from those expressed in your letter. I would also be much interested in anything further which you care to add.

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.,  
Cleveland, Ohio, October 17, 1947.

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Upon receipt of your letter of October 15, we have reviewed our letter of March 28, 1946, to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey. Our views have not changed from those expressed in that letter.

During the past year and a half additional information has been prepared and presented by the Lake Carriers Association before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We are familiar with this informa-

tion and are in accord with the opinions they have presented.

Very truly yours,

ELTON HOYT 2d,  
President.

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM &  
TRANSPORT CO., INC.,  
New York, October 20, 1947.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I have your letter of October 14 and wish to advise that the opinions which I expressed on behalf of my company on March 21, 1946, to the Honorable Josiah W. Bailey, United States Senator, are still the same. The objections which we raised to the St. Lawrence seaway are still pertinent and the figures quoted as to limitation of draft, etc., have not been changed, to my knowledge.

While it is true that the T-2 tanker will undoubtedly be the standard tanker insofar as petroleum-carrying ships is concerned, for a number of years to come, we can add that the trend is even more pronounced today, to build larger and deeper draft tankers. The possible necessity of moving crude oil from Near East ports on the Mediterranean within the next few years will undoubtedly increase the tendency to construct tankers of greater cargo-carrying capacity and higher speeds than even T-2's. This will militate still further against possibility of using the projected St. Lawrence seaway for the carriage of oil in oceangoing tankers.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. PATTERSON,  
Vice President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,  
Boston, Mass., October 28, 1947.

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have received your letter of October 15 relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project. I am only coming into the office occasionally and am very remiss in answering my correspondence.

I still entertain the views expressed in my letter which was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have no additional observations to make at this time, but if any occur to me I will write you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM K. JACKSON.

STOCKARD STEAMSHIP CORP.,  
New York, N. Y., October 17, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Re the St. Lawrence seaway, the views expressed in my letter of March 15, 1946, have not changed. Should I have anything to add, I shall be glad to communicate with you at a later date.

Yours faithfully,

L. N. STOCKARD,  
President.

SEATRAN LINES, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., November 11, 1947.  
The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: With reference to your letter of October 14, 1947, this is to advise that we have not changed our views with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Yours very truly,

GRAHAM M. BRUSH.

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN STEAMSHIP CORP.,  
New York, N. Y., October 28, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR: I have to excuse myself for the delay in answering your letter of October 14. I had to attend a hearing in Wash-

ington and also wanted to give you all the information which might be useful for your purposes.

Rereading the letter I wrote to Senator Josiah W. Bailey, I cannot change my opinion that, from the standpoint of our national shipping industry, the projected investment in the St. Lawrence seaway is uneconomical, and even against the interests of our national shipping. All larger vessels, and especially the combined passenger and cargo vessels, would be excluded from the advantage, if there is such an advantage, of using the new seaway. Because of their drafts, passenger vessels particularly are forced to use New York for the embarkation of passengers.

Tremendous capital is invested in the ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, for dock facilities and equipment for handling cargo, and our shipping companies can neither spend additional money to provide adequate service in lake ports to be used for half the year only, nor can new enterprises, intending to use the new traffic facility, expect that their investment will carry interest and depreciation if used half of the year only.

I don't believe that the saving in ocean freight will amount to more than one or two dollars per ton, considering the unavoidable expenses when using the approximately 1,000 miles of inland waterways. Exact figures would have to be obtained to get the correct picture, but as a rough estimate I would say that at least \$20,000,000 would be required to cover annual navigation expenses, and I also estimate that if 5,000,000 tons will be shipped on this waterway either the Government or the shipper of the cargo has to figure \$4 per ton expenses. Every dollar may count when shipping bulk cargo, like grain and ore, but for finished goods with their higher sales value, the convenience of using the New York facilities and connections may be more important than the possible freight saving. The biggest exporters of finished goods from the Great Lakes, the automobile industry, start the sale and shipping of their new models usually in the fall and stock up their foreign dealers during the winter season, just at the time when the new waterway would be closed by ice.

All points considered, I believe that the new seaway would be mostly used by foreign operators, who are not handicapped by heavy investments in our national seaports. Since American operators are already working against the great odds of higher operating expenses, an extension of the sailing distance by a thousand miles would only raise this handicap in proportion and mean stiffer competition in the fight to keep as much American tonnage on the oceans as possible.

Of course, I don't know what advantages could be derived from the seaway by other industries and by consumers, but such advantages would have to be substantial to offset the damage done without doubt to our national shipping.

I am gratified to see that you will put up a fight in the interest of American shipping, and if I can be of any further assistance to you I will be very glad if you will call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN,  
President.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP CO.,  
New York, N. Y., October 21, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: We thank you for your letter of October 15, 1947, with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway.

As we are still opposed to this project, our views are unchanged.

Yours very truly,

MORRIS MALKIN,  
President.



STRACHAN SHIPPING Co.,  
Savannah, Ga., October 16, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
United States Senate,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Your letter of October 14 has been received.

My views on the St. Lawrence seaway are the same today as expressed in my letter to Senator Bailey dated March 19, 1946, and I don't think there is anything I can add at the moment.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. GROVES,  
Partner, Strachan Shipping Co.

COLONIAL NAVIGATION Co.,  
New York, N. Y., October 21, 1947.  
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Answering your letter of October 7 concerning the St. Lawrence seaway, please be advised we are still opposed to this seaway and our views are the same as expressed in our letter of April 4, 1946, to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey.

Very truly yours,

J. B. DUNBAUGH,  
President.

EASTERN STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,  
Boston, Mass., November 3, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I wish to reply to your letter of October 14, referring to mine of May 8, 1946, to Senator OVERTON regarding the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

We have not changed our views, and very strongly oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project as uneconomical and unsound from the standpoint of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. SHARP,  
President.

LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP Co., INC.,  
New York, N. Y., October 30, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Reply to your letter of October 15 was delayed owing to my absence from the city.

Our shipping interests are almost exclusively from our Gulf area. It has seemed to us that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would adversely affect such interests. For that reason, we have been and still are opposed to this proposed development. Unquestionably the fulfillment of the proposals would have considerable effect on the heretofore normal transportation from a considerable area within this country.

I am not writing you in detail as no doubt you already have a great volume of material submitted by varied interested parties.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH T. LYKES.

AMERICAN SOUTH AFRICAN LINE, INC.,  
New York, October 27, 1947.  
The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Senator From Massachusetts,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Your letter of October 14 arrived just at the time I was leaving to attend the National Foreign Trade Convention in St. Louis. I, therefore, wish to express my regrets at not having replied to it prior to this date.

In my letter last March, to Senator Bailey, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, I informed him that the St. Lawrence project, if completed, would be of no economic service to American South African Line, as the draft of the channel was such that our deep-draft vessels could not use the St. Lawrence seaway. I also pointed out that I did not consider it economically feasible to construct special-type American vessels which could use the sea-

way during the approximately 7 months of the year when it would be safe for navigation, as these ships would be too expensive for operation during the balance of the year. I also pointed out the risks of navigation to any vessels using the channel.

Since my letter to Senator Bailey, my views have not changed, and my former position is still the same, namely, that even if the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, American South African Line would not be justified, from an economical view, in using it.

I thank you for this opportunity to permit me to express my views on this proposed seaway. I also appreciate the efforts you and my other able friends in the Senate and House have expended in opposing this project.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. FARRELL, Jr.

GRACE LINE, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., October 15, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of October 15 in which you refer to a letter which I wrote on March 21, 1946, to the late Senator Josiah H. Bailey, concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. Nothing whatever has transpired since I wrote the above-mentioned letter to alter in any way my views regarding the St. Lawrence seaway. In that letter I referred to a building program then in progress for Grace Line. That program was subsequently amplified and completed. Grace Line now owns 25 fine new ships, not one of which could safely navigate the proposed seaway without leaving unfilled some 15 or 20 percent of their cargo capacity.

I am pleased to reiterate to you in every particular the views expressed in my letter to the late Senator Bailey.

Respectfully yours,

R. R. ADAMS,  
President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Last fall I also wrote to other shipping companies, not included in the list replying to Senator Bailey, to ask if they considered the project practical and warranted from a purely navigational viewpoint. I should like to quote a few of these replies.

Mr. J. S. Slater, of the American Export Lines, writes:

Based upon the facts at our disposal, we would not plan to operate ships via this seaway because we believe it would be uneconomical to do so.

Mr. Thomas Host, of Moller Steamship Co., Inc., says:

It is our view that the proposed seaway will not be of material value to the United States' movements, but will rather cause severe dislocation and temporary unemployment of types of labor that are not easily employable at other tasks.

Mr. E. A. Roberts, of Waterman Steamship Corp., writes:

I very seriously doubt we would consider using the seaway except in isolated cases. To begin with, navigation would be restricted to approximately 6 months out of the year, and one certainly could not establish a regular steamship operation based on 6 months' navigation.

Just to quote one more letter, Mr. W. B. Terhune, of the Black Diamond Steamship Corp., said:

We are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and if same is constructed, we would not consider the operation of vessels via the St. Lawrence to Great Lakes ports.

The tenor of the other letters is very similar, and I request permission to have

them printed at this point in my remarks.

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

BOSTON, MASS., October 6, 1947.

DEAR SIR: During the next session of Congress, as you no doubt know, the so-called St. Lawrence seaway will come up for debate in the Senate, hearings having been held in the last session.

As an operator of oceangoing ships, I would appreciate very much your opinion and views as to the practicality of the proposed seaway. Do you consider the project warranted from a purely navigational viewpoint? (The power aspects, of course, are another question.) If the seaway were built, would you plan to operate your ships over it?

I appeared before the committee which heard the evidence in May and June of this year. I opposed the navigational features because I felt that such data as was available clearly did not justify the expenditure of several hundred millions of dollars. Also, speaking as a Massachusetts Senator, I was convinced that it can only be of detriment to the port of Boston.

Before the Congress reconvenes, I am endeavoring to collect as much data concerning the seaway as I can and would appreciate very much any thoughts which you care to give me.

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

SHEPARD STEAMSHIP Co.,  
Boston, Mass., October 28, 1947.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of October 7 which was delayed on account of the writer's absence on the Pacific coast, and also to the fact that we have been trying to gather some information in regard to this subject of the St. Lawrence waterway, one of the principal things the writer has learned in talking with a former United States engineer is that the expense will only start for the country as a whole when the waterway is put through. He states that about all the ports on the Great Lakes—probably all of them—will have to be dredged a good deal deeper and additional facilities will have to be put in if they are to handle large amounts of traffic to go through the St. Lawrence, that none of them are deep enough to take care of seagoing vessels. The total cost seems to be out of proportion to the benefits to come to certain sections of the country only.

New England would be decidedly left out, particularly the ports of Boston and Portland. These would be very heavily damaged if a large amount of the business was diverted to the St. Lawrence.

Referring to the Shepard Steamship Line to South America, we doubt very much if we would want to run that line up the St. Lawrence unless we positively had to at any rate, as it would require a larger number of additional steamships than we now have, and the turn-around would be so very much longer that it is a question whether we could make rates that would very much beat the railroads, and still find them remunerative.

It seems to us that perhaps this whole project is more for the benefit of Canada than anybody else. It would perhaps divert a considerable amount of traffic through the St. Lawrence River, from which, they would, of course, pick up considerable benefit one way or another. It looks as though we would largely have to pay for it, and it seems to the writer we are in no position at all to pay a whole lot of additional expense that would not be of benefit to us, particularly at this time in view of the Marshall plan and our finances in general. Certainly increased taxes would be entirely impractical and

damaging to the country. A great deal of the trouble with Great Britain is her very high taxes which have strangled industry. Unless I am misinformed, in many cases taxes have taken all the increased earnings that anybody could make from installing modern up-to-date machinery, so they just have not installed it. We certainly do not want to pattern ourselves on the English situation, and strangle industry here with additional taxes.

Of course, also this would be a very serious blow to the railroads in the northeastern part of the United States. We could hardly afford to lose the large amount of traffic that would be diverted by the St. Lawrence waterway. If a very large amount was not diverted, why the waterway would be absolutely useless. This would very likely put a number of our railroads here in considerable trouble. Facilities would have to be kept here for winter service, the St. Lawrence only being in service for part of the year, and we would not have use enough to make them profitable. This certainly is a very bad feature. It would probably leave dock service in Boston, New York, and even other places to be run at a loss. It would mean that the docks would gradually go into disrepair and deterioration.

Yours sincerely,

SHEPARD STEAMSHIP CO.,  
T. H. SHEPARD, President.

ISBRANDTSEN CO., INC.,  
New York, N. Y., October 18, 1947.

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I refer to your letter of October 6 relative to the proposed enlargement of the St. Lawrence seaway. It will be understood, of course, that I cannot deal therewith sufficiently in a few lines, but I will try to answer your letter very briefly. Therefore, with respect to your second paragraph—if the seaway is put in a way to accommodate large ships that enlargement presumably will be made to make the proposed seaway practicable from a navigational viewpoint.

And would we operate our ships over it? I suppose we would have to. There is, as we know, about 1,000 miles to navigate on the Lakes say from Chicago to Montreal. From Montreal to Liverpool there is 2,760 miles and from New York to Liverpool 3,066 so the additional net from navigating from the Lakes would be about 700 miles and that isn't insurmountable from a practical point of view. Navigation on the Lakes is somewhat slower—locking is slower—but presumably that would not be a major objection.

The people out there—many of whom would get a living from the direct shipping on the seaway are, of course, in favor of it. Another important matter is that the port facilities here in the East—certainly insofar as New York is concerned—have not been improved in the manner they should have been and may now be considered behind the procession. We get good service in Baltimore, are subject to much expense in New York, and Boston is also an expensive place. These expenses, while to a large extent paid by the steamships, must be passed on to the freight, so the people there in the Middle West figure that charges are getting too high on their freight and they want the direct service.

It seems to me that the eastern facilities should be reconsidered and overhauled here first before the country spends all of this money on the seaway, so as not to create or have two propositions neither of which are sufficiently efficient. The proposed seaway on account of the winter handicap is certainly not efficient and, as I mentioned above, the eastern ports are too expensive for the country's freight.

That's the best answer I can condense in this much and give to you now.

Sincerely yours,

HANS ISBRANDTSEN.

P. S.—If a new export port or district was created here on the Atlantic which could do a good job, that probably would be the best way to spend whatever money we have to spend on new export and import facilities.

HOLLAND-AMERICA LINE,  
New York, October 8, 1947.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of October 6 I must advise you that as representative of a foreign steamship company which enjoys the hospitality of the United States, I have always made it a point that I cannot in my official capacity give my opinion on matters relating to legislation to be passed in Congress.

My personal reaction as an American citizen to the St. Lawrence seaway is that I believe it to be an unwarranted expenditure from a navigational standpoint. As a resident of the city of New York I am opposed to it, as it is my belief that it will seriously harm the port of New York.

The port of New York is embarking on a reconstruction program of its harbor facilities, involving many millions of dollars. Upon completion of same the facilities offered will be of such nature that present and future shipping needs can adequately be taken care of.

Yours very truly,

F. R. WIERDSMA.

STATES MARINE CORP.,  
New York, N. Y., October 10, 1947.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Referring to your letter of October 6 with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I do not consider the project warranted from a purely navigational viewpoint. If the seaway were built, we would have to consider any changes in our present method of operations that might then be necessary. What this might entail is somewhat difficult to foresee presently. However, there is no question but that the seaway would undoubtedly take considerable business away from the United States Atlantic ports during the open season, which would certainly create an unbalanced position.

It seems to me that from both a military and economic point of view that it would be unwise to open up our country further at this time.

If and when conditions change and our position as a Nation is such that foreign countries can again pay us for what they obtain from us and our Federal financial position justifies it and the military outlook is definitely clarified, we might give further consideration to the matter in the light of conditions prevailing at that time.

Meantime, from our viewpoint it seems prudent to forget it.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. MERCER,  
President.

INTERNATIONAL FREIGHTING CORP., INC.,  
New York, N. Y., October 24, 1947.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: We acknowledge receipt of your letter under date of October 7 addressed to Mr. F. N. Bowers, requesting his views on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, which will come up for debate at the next session of Congress.

For your information, Mr. Bowers is at present out of the country and is not expected to return until some time in December. Upon his return, however, we will bring this letter to his attention.

Sincerely yours,

F. L. URMSTON,  
Secretary to F. N. Bowers.

MOLLER STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,  
New York, N. Y., November 25, 1947.  
Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
United States Senator,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: We duly received your letter of October 3, and apologize for the delay in answering.

You ask for our opinion and views as to the practicality of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which we understand to be an intention to increase the present draft of the canals and locks from 14 feet to 27 feet, and to increase the size of the locks and of the canals sufficiently to allow vessels of sizable tonnage.

On this presumption it is our view that the proposed seaway will not be of material value to United States movements, but will rather cause severe dislocation and temporary unemployment of types of labor that are not easily employable at other tasks. We are presuming that it is not intended to attempt to navigate the waterway during the 12 months of the year, and we presume that it will be unsafe or at least unattractive for high-class ships from the middle of November to about the early part of May each year. During that period the present facilities on the Eastern seaboard with piers, tugs, barges, lighters, trucks, and stevedore labor will be required to the same extent as if the waterway did not exist. The railways to the eastern seaboard will be similarly taxed. However, after April 15 each year those functions should if the seaway attains its purpose move to ports on the Great Lakes. Those ports have not yet the pier facilities and the many complementary facilities that are required to handle large volumes of general cargo moving overseas. The labor is also not available and if it were made available it would receive employment only on a seasonal basis.

The main operations of this company include general cargo services to the Far East and to the European continent. The service to the Far East is our principal service. In that service vessels of about 9,000 tons dead weight and 27 feet draft are employed. They generally load at New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and when sufficient cargo offers at Boston. If these vessels were to load in the summer season also in the Great Lakes we would find it impractical to maintain a schedule because an additional amount of steaming involving at least 12 days' delay would be incurred.

A similar condition would prevail with services that proceed via the Panama Canal to Australia and New Zealand, and a quite comparable condition would prevail with services to the east and west coast of South America.

As for our transatlantic service the steaming from Detroit to Antwerp is 3,565 miles, compared with 3,378 nautical miles from New York. Taking into consideration the delay in passing through the locks and navigating in narrow waters, this would mean at least 2 days extra steaming on every voyage, and as it is hardly feasible to load the same ship both in the lakes and on the Atlantic seaboard, it would mean completely separate sailings. That, in turn, would require an organization in the Great Lakes area which would only be occupied on a seasonal basis, and this would hardly be a practical arrangement for us.



Apart from the foregoing considerations, there is the fact that the St. Lawrence River is not very desirable to navigate. Fogs are frequent and the ice risk always prevails early and late in the season. If in the late season a ship incurs delays or is subjected to an accident she is ice-locked until the coming spring. Because of the undesirable navigable features of the St. Lawrence it is always with reluctance that we send our better and bigger ships to that river, and when we do so it is generally only during the months of June, July, August, and September.

In answer to your direct question whether we would operate ships over the St. Lawrence seaway we would say that it does not seem practical for our present operations to do so. What competition might compel us to do is, of course, another matter.

In conclusion, we feel that we ought to state that this company is primarily concerned with the operation as general agents of Danish flag vessels. In doing so we feel that we are assisting the world in getting on its feet, because the only solution which we believe exists is for Europe and the rest of the world to earn its own way in dollars. This can only be done by exports to the United States or service to the United States. Ocean transportation is one of the principal ways in which foreign countries can at present earn dollars.

Always at your service, we remain,  
Yours very truly,

TH. HOST,  
President.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.,  
Mobile, Ala., October 18, 1947.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
United States Senate, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 15, and I am indeed pleased to hear from you again. I have followed your activities in the Congress with keen interest, and I only wish that we had more legislators like you.

In regard to the St. Lawrence waterway, it would take a considerable amount of time to give you my detailed views, because it would involve freight rates and sundry things, and I am not going to do that at this time, but will be very happy to do it if you think it would be of any real benefit. In general, I cannot conceive of our Government spending the amount of money necessary to complete this project in order to give deep-draught steamship service to the Great Lakes region. To me, we might just as well say that the Mississippi River should be dredged to a depth of 40 feet so as to make Memphis, St. Louis, and Chicago deep-water ports. The Tombigbee River here could just as well be dredged to make Birmingham a deep-water port, and so on throughout the country. Of course, these things could be done, but there is no possible way to justify the expenditure of any such sums of money when weighed against the advantages that would accrue.

You asked me whether or not we plan to operate our ships over the seaway if it be built. This is a very difficult question to answer, because it would depend on the competition; however, I very seriously doubt we would consider using the seaway except in isolated cases. To begin with, navigation would be restricted to approximately 6 months out of the year, and one certainly could not establish a regular steamship operation based on 6 months' navigation. As you, of course, know, to operate successfully at a port like, say, Chicago, proper terminals would have to be constructed and a large staff of people employed, not only in the offices, but on the docks. Just what we would do with these people when navigation was closed I do not know. In the circumstances, I am sure we might consider using the spillway in isolated cases, provided we could find someone to act as agent and proper

terminals and stevedoring facilities were available.

As I have said in the beginning, if you would like a detailed statement concerning the proposition I would be very happy to go into it, but, of course, it would take considerable time.

With all good wishes,  
Sincerely yours,

E. A. ROBERTS,  
Chairman of the Corporation.

BLACK DIAMOND STEAMSHIP CORP.,  
New York, N. Y., October 24, 1947.  
The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your letter of the 6th and the writer regrets not having replied to same at an earlier date. However, the delay was due to my prolonged absence from the office.

In connection with the second paragraph of your letter, and as an operator of American-flag tonnage, we are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and if same is constructed we would not consider the operation of vessels via the St. Lawrence to Great Lakes ports. As you are no doubt aware, there are numerous organizations opposed to this project. Considering the expenditure involved for the amount of commerce that might be derived therefrom, it would discriminate against the entire North Atlantic seaboard, including the port of Boston. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that if the seaway were constructed it would only be navigable about 7 months of the year and during the remaining 5 months any foreign commerce flowing from or to the territory served by it would again revert to the North Atlantic ports, which are now being adequately served the entire year by steamship lines operating to all parts of the world.

The question of the St. Lawrence seaway, ever since its proposal, has been the subject of discussion by many trade and commerce organizations and, without launching into detail, I believe the enclosed publications of the Buffalo Business, as well as the Inland Waterways Issue for March-April 1946, emphasizes the fact that many of the interior cities oppose the project as being unsound as well as uneconomical in many instances. I also believe the enclosed copy of address made by the vice president of the New York Maritime Association before several organizations outlines in detail the salient facts, not alone from a purely navigational standpoint but from the economical view as well.

While it is quite true that Mr. Callaghan's statement is based more or less on the effect it will have on the port of New York, the same remarks hold true of other North Atlantic ports.

We operate a regular weekly American-flag service between Boston and Antwerp, Belgium, and Rotterdam, Holland, and also serve all other major United States North Atlantic ports.

We hope the enclosed data, as well as the personal opinion expressed in this letter, will assist you in your opposing the issue when same comes up for debate at the next session of the Senate.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

W. B. TERHUNE.

COSMOPOLITAN SHIPPING CO., INC.,  
New York, October 31, 1947.  
Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I received in due time your letter of October 6 regarding the St. Lawrence seaway. From a steamship point of view I cannot see that it would be a practical undertaking. It would undoubtedly result in increased costs of ship operation and reduce shipping activities in North Atlantic ports.

This is also the sincere opinion of all shipping interests in North Atlantic ports after careful study by them in committee and on the various exchanges.

Sincerely yours,

GRANVILLE CONWAY.

AMERICAN EXPORT LINES, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., October 9, 1947.  
The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of October 6 with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Speaking entirely from a navigational viewpoint, since I do not have information on the power aspects sufficient to justify an opinion, I do not believe the waterway is warranted. It has been amply demonstrated that the cost of handling this type of cargo to the Atlantic by other means, and particularly by the Great Lakes transport systems, is far less expensive than would be possible with a normal ocean-going vessel.

Based upon the facts at our disposal, we would not plan to operate ships via this seaway because we believe it would be uneconomical to do so.

Very truly yours,

J. E. SLATER,  
Executive Vice President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I quote these letters because I believe the opinion of the men who manage and sail our ocean-going steamships is of tremendous value. They are in the business of making money from the movement of cargo. Is it not reasonable to assume that if they believed this seaway would open up greater potentialities for their business they would be in favor of it?

I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have my good friend from Massachusetts give me an answer on one or two points.

Is it not true that the ship companies which the Senator has just cited in his speech have at the present time large investments running into huge sums of money, in some instances many million dollars, in docks, wharves, and terminals at various ports on the east coast and on the Gulf coast?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should assume that to be true. I should also assume that there are not as many ships now possessed by ship companies as there were before the war, because many of them were sunk. I think many ships now operating belong to the United States Government.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator's answer is that the steamship companies which he is now citing as being in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway are steamship companies whose investment is already made so far as docks, freight terminals, and wharves are concerned in existing ports on the east coast and in the Gulf?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should assume so.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator, who is a lawyer, will understand, I am simply seeking to ask a series of questions to qualify his witnesses, or, at least, to bring out their qualifications.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was curious to know where the Senator was leading.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator to be absolutely sure where I am leading.

Does the Senator think it would be unfair to assume that if the St. Lawrence seaway were constructed there would be at least some competition provided through the St. Lawrence seaway for steamship companies which already have huge investments in transportation facilities at the various ports on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I sincerely answer the Senator's question when I say that I do not think so, and for the reason, without going fully into the matter, unless the Senator asks me to do so, that the average oceangoing steamer that can use a canal with a 27-foot depth will have a 23-foot draft, and be capable of carrying approximately 5,000 tons of cargo.

The whole business of offshore shipping has had to be speeded up to compete and to be profitable, because of the high cost of doing business ashore and the high operating costs of ships. I am told by a steamship company—and I received this information, not as a Senator, but formerly, when I was Governor—that 35 percent of the time of a dry-cargo ship is spent in port. The necessity of making a ship operate profitably requires that the time it spends in dock be cut down, because that is wasted time—the ship is not going anywhere, it is not earning any money. The whole tendency today is to increase the size of ships and give them a speed as much as 19 knots. The Victory ship I think goes 15 knots, and with another type of engine goes a little better than that. The Liberty ship will make 11½ knots. A profitable cargo ship today has to make 19 knots, and, as the President's Commission recommends, has to have a minimum draft of 19 feet 9 inches.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his statement, and I want to be sure I understand its implications. Am I to understand that the position of the Senator from Massachusetts is that if the St. Lawrence seaway shall be built there will be no cargo at all that will be transported through that seaway in competition with any of the other steamship companies?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no. I think the cargoes may be carried by lake carriers which would transfer their cargo at Montreal, and we would build up the port of Montreal with the lake carriers, because the cargo would then have to be transferred to deeper draft vessels.

Mr. MORSE. Bearing upon the purpose of my questioning, which I have very fairly pointed out to the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, the interest, if any, these steamship companies may have as special pleaders in the testimony in their behalf which the Senator has put into the Record, I wish to ask this question: Does the Senator feel that there is any basis at all for the inference that the testimony of these steamship companies may have at least some bearing upon their selfish, economic interests?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would assume that obviously they may be motivated by a selfish interest. I would not expect it to be otherwise. What we have to consider, unless we want to turn completely over to the Government the business of freight ships, is that the shipping interests are continuing in and proceeding

with the business. We do not want to put them out of business. We want to have them continue to operate, we want to have them continue to operate the ships in the United States merchant marine. Naturally their interest is selfish, and that is why I cited it.

Mr. MORSE. I merely want to bring out in the Record what interest they may have, so that no one may make the mistake of assuming that the testimony of these shipping companies was without a selfish motivation, at least to some degree. That leads me to ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator agree with me that that does not necessarily mean that they are untruthful?

Mr. MORSE. Most special pleaders really believe their contentions, but those of us who sit in an impartial position of judgment have to weigh their motivation against all the facts in the record, as we find and see the facts. That is the only point I care to make.

As I said in my brief remarks on the seaway a few days ago, I am going to seek only to judge the question before the Senate from the standpoint of what I honestly believe to be the national interest, not a sectional interest. I believe the national interest supports the seaway.

The last question I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts is whether or not he agrees with me that if the seaway is built, and competition does develop on the seaway against the present shipping practices of the shipping companies he has cited as witnesses in his excellent address, those very steamship companies in a short period of time will be building their transportation facilities along the seaway in order to carry out the good old American practice of free competition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I answer the Senator's question in this way: Any new companies that are started with new ships which are built in such a way that they can go through the seaway and also use the ocean, can use the seaway only for seven and a fraction months a year. That would mean that these companies would have to establish terminal facilities, and build up their local personnel, for use a little more than 7 months in the year. That is a difficulty which will come if they are to use oceangoing ships and expect them to traverse the seaway.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator most respectfully, because I think he knows the very high opinion I have of him and for his views, that I have heard similar arguments in regard to other issues in the past presented by witnesses having a special interest in blocking a development which some might think was in the national interest. I have always noticed that when the development is finally completed, be it a great power dam, be it a roadway, or be it any other great utility which will serve for the benefit of all the people, the very ones who testified against it as businessmen, trying to block it in the first instance, always came forward to take advantage of the economic fruits that grew from it once it was constructed. I think that will be true with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway on the part of the very steamship

companies which the Senator from Massachusetts is now citing as witnesses against the project.

I thank the Senator very much for the courtesy which he always extends to me when he and I share a difference of opinion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon heard my very brief remarks on the power side of the issue and on the national defense feature. What I am now discussing is the commercial phase. We believe in private industry going ahead and making a profit in its business if it is possible to make a profit. That is all in the interest of our country, and the system of living which we have in the United States.

When the Senator distinguishes the national interest as opposed to the straight commercial interest, he has to bring in the power question and the national-defense question. So far as the power question is concerned, I am in favor of the power phase of the seaway if the cost question and question of administration can be determined. So far as national defense is concerned, in the interest of all the people of the Nation, I believe the same good can be accomplished at a much lower cost by building up facilities which can be utilized 12 months in the year. I will not argue that now.

So far as the commercial interests, what we are now discussing, are concerned, I am merely pointing out that the present steamship companies, operated under the flag of the United States, have testified that they will not use this seaway. If our system of government is to continue on the basis of private industry as we know it, we have to build up new private companies, or we have to persuade existing companies to use the seaway.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator's remarks very attentively, except for the few minutes I have been called out of the Chamber, and I heard the discussion to which he has just alluded. I respectfully disagree, however, with the conclusions he has reached, because I think the project is very much in the national interest, and I am satisfied that once the seaway is built it will be found that the steamship companies which are now opposed to it will take advantage of all the profit-making they can gain out of the seaway in competition with the new competition the seaway itself will create. I think it is desirable to get as many competitors as possible in our transportation system.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Oregon to some facts in the record which bear out, I think conclusively, what he has assumed will be the situation once the seaway is completed. I contend it is not necessary that the seaway be opened in order to have a demonstration of what will happen, because of the fact that a 14-foot channel now exists and is used.



I read from the statement made by John C. Beukema, secretary and acting chairman of the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission, which appears on pages 130 and 131 of the hearings. He testified that in 1933, which was one of the toughest years in American economic history, the city of Muskegon improved its port facilities by building a \$2,000,000 wharf. But here is the point I desired to bring out. He stated:

When the Senate defeated the treaty by failure to secure the necessary two-thirds vote, we naturally had a problem before us. After negotiating with some of the American lines, we got in touch with the Norwegians—the Fjell Line. They came in, in 1935, with one ship. At the time the war broke out the Fjell Line had 17 ships in service. They were these little ships capable of navigating the St. Lawrence canals, drawing less than 14 feet of water.

They were ocean ships, Mr. President, and I shall have something to say about the size of ocean ships later. This is an official of the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission speaking:

We had regular sailings every 2 weeks to north European ports—Antwerp, Rotterdam, London, Liverpool, Oslo, Malmo, and other ports. In 1938 the Oranje Line—that is the Holland-Dutch Line—came in with four ships. We were negotiating with the Poles, the Swedes, the Belgians, and the French for additional facilities when the war broke out. Now that the war is over, our dock people have made arrangements with the Fjell Line to come in this year with five ships. Their old fleet was largely sunk and destroyed. A conference composed of the Thorden, Swedish-American, and the Swedish-American-Mexico Lines are coming in with nine ships. We understand the program will become effective immediately after the united maritime agreement terminates in March. Swedish-American is developing a special ship to navigate these present 14-foot canals, that will carry 2,900 tons to Montreal, lighter 500 tons at that port, and navigate the St. Lawrence Canal with 2,400 tons. Obviously, we would like to see the seaway opened so that our own Victory ships, and Liberty ships, and other American-flag ships can come in the service.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that much of the argument which has been developed by my distinguished and lovable friend from Massachusetts has gone completely out to sea. If foreign lines will contract to build ships to the tune of 17 or 18, or more, to use a 14-foot canal because the traffic justifying their use exists, because the economic heart of America can use them for shipping its goods, what will happen when we have a 25-foot channel or a 30-foot channel? The question answers itself.

Mr. President, Boston was not built by people who were fearful or doubtful. The people of that city had faith in its future when they built it. Faneuil Hall stands as a symbol of men who had courage to build, who did not hesitate, who did not quibble over whether a penny should be spent here, or a nickel there, but who knew that whatever was expended upon the building of that city was justified. All those men asked was "Are we doing right?", and if they were convinced they were doing right they did not hesitate to act.

On the point of whether the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is feasible in connection with our national self-

defense, I call attention to a letter written by Secretary Patterson on February 16, 1946, which appears in the committee report, Secretary Marshall's statement made on this subject on May 28, 1947, which appears in the hearings, the testimony of Secretary of the Army Royall on May 29, 1947, which appears in the hearings, and the conclusion of the Joint Board of Defense which also appears in the hearings. They all bear out the contention that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is of extreme importance in case the United States should ever again become involved in war.

I wish to thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts for having yielded to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall reply to the Senator from Wisconsin very briefly in this way: In the first place, I should like to state, as I know, and as I think he knows, that Secretary of the Army Royall's testimony was not very emphatic in favor of building the seaway for defense purposes. Furthermore, in talking about a 14-foot canal for ships that now make use of the 14-foot canal, I should like to point out that five-sixths of them are now owned by Canada, and had to be sold by American owners because we could not operate them in competition with the Canadians.

Furthermore, all the ships the Senator speaks of that used the canal this year—and I believe there were 9 Dutch ships and 3 Norwegian ships—draw less than 14 feet, and are used in the coastal trade, and carry a very negligible portion of the cargoes transported through the seaway at the present time.

#### POTENTIAL TRAFFIC OF THE SEAWAY AND EXPECTED SAVINGS

Nowhere in the documentation of the St. Lawrence seaway project over the past 20 years do we run into such detailed, confusing, and self-contradictory figures, based on so many assumptions and intangibles, as we find in the consideration of potential tonnage that would move over the seaway and how much savings will result therefrom.

In 1948, as we look at these two all-important factors in considering whether the seaway will pay its own way, it is significant to note what Dr. N. R. Danielian, vice president of the National St. Lawrence Association, told the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee last July. He said:

The latest extensive traffic study was undertaken by the Department of Commerce, and the results were public in part 3 of the St. Lawrence survey reports in 1941.

Part 3 of the 1941 Commerce Department survey made a study of 17 different commodities which presumably would be transported over the seaway. It comes up with a total of 4,500,000 tons on which there will be a saving of between eighteen and twenty million dollars in transportation charges. Other commodities were omitted from this study, and the survey, on page 36, went on to say:

If we were to add to our estimates the commodities that were omitted from our specific studies, and the increased trade that would be created as a result of cheap trans-

portation, it is not improbable that actual American traffic within a reasonable period will be as much as 10,000,000 tons, with a potential saving of at least \$36,000,000 in transportation costs.

This 10,000,000-ton figure has been accepted in the past as a conservative figure. Dr. Danielian directed that study, and proponents have necessarily looked upon this survey as the most factual and exhaustive study of potential traffic and savings. Since that report was published, the figures on potential traffic and savings have been greatly increased and, I think, exaggerated.

In 1948 Dr. Danielian reestimated the traffic potentialities of the seaway with "greater regard to the broader developments of the future." He predicted a total of 31,700,000 tons of traffic and estimated the total revenue, based on the toll charges as provided in the resolution, in the neighborhood of \$21,000,000 a year. At the same hearings last July Secretary of Commerce Harriman stated that the seaway's traffic capacity under optimum conditions might range in the future anywhere from thirty-eight to fifty-two million tons and placed the total toll revenues at from fifteen to thirty-one million dollars. It is particularly significant, I think, that Secretary Harriman, in submitting the above figures, warned the committee that—

The Department has not yet made a detailed analysis of potential traffic on the seaway. My subsequent comments on traffic which might use the seaway must accordingly be considered as only very rough estimates rather than conclusions resulting from careful study.

Finally the 1947 Commerce Department Industry Report, page 70, says:

With specific reference to the traffic estimates on ore, coal, and grain of from forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons, it appears likely that the seaway should be able to handle such a volume.

In spite of these changing estimates, many students of the waterway still stand by the original Army engineers' estimate of 25,000,000 tons for expected traffic of combined United States and Canadian trade. Now how does that figure stand up?

This 25,000,000-ton total includes the 9,000,000 tons of traffic which at the time of the original estimates was moving over the 14-foot channel, and I know of no study that has been made indicating how much of this 9,000,000 tons will continue to use the canal or how much will be picked up in through traffic. So, actually, we are talking about 16,000,000 tons, as no one can honestly hold that the existing traffic is a new factor. Another prime consideration is how much of this 16,000,000 tonnage claimed will be American and how much will be Canadian.

Senator WHITE, in his minority report written in 1946 on Senate Joint Resolution 104, gave his appraisal on potential traffic guesswork in this paragraph:

As of this time freight moving on the Lakes through existing St. Lawrence canals is about 9,000,000 tons annually, and Canada furnishes approximately two-thirds of this. The departments of Government and others who seemingly would build this waterway without adequate consideration of economic

need or economic consequences look for 25,000,000 tons in 10 years' time, of which 10,000,000 will be new United States tonnage. If we accept for the sake of argument that there will be 25,000,000, and that of this 10,000,000 will be new American, this means that about 13,000,000 of that total will be United States traffic and 12,000,000 Canadian traffic; that is, slightly over one-half will be the United States part of the total traffic. \* \* \* But there is nothing in the record to justify such optimism as to any such volume of United States traffic. This figure of 16,000,000 new tons—that is, the difference between the present 9,000,000 and the estimated 25,000,000 tons—is purely speculative.

Discrepancies in all these figures merely point out how important it is that we should have an up-to-date analysis of these basic factors, in the interest of arriving at a closer agreement between the experts, before we go on the assumption that the project can be self-liquidating.

I have mentioned the many assumptions accepted in the 1941 Commerce Department study of the 17 commodities which have been used to this day as the basis for potential traffic estimates. I now should like to discuss two or three specific commodities to illustrate why I believe the proponents' estimates of shipping-cost savings are overoptimistic.

Take the question of grain, for instance, which always has been given prominence in the consideration of future traffic moving over the seaway, since the Great Lakes tributaries area is the greatest grain-producing area in the world. The 1941 survey concluded that a total of 1,292,300 tons of grain, both domestic and foreign, would move through the seaway at a total saving of slightly over \$2,000,000—Survey, part 111, page 33. Last July Dr. Danielian estimated potential grain traffic at 6,000,000 tons, a total revenue of \$3,000,000—Senate hearings, page 440. Then just last November the Commerce Department in its economic appraisal of the St. Lawrence seaway predicted potential volume of grain traffic from a minimum of 6,500,000 tons to a maximum in excess of 11,500,000 tons—Industry Report, page 45. These swelling estimates certainly call for critical analysis.

I wrote the New York Central Railroad for information. Mr. Metzman, president of that railroad, replied with an accompanying memorandum in which one paragraph stated:

To illustrate, proponents have claimed savings of from 5 to 8 cents per bushel which cannot be supported and are more illusory than actual when consideration is given to the fact that during the last 3 years before the war began in Europe (1936-38) the cost of shipping grain the whole length of the Lakes from Duluth to Montreal averaged only 4½ cents a bushel. Adding to this the charge of three-fourths of a cent for transshipping the grain to ocean bottoms at Montreal makes a total charge of about 5½ cents—out of which it is seriously proposed to save more than 5 cents.

The recent 1947 Commerce Department report bases potential grain tonnage through the seaway primarily on what is now exported via the ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Where does all this grain that now goes through these American

ports on the Atlantic seaboard originate? During the period from 1936 to 1946 the total wheat exported through United States Atlantic ports was 478,201,000 tons, of which 85 percent was Canadian. Construction of the seaway would presumably take these Canadian exports away from the Atlantic ports, except for that which moves in winter. I cannot see how it could have any other effect. For instance, the potential loss to Boston is clearly brought out in this recent Commerce Department report. It shows that during the period 1920 to 1935, 75 percent of all the grain exported from that port was Canadian, and from 1936 to 1946 Boston handled 34,500,000 bushels of Canadian grain.

Furthermore, this new study points out that overseas grain trade will come down the Lakes in large lake carriers for transshipment at Montreal with a loss to the shipping facilities at Buffalo. This study admits ocean-going ships will not carry grain down the seaway.

Proponents who continually have shifted from one tack to another through the years are now pinning their hopes for increased traffic on iron ore which would move over the seaway. This conclusion again clearly emphasizes the need for a new reappraisal of the seaway's potentialities. Movement of iron ore over the seaway was given only the slightest consideration in the 1941 survey. But, in recent months proponents have gone all-out on ore. The 1947 Commerce Department report estimates potential ore tonnage at thirty to thirty-seven million tons. This whole ore question is based on the apparent fear of the proponents that Great Lakes ore is just about finished. Secretary Harriman told the committee last July that—

Construction of the seaway serves as sort of a national insurance by making it possible to bring into the lake region great amounts of foreign ore. The iron grade ores of Labrador are particularly significant from this standpoint of national security.

He predicted twenty to thirty million tons of ore might well develop as potential traffic within the foreseeable future—Senate hearings, 1947, page 402. If this volume of ore does develop, the real question comes down to this: Is the capacity of the seaway sufficiently large to handle it? In an authoritative discussion of this question, Prof. John L. McDougall, associate professor of commerce at Queen's University, in Canada, has this to say:

Even if the Pittsburgh area is supplied by rail from the Atlantic coast, the ore requirements of the remaining steel cities are still probably in the vicinity of 50,000,000 tons a year. It is most unlikely that this volume of ore traffic can be handled through the seaway.

What do the steel people who depend upon ore say about these gloom predictions of economic death to Lake Superior iron ore? Mr. Wilfred Sykes, president of the Inland Steel Co., in a speech last month said:

I think we have in sight enough ore to last us say for 30 to 40 years; that is, the ordinary high-grade easily mined ores. But that is not the end of the steel business by a long way on the Mesabi Range.

Referring to ore which can be concentrated from taconite in this country, Sykes stated that this was good for another 75 to 150 years after the easily mined ores are exhausted. He goes on to say:

But that is not all. There is other iron-bearing material which is not magnetic, that we think we know how to concentrate today. We could make the iron magnetic so it could be concentrated by the same methods as the ore previously referred to. And of that material there is in sight from thirty to forty billion tons of concentrate—enough to last us, oh, for 400 to 500 years or something like that; and beyond that I don't think we will be worrying about it.

On this point the minority report on page 18 said:

We do not believe that justification of the seaway as a potential contribution to our national defense can be founded on the proposition that the Great Lakes mining industry is going to become unable to supply our blast furnaces with ore, therefore we must build a seaway to provide the means of importation of foreign ores.

Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1946 Mr. R. C. Allen, president of the Reserve Mining Co. said:

Unless it be our deliberate purpose to turn the Lake Superior iron-ore market over to foreign capital and labor and to put our iron and steel industry at the jeopardy of a foreign ore supply, there is no need and no demand for a St. Lawrence seaway to make foreign ore available to inland furnace plants.

We do not fear competition through the proposed seaway if ships laden with foreign ore are charged fairly for the use of the facilities. We do not fear competition from any source that pays labor our scale of wages. We are not asking our Government for any subsidies. All we ask our Government is that it withhold subsidies to our foreign competitors. If subsidies to our foreign competition are withheld, there need be no worry about large importations of iron ore through the proposed seaway. (Hearings on S. J. Res. 104, p. 1364.)

I think a very fair presentation of the ore question is contained in a letter I recently received from Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.  
OF DELAWARE,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 2, 1948.  
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: It was a pleasure to receive your letter of December 11, stating your opinion with reference to construction of the St. Lawrence seaway canal.

At this time it cannot be determined what tonnage of iron ore and other commodities would be available for transportation through the canal. For example, the iron ore deposits of Labrador mentioned in your letter will require additional time to prove a sufficient tonnage of ore to make their development possible. Last year's exploration, retarded by the short season, proved approximately 100,000,000 tons of available ores. There are other favorable areas still to be prospected in these concessions.

It is difficult at this time to foresee any large tonnage of foreign ores, unless it be



from the Quebec-Labrador area, which by the use of such a canal could be made competitive with the beneficiated ores from the Lake Superior district. Such beneficiated Lake Superior ores will gradually become a larger percentage of the Lake ores consumed by the various steel companies.

The general policy of United States Steel Corp. with regard to the building of the St. Lawrence seaway canal at present is to await additional information as to its commercial potential possibilities and its cost before a definite position is taken either for or against the project.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Sincerely yours,

B. F. FAIRLESS,  
President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call particular attention to his last paragraph:

The general policy of United States Steel Corp. with regard to the building of the St. Lawrence seaway canal at present is to await additional information as to its commercial potential possibilities and its cost before a definite position is taken either for or against the project.

These remarks merely add to the argument that further study of the whole proposition should be undertaken.

The savings claimed by the 1941 study on the transportation of automobiles and trucks appears to me extremely dubious. The survey estimate of savings on coastwise movement of these commodities is based on the shipping of 216,575 cars and trucks weighing 359,000 tons. Total savings in transportation charges are put at \$3,993,000. This quantity of automobiles calls for an average shipment of 902 cars and trucks per day from the Great Lakes in domestic trade alone. In these days when the roads are good and cars can be run over them or trucked over them, when the demand for new cars is intense, and will continue intense for a number of years, is it reasonable to suppose, first, that as many cars as this can be loaded per day; and, second, that they would be transported in this manner? I have not seen any survey which compared the cost of shipping automobiles by the seaway to the cost of shipping them by trailer-truck which is so common today. The survey also makes an estimate on shipping automobiles via the seaway to the Atlantic coast and via the Panama Canal to the Pacific coast. It is hard for me to believe that there will be much traffic of this character. These figures do not include shipping automobiles for export. Is it not reasonable to expect—and this is important, Mr. President—that a large proportion of automobiles for export will continue to pass through the eastern ports, where cargoes for various foreign destinations may be classified and consolidated and where return loads are more assured?

The survey also stated that 163,000 tons of bananas would travel via the seaway. We in Massachusetts know that the United Fruit Co. handles most of the bananas within this country. Yet, both Mr. Kelleher, manager of the freight and passenger department of the company, and the late W. K. Jackson, former vice president of the company and president of the National Chamber of Commerce of the United States, wrote

to me that their company does not plan to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway as "it would be much more economical to discharge the fruit at United States Atlantic and Gulf ports and rail it to the interior markets." Mr. Jackson adds:

One of the principal arguments in favor of the waterway is that it might reduce the ocean rates on grains and other bulk commodities moving from the Great Lakes area into foreign commerce and that this would be of benefit to the farmers of the Middle West. I suggest that the freight on these commodities is paid by the foreign purchasers and it is doubtful whether a slightly lower freight rate to these foreign purchasers would be of any value to the shippers of the Middle West.

In concluding this discussion of expected traffic and expected savings, Mr. President, we find that there is no real agreement among any of the experts on traffic expectancy and no real agreement on savings; and, finally, in going over the masses of material on both these vital phases of the project, we find that no complete study of these two subjects has been made since 1941. How can we possibly determine whether this seaway will pay its own way, if we do not have an up-to-date, all-inclusive picture of capacity and expected savings in light of present-day conditions?

#### QUESTION OF TOLLS

Mr. President, while a discussion of tolls has hovered in the background, it first came into the open when Senate Joint Resolution 111 was introduced in the Senate on May 9, 1947. That resolution called for making the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls. The committee changed the words "St. Lawrence River" to "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system." The resolution provides, in section 1, that the President shall conclude satisfactory agreements with Canada agreeing to this proposition before going ahead with the seaway. In section 3 it states:

During the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada, under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River, authorized in this joint resolution.

There are various provisos in that section; but, the present proposition comes down to this: that tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works of the St. Lawrence, that they shall be sufficient or supposed to be sufficient—and I use the word "suppose" advisedly—to liquidate the so-called new deep-water navigation works on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

Mr. President, why should not these agreements be made before construction starts? There are a great many factors that enter into this proposition. Why should not we have a complete understanding with Canada before we go ahead? We leave to the President just what he can negotiate without any qualifications; namely, tolls for the so-called new deep-water navigation works. Is it

wise thus to tie the hands of the President and thus to deliver, in effect, a form of ultimatum to Canada? To illustrate what I mean, why is it not perfectly reasonable for Canada to ask that these toll negotiations include consideration of the sum it already has spent on the seaway? Canada has spent four times what we have spent thus far. Why is it not reasonable for Canada to ask various other questions? What effect will tolls have on their own traffic? It is true that the 14-foot canal will remain toll free, but the great majority of the vessels now using this canal and now using the Welland Canal are Canadian. Certainly a perfectly fair Canadian point of view would be: How much of this traffic might we lose to foreign ships and take away from Canadian ships as a result of imposing tolls? Today, grain going down the St. Lawrence is carried almost exclusively in Canadian bottoms, through the 14-foot canal. Imposition of tolls on the seaway would increase the competitive position of the Canadians. These are just a few questions that I certainly should like to ask if I were a Canadian negotiator. To me it is self-evident that the result of these negotiations should be before us while the question of building a self-liquidating seaway is being discussed. Mr. President, let us remember that the resolution states that an agreement on tolls shall become effective only after approval of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

Another question comes to my mind. The language of the resolution makes perfectly clear that the President must see to it that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making "the new deep-water navigation works on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls." Just what are these works? If we turn to page 14 of the majority report we find the following:

The next step is to determine the proper allocation of total costs between the power phase and the deep-water navigation facilities. General Wheeler, in discussing the annual charges to the United States of the navigation facilities, took the United States cost to complete the seaway and power project, \$491,000,000, and subtracted therefrom the cost of works primarily for power chargeable to the United States, \$166,000,000, as well as one-half of the item common to power and navigation, \$91,000,000, making a total first cost to the United States for navigation alone of \$234,000,000. While this method of allocation is sound for engineering purposes, it does not meet the needs of the subcommittee in determining the allocation of costs between power and navigation for the purposes of self-liquidation.

As already indicated, the subcommittee considers that all expenditures for new work should be liquidated. Accordingly, the actual payments by the State of New York to the United States Government under the accord referred to in section 5 of the resolution, and the payments by the Province of Ontario to the Dominion Government under the Dominion-Provincial accord of March 19, 1941, for the power facilities must be taken as the total cost of the power project, while the remaining cost is out-of-pocket contributions by the Federal Governments of Canada and the United States to be liquidated by charges against navigation.

Mr. President, I have quoted the foregoing in full because it seems clear to me from this language that, whereas the commanding general of the United States engineers charged \$91,000,000, one-half of the item common to power and navigation, the committee would liquidate this item by charges against navigation. Is this entirely part of the deep-water navigation works as called for in the resolution? Is this a proper allocation? I think the allocation should be made clear and decisive. If it is intended to subsidize the power project by \$91,000,000, let us be sure that everyone understands that this sum, or such other sum as may finally be determined, is going to be paid for by the shippers who use the navigational features, or by the United States taxpayer if the tolls fail to liquidate this amount. Personally, I do not believe it is the intent of this body to subsidize power at the expense of shipping or the taxpayer.

I wish to make it clear that I am not opposing the proposal for the imposition of tolls. I am stating that on the present evidence we have no assurance that they will liquidate the project.

Furthermore, the levying of tolls is in itself a subject for more careful study. I quote now from the 1941 survey, starting on page 30 of part VII:

Whether or not tolls should actually be levied on the St. Lawrence seaway is a matter of national policy which requires careful study and analysis. The question of charging tolls on waterways has been a highly controversial issue in American history and has become enshrined in tradition and practice which does not allow a quick and partial solution. With the exception of the Panama Canal, waterways established by the United States have been notably free of tolls. This policy is embedded in the law of the country.

Mr. President, remember that the paragraph I have just quoted was written in connection with the seaway by our own Department of Commerce. I agree with what it has to say. It is most important, it seems to me, that we have more thorough discussion and more thorough analysis and research of the problem which tolls involve, than have been presented since last May 9 when this resolution was introduced.

The Senator from Vermont, this afternoon, in reply to the Senator from New Jersey, raised the question of whether tolls should be charged. As between the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Commerce, he felt that the Department should be asked for a recommendation. I mention this because I have quoted from the report of the Department of Commerce, which also raises the question of tolls in connection with various other rivers and lakes, which would have to be considered in the event tolls were charged on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Let me quote further, Mr. President, from the 1941 survey:

In considering the problem of toll charges on the St. Lawrence, certain difficult problems present themselves. In the first instance, the general policy of charging tolls on waterways must be reexamined before any application in a particular case is undertaken. Since changes in freight rates affect

the welfare of established industry and the location of new plants and industry in the future, a reexamination of national policy on tolls requires an extensive analysis of the effect of this change of policy upon American industry, particularly in those areas where waterway transportation is available.

And again reading from the 1941 survey:

Furthermore, a consideration of tolls in any one case, such as the St. Lawrence seaway, necessitates an examination of the effect of such tolls upon competitive routes. Tolls cannot be charged on the St. Lawrence without studying the effects of this practice upon the Ohio and the Mississippi River systems and the New York State Barge Canal. The problem of charging tolls on the St. Lawrence is further complicated by the fact that there already exists an extensive canal system from Lake Superior to the lower St. Lawrence River, which is free of tolls. The effect of a new schedule of toll charges upon existing traffic must certainly be studied very carefully, and the possibilities of discriminatory charges in order to preserve the relative position of industries and commerce established on a principle of free water transportation, must be examined. This is particularly important since Canadian national policy in the St. Lawrence watershed, which is the Dominion's economic lifeline, is based on the principle of toll-free water transportation.

Here are additional good arguments for negotiating tolls now:

The peculiar nature of traffic through the St. Lawrence canals at present and through the prospective seaway also creates some problems that require careful examination. Low-priced stable agricultural products form a considerable part of this traffic. Hence a flat charge on a tonnage basis, as at Panama Canal, may not be effectively applicable in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is important, therefore, to study the possibilities of discriminatory rates between classes of products that utilize the seaway.

This point is recognized by the proponents, and yet it should be recognized by all as another convincing reason why we should have negotiations now. Let me read two further paragraphs, which I believe give even more convincing arguments:

The St. Lawrence seaway is not a continuous canal system. It consists, in fact, of a series of canals separated from each other by lakes, rivers, and channels. There is one-way traffic over part of the distance in this extensive Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, between, for instance, Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, or between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, or between Lake Ontario and Montreal. Some traffic utilizes one segment, other traffic uses two links in the waterways system, and there is also through traffic which utilizes all of the canals in this interconnected system. Hence the establishment of tolls must be studied in the light of this situation, which is immeasurably more complicated than at either the Suez Canal or the Panama Canal.

Finally, the question of tolls on the St. Lawrence seaway or any part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system must be examined in the light not only of the economic structure of Canada and the Middle West of the United States, but also in the light of the existing legal precedents of each country, and in the light of treaty relations between the two countries.

If the seaway is to be made self-liquidating through tolls, it seems to me that

the Department of Commerce itself sets forth very pungent reasons why the negotiations should be done and the results given to the Congress before it is asked to approve this resolution.

Now let us turn to the question of costs with relation to tolls.

#### COST OF PROJECT

The total cost of the project as given in the majority report is \$719,928,000, of which Canada's share is \$228,319,000 and the United States share \$491,609,000. From each of the figures must be deducted payment by New York State for power and payment by Ontario for power which is estimated in each case at \$160,795,000, giving the remaining new work for Canada \$67,524,000, for the United States \$330,814,000, or a total for both Canada and the United States of \$398,338,000. Let us for a moment accept these figures. To them must be added interest charges during the period of construction. At just what rate this should be taken it is difficult to say. Interest rates are rising, as recently stated by the Federal Reserve Board and as is apparent as a result of their actions in dropping the support levels on Government bonds. It is probably safe to assume that the United States interest charges during the period of construction would run close to \$30,000,000, giving a cost to the United States of \$360,000,000. But I have pointed out at some length that this does not include the costs which must be added to make the harbors and ports of the Great Lakes capable of handling ships that might get through this seaway. I have stated that the Brookings Institution places this figure at three hundred and forty million as of 1929. If it was three hundred and forty million in 1929, it is probably at least five hundred million today. This gives us a figure of eight hundred and sixty million for United States costs exclusive of the power development. In addition, we must consider the cost to date of expenditures for navigation, estimated as \$132,000,000 for Canada and \$32,000,000 for the United States. So an eventual figure of a billion for the United States alone is not too far off.

The majority report gives an item common to power and navigation of which the United States half is ninety-one million. This item is included in the figures as quoted. But, let me again ask, should navigation be expected to pay for all the features which are common to navigation and to power, as previously explained?

The base figures which I have given so far have been taken from the majority report. I have recently received a letter from Mr. L. C. Sabin, vice president of the Lake Carriers' Association, in which he gives certain calculations and conclusions. These calculations are based 9.7 percent higher than the base used by the Army engineers. The reason for this is because the Engineering News Index has increased its cost index this amount since last May.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD exhibit F, showing various estimated costs and carrying charges.



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

## EXHIBIT F

## St. Lawrence seaway—estimated cost and carrying charges

(In thousands of dollars)

|                                                                               | Canada,<br>May<br>1947 | United<br>States,<br>May<br>1947 | Total,<br>May<br>1947 | Total<br>for Jan-<br>uary<br>1948 <sup>1</sup> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Total cost:                                                                   |                        |                                  |                       |                                                |
| United States engineers.....                                                  | \$315,770              | 523,351                          | 839,121               | 920,515                                        |
| Added by Senate committee.....                                                | \$44,629               | -----                            | 44,629                | 48,955                                         |
| Corrected total costs.....                                                    | 360,399                | 523,351                          | 883,750               | 969,470                                        |
| Expended to date.....                                                         | \$132,672              | 31,742                           | 164,414               | 164,414                                        |
| Cost to complete.....                                                         | 227,727                | 491,609                          | 719,336               | 805,056                                        |
| Interest during construction 3 percent: Half of 6 years.....                  | \$20,495               | 44,245                           | 64,740                | 72,455                                         |
| Cost, including interest.....                                                 | 248,222                | 535,854                          | 784,076               | 877,511                                        |
| Possible payments for power works.....                                        | \$64,571               | 166,184                          | 230,755               | 253,128                                        |
| Amount to liquidate by navigation.....                                        | 183,651                | 369,670                          | 553,321               | 624,383                                        |
| Interest and amortization by Engineer Department, estimated 4.33 percent..... | \$7,952                | 16,007                           | 23,959                | 27,036                                         |
| Operation and maintenance estimated at 2 percent.....                         | \$3,673                | 7,393                            | 11,066                | 12,487                                         |
| Estimated total annual charges.....                                           | 11,625                 | 23,400                           | 35,025                | 39,523                                         |

<sup>1</sup> Allowing for advance in construction costs since May 1947. January 1948 ENR index referred to May 1947 = 1.097.

<sup>2</sup> Hearings, Senate committee, June 13, 1947, p. 394.

<sup>3</sup> Report 810, Jan. 7, 1948; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, pp. 13-14.

<sup>4</sup> Report 810, Jan. 7, 1948; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, p. 15, rate of interest.

<sup>5</sup> Report 810, Jan. 7, 1948; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, p. 14, as to "cost of works solely for power."

<sup>6</sup> General Robins, Senate hearings, Feb. 20, 1946, p. 170.

<sup>7</sup> The average annual charges for maintenance and operation on 6 important United States canal and river projects having combined traffic of over 200,000,000 tons was 2.07 percent of cost of new work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In explanation of the tables, I quote from Mr. Sabin's letter:

In explanation you will note I have used basically the estimate of the Corps of Engineers given by General Wheeler at the Senate committee hearing on June 13, 1947, page 394. To this I have added the \$44,629,000 allowed by the Senate subcommittee to bring the Canadian cost estimates up to May 1947. In possible payments for power works, I have used the Senate committee allowance from the State of New York, although this is believed to be a pure assumption not based on any official agreement. For the suggested payment by Ontario to the Dominion, I have not followed the committee as there seems to be even less authority for such reduction, but I have subtracted the estimated cost of works solely for power as being a reasonable expectation.

For rate of interest during construction and for annual interest and amortization charges I have used General Robins' testimony. All estimates of maintenance and operation heretofore made by the War Department seem to me quite unrealistic. I have made an analysis of six large projects, finding the maintenance and operation charges vary from 1.6 percent for St. Marys River and Cape Cod Canal to 4.1 percent for Monongahela River. The total freight carried by these six projects is 200,000,000 tons annually. The average annual maintenance and operation charges amount to 2.07 percent

of total cost. For the Panama Canal the rate is about 2.7 percent. I have used 2 percent for this annual charge.

I have introduced this table because I believe it points up some of the basic questions of cost which exist. There is certainly serious controversy as to just what the ultimate cost is that may be liquidated by tolls. Certainly, this amount—or the basis to arrive at the amount—should be negotiated with Canada prior to the passage of this resolution.

However, I refer particularly to Mr. Sabin's conclusions as to the estimated total annual charges. His figure, as of January 1948, is \$39,523,000. This compares with the figure given in the majority report for May 1947 of a low of \$17,448,000 and a high of \$21,260,000. The difference between these estimates is obviously great. Accepting Mr. Sabin's figure, \$39,523,000 for the moment and applying the total limit of \$1.25 per short ton, it would take a volume of about 31,000,000 tons annually to liquidate the seaway. If we apply the average toll charge for all commodities, as presented by Mr. Danielian last year, you would need an annual volume of traffic of 38,000,000 tons to accomplish self-liquidation. This amount of traffic could not go through the locks—25,000,000 tons is probably the maximum.

When there is a question as to whether any potential traffic will even liquidate the smaller figures, and we are presented with larger factual figures, is it not fair to say, Let us negotiate toll agreements now and find out exactly where Canada stands and where we stand?

There is another factor of costs. Without quoting statistics and tables, I can find no project of this character that has been built at less than the estimates. The cost has always been more—in most cases very substantially more. While the costs I have mentioned are enormous, compared to our present national income, compared to the costs of war and the aftermaths of war, percentage-wise they are not very great. But let me repeat, we are discussing a 27-foot channel. I have tried to show it will take at least a 30, probably a 33-foot channel, before this can be called a first-class navigational project. Some people try to compare it to the Panama Canal. The controlling depths in the Panama Canal are 40 feet. The main channel in Boston is 40 feet. The controlling channel from Montreal down the St. Lawrence will be at least 35 feet. How much more would it cost to deepen this seaway and to deepen all the harbors and ports and connecting channels in the Great Lakes to 30 or 33 feet? I should like to have an idea of those figures before considering going ahead.

I know costs have changed during recent years, that they have gone up enormously. I have high regard for the Army engineers. I do not want to belittle their statements. But let me repeat: We must know the rate of interest to be used. We must know the figure for amortization. We must know the figures for maintenance, and the figures for operation. The figures must be agreed to by Canada before we can possibly go ahead and even have a basis

for negotiating tolls. I believe there is good reason why this whole question of all costs should be completely reconsidered in view of conditions which exist in 1948 and which will probably exist in the years that are to follow. Let me emphasize the word "All." Let us be sure of what figures we are trying to liquidate by tolls.

In considering the possible injury to our ports, it is fair to keep in mind that the cumulative cost to the Federal Government to June 30, 1944, for new work on all the sea-coast harbors and channels of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports of the United States amounted to only \$705,000,000. This is less than the probable cost of this seaway and the improvements which must be made in the Great Lakes.

Today in order to handle modern steamships and modern cargoes we need new dockage facilities, which are modernized and can handle cargo quickly and efficiently so as to save in the turnaround of the ships of our merchant marine. In this connection, I would like to quote from the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Merchant Marine, November 1947:

Reduction in handling costs can come through the application of suitable mechanized systems for moving cargo into and out of ships through the modernization and improvement of port and terminal facilities and through the development of ships of specialized type where their utility for the service in view is indicated. In view of the wide application and importance of improved cargo handling procedures and facilities in the national economy and in the development of American-flag shipping, the committee recommends that the Government sponsor a concerted cooperative effort by shipping companies, shippers, ship designers, maritime labor, port authorities, and interested governmental departments toward the reduction of cargo-handling costs.

Why is it not fair to consider what it will cost to carry out these recommendations to modernize existing facilities before further considering the project now under debate? This seaway will handle at best only a comparatively small amount of tonnage for 7 months each year. Much of this tonnage will come, if the proponents are correct, from the ports which we have already built up—from the ports which we need for national defense purposes—and which the people who now make their homes in those parts need in order to earn their living.

I come now, Mr. President, to the number of agreements necessary to put provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 111 into effect.

Senate Joint Resolution 111 authorizes and empowers the President to fulfill the undertakings made in behalf of the United States in the agreement dated March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada with the exception of article 7, article 8, paragraph (c), and article 9. This agreement of March 19, 1941, according to the resolution is based on the provisions of article 13 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain. I would like to point out 10 acts this resolution calls for:

First. Section 1, page 2, line 5: Before fulfilling the undertakings made on behalf of the United States in the agreement, the President has first to secure satisfactory evidence of the approval of the agreement, with the exceptions provided, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation of Canada.

Second. Section 1, page 2, line 12: The President must obtain satisfactory assurances by exchange of notes or otherwise that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the new deep-water navigation works self-liquidating.

Third. Section 2, page 2, line 2: Article 7 and article 9 of the agreement of 1941 having been excluded, the President is asked to negotiate with Canada a treaty or treaties with reference to the matters provided in these articles, including provisions for perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes, on the connecting channels and canals and in the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence River, as well as diversion of the waters of the Niagara River.

Fourth. Section 2, page 3, line 5: These treaties must then be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent and either approved or disapproved.

Fifth. Section 3, page 3, line 8: During the period of construction, the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities.

Sixth and seventh. Section 3, page 4, line 6: Such an agreement will become effective only after approval of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada. This is actually two steps, so I assign them Nos. 6 and 7.

Eighth. Section 5, page 5, line 3: The President is authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the Governor of the State of New York for the transfer to the appropriate agencies of that State of the power facilities on the United States side of the International Rapids.

Ninth and tenth. Section 5, page 5, line 17: The arrangement negotiated to be effective only after approval of the Congress of the United States and Legislature of the State of New York. This is also two steps, so I assign them 9 and 10.

I call these acts to your attention because these 10 moves have to be made, negotiated, approved, or disapproved as a result of this resolution. With some of them I agree, with others I do not. But I would like to repeat the question I have already asked. Why not come to an agreement with Canada on the question of tolls? Why not have that agreement before the Congress of the United States and approved by that body and approved by the Parliament of Canada before going ahead?

Then there is the question of a treaty or treaties with Canada. Article 7 of the agreement between the United States and Canada of 1941 has to do with the rights of navigation of the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes system, including the canals now existing or which may be hereafter constructed. Do you not think it is a good idea to decide that

question before you go ahead digging a canal to permit ships to use these facilities?

Article 9 deals with diversion of waters from Lake Erie and the Niagara River—deals with preserving Niagara Falls. Again I ask the question, Why cannot we have the actual treaty before us and not leave the negotiation until a later date?

Neither these treaties nor these agreements can possibly come before this present Senate. We well know that while the Senate is a continuing body, one Senate cannot bind another—that one Congress cannot bind another. How, then, do we know what the feeling of a future Congress which has to act upon these treaties and these agreements may be? It is perfectly possible that another Congress might refuse to approve some of them. I believe this is a very serious question. I believe that it is one which should have the most careful attention of every Member of this body. I cannot imagine, if this were a private enterprise, going ahead with it until the loose ends had been tied together—until there was a definite understanding between the contracting parties.

There is another question, one which I have already emphasized and which I think anyone will admit affects my State of Massachusetts. It affects all the New England States because they are within 300 miles of the proposed site of the power project. There is still to be negotiated the arrangement between the Federal Government and the State of New York concerning the power facilities. I want to know the exact terms of that agreement and just how we are going to be treated in New England. It is not that I distrust the intention of any official in the State of New York. It is not that I distrust, in any particular, the intention of the Congress of the United States, but again let me point out that no one official is responsible for the acts of his successor. No Congress can be responsible for any ensuing Congress, and as a Senator from Massachusetts who is presently representing that State, I should like to know, and it seems to me that I have a right to know, how my State is going to fare, how it is going to be treated, before I even consider or even think of giving a blank check, and what really amounts to a blank power of attorney to somebody, somewhere, at sometime in the future.

#### SUMMARY

I now wish to summarize the points which I have endeavored to develop as to why the Senate should not at this session approve Senate Joint Resolution 111.

First. Treaty versus agreement: I question the constitutionality of basing the St. Lawrence project on an Executive agreement requiring a majority vote rather than a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote by the Senate.

Second. Power: I am not opposed to the hydroelectric power phase of this project, but I believe power can and should be considered independently of navigation. I believe the power plant should be administered by the Federal Government for the benefit of all possible consumers. I do not believe its administration should be turned over to one

State as section 5 of the joint resolution permits. As a Senator from Massachusetts, I want to know in specific terms just how much power Massachusetts would get before I even consider giving a blank check and what amounts to a blank power of attorney to somebody somewhere at some time in the future.

Third. National defense: The proposed seaway with its complicated system of locks, closed by ice 5 months a year, limited by a depth of 27 feet, and located closer to a potential enemy by the polar concept of attack than the Atlantic seaboard—all render its defense value highly questionable. Furthermore a recent recommendation to convert the Panama Canal into a sea-level channel states "by contrast a lock canal, no matter how strongly protected, can be put out of operation for periods of 2 to 4 years by conventional or atomic weapons." If over \$2,000,000,000 must be spent to convert the Panama Canal to a sea-level route for security reasons, how can this lock canal be of value for defense purposes?

Fourth. Limiting depths of seaway: The seaway's limiting depth of 27 feet makes it possible for only a very small percentage of our freighters and tankers to pass through it fully loaded. A fully loaded Liberty ship under way draws over 30 feet. Maritime Commission figures of 1945 would indicate that only 9.4 percent of our freighters and 2.3 percent of our tankers could negotiate the seaway.

Fifth. Limiting depth of Great Lakes harbors: If ships do get through the seaway, the limiting factor of Great Lakes harbors is even more convincing that modern, ocean-going ships will not come up the seaway. Not one Great Lakes harbor can presently accommodate ocean-going ships the size of a Liberty ship with a draft of 25½ feet, according to the Army engineers. Speaking practically, I just do not see how it is possible to get a ship drawing over 30 feet up a 27-foot channel and into harbors that have even lower controlling depths.

Sixth. Cost to deepen Great Lakes harbors: Why should not the cost to make these necessary improvements to the Lake harbors and channels and docking facilities be included in the total cost of the seaway? A Brookings Institution study in 1929 put the cost of the harbor and channel improvements at \$340,000,000. Construction costs in 1948 are considerably higher—yet no survey has been made to determine how much.

Seventh. Capacity of Welland Canal: Can the present traffic and the new traffic which the seaway may generate all be handled by the existing Welland Canal? Will a bottleneck develop there? We do not have any up-to-date factual study on this subject.

Eighth. Potential traffic and savings: Guesses of the traffic which may go through the seaway and resulting savings vary so much that it is impossible for Congress to determine now whether the project will be self-liquidating. Savings estimates, in my opinion, show frequent lack of intimate knowledge of our distribution system. Proponents now pin high hopes on great shipments of Labrador ore which could be imported via the



seaway. Right now even the steel companies admit that they are not sure whether there is enough ore in Labrador to make its development worth while. Would it not make better sense to have a new all-inclusive appraisal of expected traffic and possible savings over the seaway before we authorized it, rather than proceeding on masses of out-of-date and contradictory material?

Ninth. Toll negotiations: We are asked to negotiate tolls—which require factual analysis of many far-reaching economic factors to reach the proper answers—during construction, not before it is constructed. Even our own Department of Commerce has raised important implications—questions concerning the charging of tolls on St. Lawrence traffic. For example, how would toll charges affect existing free channels on other rivers and canals. Would they set a precedent? How will it affect present rate structures on industrial products, and plant locations? We should have a complete understanding of these factors before, not after, we approved the toll principle.

Tenth. Cost of seaway. We do not have a realistic idea of its total cost. Most frequently \$491,000,000 is quoted as the United States share, but this does not include annual interest rates, or the cost of improving Great Lakes harbors. Present costs would make it more in the neighborhood of a billion dollar undertaking before it could be completed. These figures are for a 27-foot canal. How much will it cost to deepen the seaway to accommodate up-to-date ships to a depth of, say, 33 feet? Let us not deceive ourselves on the true cost picture.

Eleventh. Who will use the seaway? I have received letters from the leading steamship companies in the country. They almost unanimously oppose the seaway from a practical navigational viewpoint and do not intend to send their ships through it even if it is built. It is impossible for me to believe that the men who are in the business of moving cargo are against it if it would help their business.

Twelfth. Value of seaway versus existing ports: We must weigh one national desirability against another. Do we want to improve, for defense purposes and for commercial uses, our ice free, year-round Atlantic and Gulf ports or build this multimillion dollar seaway which can be used only 7 months a year? Considering the alternatives from a cost angle, we remember that the cumulative cost to the Federal Government for all new work on all our seacoast harbors and canals of the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Gulf amounted to only \$700,000,000 to June 1944. This is less than the probable cost of the seaway.

Thirteenth. Resolution involves 10 steps: Enactment of this resolution sets in motion 10 different steps—treaties and agreements—which must be negotiated, approved, or disapproved. None of these treaties or agreements can possibly come before the present Senate. Why were not many of these loose ends tied together before we were even asked to discuss Senate Joint Resolution 111?

For these reasons, Mr. President, I sincerely hope Senate Joint Resolution 111 will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. At page 956 of the proceedings and debates of the Eightieth Congress, second session, in the discussion of the St. Lawrence waterway, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] read in part from a letter which was sent to him by Mr. Sam Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co. The letter is dated December 11, 1945.

The statement read was only a part of the letter, and I should like to have unanimous consent to incorporate the entire letter in the RECORD. I may say that I have spoken to the distinguished Senator from Vermont about the matter, and he said that had he had the entire letter with him at the time he would have inserted it all in the RECORD, and he is perfectly agreeable to my having the entire letter inserted in the RECORD at this time. My purpose in doing so is to have appear completely on the record what Mr. Ferguson's position with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway was at that time, and I understand it is unchanged.

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

THE HARTFORD ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.,  
Hartford, Conn., December 11, 1945.  
The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Inasmuch as you cited me by name as supporting the St. Lawrence development (Appendix of the RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 13, p. 5261), I feel justified in writing you in order to bring to your attention certain changed conditions which have come to pass in the 20 years which have elapsed since the committee report.

1. Construction costs of this character are double what they were.

2. Steam plants are more than twice as efficient as they then were.

3. Federal policy for utilization of tax-free power today is to preempt the loads now served by tax-paying utilities which is destructive to this branch of private enterprise.

It is No. 3 above which makes me oppose the project under today's conditions in the interest of hundreds of thousands of investors with whose money existing facilities have been built. I regret to be forced to take this position, as I would otherwise favor the utilization of this natural resource.

Even today I would favor it if the enabling legislation required that:

All power developed is to be sold at the bus to private distributing companies under the proviso that all savings effected by the purchase and resale of Federally generated power shall be passed on to the ultimate consumer as directed and regulated by the appropriate regulatory authority.

A refusal of such an eminently fair recognition of the impropriety of creating private profits out of a taxpayer's investment can only be interpreted as indicating a desire to wreck the industry.

I enclose copy of recent correspondence with a St. Lawrence enthusiast who knew only part of the story.

Yours sincerely,

S. FERGUSON,  
President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very glad the junior Senator from Connecticut has inserted all of Mr. Ferguson's letter in the RECORD, and, as he said, if I had had the entire letter with me the other day when I quoted from it I would have inserted it myself. Mr. Ferguson's letter was occasioned by a speech which I made before the Boston City Club on November 14, 1945, and, so that the RECORD may be complete, I ask unanimous consent to have my speech, together with the Appendix appearing at the end thereof containing the names of the members of the Joint New England-St. Lawrence Waterway Committee, 1923-25, printed in the RECORD at this point. I believe that will make the entire situation perfectly clear. There is no disagreement between the Senator from Connecticut and myself as to Mr. Ferguson's position and as his meaning as expressed in the letter.

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

NEW ENGLAND AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT  
(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, delivered before the Boston City Club, November 14, 1945)

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I received the invitation to speak to you today.

I am a New Englander and, next to the Nation as a whole, my loyalties will always be with the people here in the Northeast.

I am optimistic about the future of New England. I am optimistic about the future of the country as a whole.

Any nation that can do what we have done in a period of 100 years can look forward with confidence that we shall solve every new problem and go straight forward on the path of progress.

I am much encouraged to note that there is now in progress a healthy self-examination to discover the weak spots in our social and economic fiber, and to repair and reinforce it in order to secure our proper position in the future world.

In recent weeks you have undertaken, under the leadership of Governor Tobin and Mr. Joseph Kennedy, a highly useful investigation to find out how you can improve economic conditions in Massachusetts.

#### ONCE LEADER IN MANY FIELDS

A review of industrial development in Massachusetts will indicate that this State has been a leader in manufacturing and commerce just as in the cultural and political field.

It was here that large scale manufacturing first flourished. It was also out of Boston that 100 years ago the clipper ships ranged the far-flung ports of the world, bringing prosperity to Boston and the rest of the country.

It is significant to note that in achieving this leadership New England, and Massachusetts in particular, had the blessing of three important factors contributing to prosperity:

First, Massachusetts was the leader in the development of its water-power resources for manufacturing purposes. It was on water power that its industrial supremacy was established.

Second, it had the blessing of a vast and efficient fleet of ships that utilized cheap water transportation.

Third, it had the advantage of a plentiful supply of skilled labor.

During the last century New England, and especially Massachusetts, held a dominant position in the field of industrial production.

Even as late as 1909 New England produced nearly 13 percent of the total value of manufactured products of the whole country.

Twenty years later, in 1929, a year of prosperity, the contribution of New England to the total manufacturing output of the Nation was only 9 percent. Ten years later, in 1939, the proportion of New England's contribution was down to 7 percent.

Massachusetts was also losing ground relatively to the rest of the Nation during the same period. In 1909 the contribution of Massachusetts to the total value of manufacturing production was 7.3 percent. In 1929 it was 4.9 percent, and in 1939, 4.4 percent.

#### BEST OF COUNTRY GROWING FASTER

These figures do not necessarily mean that New England and Massachusetts had lost industries to the extent of 40 to 50 percent during this 30-year period. They do mean, however, that whereas the rest of the country was growing by leaps and bounds, the Northeast was not keeping pace.

The same experience continued during the war years. Industry, as well as per capita income, increased much more rapidly in other parts of the country than in New England.

It is interesting to note that the greatest increase of industry and income was in those States where we had a definite program of river-basin development, such as the States of Tennessee, Washington, and Oregon. The total and per capita income in those areas went up more than the national average, whereas the increase in the Northeast was less than the national average.

What is the answer to this dilemma? Is it to hold back other parts of the country, or to accelerate our own pace?

Should we, through political sabotage, prevent the development of other sections, thereby permanently impairing the industrial vitality and military strength of our whole Nation?

Or should we adopt measures to help our section of the country at the same time as we assist the betterment of other areas, thus increasing wealth and industry all around?

Your Representatives in Congress are confronted with this question on every important economic issue. In your sober judgment, do you want us to consider the interest of our Nation as a whole, or do you wish us to take a narrow, sectional view of every issue before Congress?

We have given up, by and large, international isolation, as impractical, unrealistic, and against the enlightened self-interest of our country.

We frown upon the old, discredited colonial imperialism of other countries which retard world economic improvement.

#### NEW COLONIALISM—AMERICAN STYLE

But in this country we tolerate, fortunately in ever-decreasing degree, economic sectionalism which is the national equivalent of international isolation, and there are some among us who want to control or retard economic development in other areas. This is colonialism of the old pattern at its worst.

In a world as small as ours where the actions and economic policies of every other country of the world affect our national security and prosperity, we can ill afford to adopt such narrow-minded domestic policies that we thwart the growth of our own national domain.

How tragic it would have been in our recent struggle for survival if we had allowed a few obstructionists to prevent the development of the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia River. As President Truman said in a recent message to the Congress:

"Without the power from these rivers the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year—considered fantastic only five short years ago but

actually surpassed twice over—would have been impossible. Nor could we have developed the atomic bomb as early as we did without the large blocks of power we used from the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers. The timely development of these rivers shortened the war by many years and saved countless American lives."

#### NEW ENGLAND'S OWN OPPORTUNITIES

The answer to New England's industrial problem is not in stopping or slowing the development of the rest of the country; nor is it in any artificial advantages obtained at the expense of the rest of the country. I know you agree with me in this. This solution of our desire for an equal opportunity with the rest of the country is in the spirit of enterprise and adventure, in the eagerness to pioneer in a new and better world.

It is within the scope of our ability to create new opportunities in the production of new products, improved methods of manufacture, development of water resources, and new methods of transportation.

Why do I emphasize these general principles when I was asked to come here to discuss the St. Lawrence project? I do this because it is important to put the discussion of this project in the proper perspective of national and local affairs. For this project, more than any other in the past 50 years, has aroused the worst manifestations of sectionalism; and what is even worse, sectional passions are aroused by misrepresentations and false arguments by a small group who are perpetrating a new colonialism—a remote control over the economic destinies of our people.

I shall, therefore, try to show you that in the best opinion of the country the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is of great national advantage and should be speedily developed. Also that it is to the best interests of New England and Massachusetts in particular; and, that the narrow, self-seeking propaganda that has been loosed upon New England is of comparatively recent origin in the long history of this controversy and is not expressive of our local interest.

#### WHAT THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT DOES

First, let me briefly state, for the benefit of those not entirely familiar with it, what the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is.

The project contemplates building the necessary dams, canals, locks, and powerhouses which will permit ocean-going vessels to travel from Montreal to the Great Lakes, and also to develop 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric capacity, to be divided equally between Canada and the United States.

You know, of course, that there is deep-sea navigation to Montreal which is 1,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean. There is also deep-draft navigation from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Duluth and Chicago, 1,200 miles beyond.

The Welland Canal was completed by Canada in 1932 to scale the Niagara escarpment, and this canal only needs a little dredging. We built the MacArthur lock at St. Mary's River, and that too is a link in the seaway already completed.

With the exception of some dredging in various channels, the main works still to be built are in the 119-mile stretch between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, where the water drops 243 feet over a series of rapids between the level of Lake Ontario and the level of Montreal Harbor.

There is an agreement between Canada and the United States whereby we undertake to construct the necessary works at the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and Canada undertakes to do the work in the Canadian sections.

#### COST TO THE UNITED STATES

Without going into detail here, let me say that the remaining cost of the project to

the United States will be less than \$300,000,000, of which at least a third will be paid for by the power project, leaving around \$200,000,000 for the seaway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

Considering every item of expenditure, the seaway will cost about \$10,000,000 a year to maintain. When completed it will accommodate not less than 25,000,000 tons of traffic annually. At present nine to ten million tons move over the existing 14-foot waterway.

There will also be available at the International Rapids annually 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, more than the total output produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1944. It is the cheapest undeveloped power in America, costing about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour at the station.

This power will be available for distribution within 300 miles of the site in Canada and the United States.

The project will also make ocean seaports of all the principal cities on the Great Lakes. Rochester, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth will be accessible by ocean-going vessels without transshipment.

On October 2 Senate Majority Leader ALBEN BARKLEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 104, which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, to approve this Canadian-American agreement and authorize construction of the project. The resolution is sponsored, in addition to Senator Barkley, by Senators Ferguson, Hill, La Follette, Langer, Vandenberg, Wagner, Shipstead, Taylor, and myself.

That this is a national project of the first magnitude is attested by the nonpartisan and nonsectional support it has received during the past three decades.

#### PRESIDENTS URGE COMPLETION

On October 3 President Truman urged speedy approval of the Canadian-American St. Lawrence agreement, stating:

"One of the great constructive projects of the North American Continent, in fact, one of the great projects of the world, which was delayed by the exigencies of war, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

"For 50 years the United States and Canada under both Republican and Democratic administrations, under liberal and conservative governments, have envisioned the development of the project together, as a joint enterprise.

"Upon the expectation that we would join with them in completing this great engineering project, Canada has already built more than half its share of the undertaking.

"We, however, still have our major contribution to make.

"Every engineering investigation during the past 50 years, every economic study in the past 25 years, has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved; the plans are ready."

President Truman is from the State of Missouri where opinion for this project is divided. But the President is speaking for the country as a whole, and not for any one section.

President Truman is but one of the illustrious spokesmen for this great undertaking. In 1941, when the country was upon the threshold of war, President Roosevelt recommended it in these words:

"I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war. Its authorization will demonstrate to all the enemies of democracy that, however long the effort, we intend to outstrip them in the race of production. In the modern world that race determines the rise and fall of nations.

"I hope that authorization will not be delayed."

Before President Roosevelt, President Hoover was eager to see this project constructed, and he and his Secretary of State,



Henry Stimson, negotiated a treaty with Canada for that purpose. On July 18, 1932, President Hoover recommended this project in these words:

"The signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty marks another step forward in this the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent. . . . Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest. The large by-product of power will benefit the Northeast."

We need not go to Missouri, New York, or California to hear strong voices for this project. One of our own first citizens, President Calvin Coolidge, recommended it to Congress in 1923, calling it a "capital investment which will be reproductive . . . . Upon these projects depend much future industrial and agricultural progress."

In addition to a long line of Presidents of both parties, other forward-looking distinguished leaders have espoused and advanced this cause. Secretaries of State Charles Evans Hughes, Frank Kellogg, Henry Stimson, Cordell Hull, and now James Byrnes; Governors of New York Alfred Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, and now Tom Dewey, have all given it strong support.

Former Secretary of the Navy and Governor of New Jersey Charles Edison, the son of the famous inventor, and the late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox were for the project.

The list is long. And the theme of all these proponents has been universally the same—the St. Lawrence project is one of the great projects in the world. It will give this Nation abundant cheap power and an unequaled navigation facility from the Atlantic to the heart of the continent.

#### SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION

The support for this undertaking is not partisan. It is not sectional. Nor is it purely political. Even before there were concrete governmental proposals for its construction, substantial business interests were eager to develop this resource.

In 1921 Col. Hugh L. Cooper, the same eminent engineer who later built the Dnieper Dam for the Soviet Government, laid a proposal before the International Joint Commission to make a gift of the navigation facilities if the Governments of the two countries would give his clients a franchise to develop the electricity on the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg and Montreal.

And who were his clients? The Aluminum Corp. of America, the General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co., who evidently considered that the power production alone would be worth the cost of the entire development.

These companies, as you know, are not in the habit of engaging in uneconomic undertakings. Let me quote a few passages from the extensive report of Colonel Cooper:

"We believe that the greatest single need for the restoration of the public to normal contentment and happiness is cheap power. The construction of the works here proposed will give to the zone east of Niagara Falls, and for a radius of over 400 miles from the Croil Island site, power advantages at least equal to and probably better than those that now exist or can be hereafter created at Niagara Falls."

Colonel Cooper's report was equally eulogistic about the advantages of navigation, and I quote briefly from that section of the report:

"It will be seen, therefore, that the zone to be supplied with cheap power will also be aided in its commercial development by the coincident creation of new navigation advantages. These navigation advantages properly coordinated with water power and the vast railway system now existing in this territory will give to this zone industrial advantages that cannot be otherwise created or found elsewhere on the American Continent."

#### WHERE DO RAILROADS STAND?

At one time, many railroad interests were supporting the seaway. Almost all of the transcontinental lines west of Chicago favored it. The Great Northern and the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, the Illinois Central, the Chicago & North Western, the Minneapolis & St. Paul, the Chicago Great Western, the Quincy lines, all favored this project only 20 years ago.

From the point of view of national interest, and as a business proposition, the overwhelming testimony has been in favor of earliest possible construction of this great project.

You may say, "Very well, but how about us? How will it affect New England?"

Here again, the prevailing opinion and all of the factual analysis available have been favorable. The conclusion of all serious studies has been unanimous that this project would benefit New England.

#### THE HARRIMAN STUDY

One of your business leaders, Mr. Henry I. Harriman, made a serious study of this subject and published his findings in 1929 in a book of 152 pages entitled "New England and the St. Lawrence Seaway."

Mr. Harriman was at that time president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. As you know, he has also been president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for several terms. I need not mention to you that he is one of the most successful businessmen of this community and a leading figure in the public utility field. I shall only read to you Mr. Harriman's conclusions which appear on pages 32-33 but commend you to read the whole book.

Mr. Harriman concluded in these words: "I am convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway is of as great importance to New England as to the Middle West, and that New England should unitedly, heartily, and enthusiastically support the project."

The seaway means to New England:

1. Lower transportation costs on much of its food supply, hence a lower cost of living.
2. Lower freight rates on many of the raw materials required by its industries.
3. Lower freight rates to many markets for its finished products.
4. A supply of export grain and flour at prices as low or lower than can prevail in other North Atlantic ports, hence a revival in the export business of the port of Boston and other New England ports.
5. The removal of the handicap of rail differentials, due to water competition via the St. Lawrence.
6. A reasonable supply of cheap power.

Three years later, when Mr. Harriman was president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as to the amount of business expected between New England ports and those of the Great Lakes. I quote from his testimony:

"The total annual traffic available on the most conservative basis for a water route between New England and the Great Lakes will be not less than 6,000,000 tons, and very probably it will be twice that amount, and the annual saving to our New England industries will not be less than \$16,000,000. What holds true for New England holds equally true for eastern New York and Pennsylvania."

There may be those who will try to discount this weighty opinion by saying that this is only one man's view. But that is not true. At one time or another leaders of New England industry and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts favored this project. Furthermore, this position was taken after careful study.

#### NEW ENGLAND COMMITTEE APPROVES

In 1923, at the time President Coolidge recommended the project to the Congress, a New England committee of 30 industrial and public leaders—5 from each State—was es-

tablished. They devoted a whole year of study to the subject.

Some of them are still with us and quite prominent in public and business circles—just to mention at random—John G. Winant, former Governor of New Hampshire, and our Ambassador to England, and Samuel Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co.

Col. Charles Gow was the chairman of the committee. He is here today and can tell you more about this important work. I shall only read you the unanimous conclusion of this group of 30 New England leaders:

"The committee looks upon the proposed expenditure for developing the waterway as in the nature of a capital investment of a national character upon which exceptionally liberal dividends will be returned in the form of reduced transportation costs and the general benefit and prosperity of a large and important section of the country which at the present time is laboring under a most serious and difficult economic handicap. It further believes that the net result of the development of such a waterway will incidentally be of considerable advantage to New England and the surrounding community, both from a broad national standpoint as well as that of purely local self-interest."

"The committee, therefore, places itself definitely on record as favoring the early entrance of this Government into negotiation with the proper officials of the Canadian Government looking toward the prompt consummation of a treaty which will make possible the undertaking of the enterprise and urges upon all New England's local and national representatives the desirability of their full cooperation in every reasonable manner to bring this result about."

#### DO WE WANT CHEAP POWER?

This is a far cry from the opposition registered by a representative of the Maritime Association of Boston before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. This man, previously a long-time employee of railroads, claimed that cheap power would ruin Massachusetts. One of the Congressmen asked incredulously, "Do you mean that giving the people of New England electricity at reasonable rates, and taking this overcharge of \$97,000,000 a year off of them would ruin New England?"

And the witness replied, "Yes; I do."

Apparently this witness and his philosophy have been well accepted here, for the people of New York and New England, except Connecticut, pay the highest electric rates anywhere in the country.

I cannot believe that the voice of Massachusetts will continue to be expressed by such unabashed spokesman for monopoly and public exploitation. The tradition of liberalism and progress is too well ingrained in New England soil to remain covered for long.

If this project is of great advantage to the Nation in peace and in war; if New England, by the testimony of its citizens, will stand to benefit, then where does this effusion of propaganda against the project come from?

#### NUB OF OPPOSITION

I shall be candid and to the point, for it is time to call a spade a spade. The opposition is engendered by the eastern trunk lines and power companies, both intimately connected with the higher echelons of finance in New York.

I shall not here expose in detail the evidence, for that was done effectively by Senator La Follette on the floor of the Senate last December 8. It is available for everyone in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

The eastern roads fear competition in their rates, and the power companies fear cheap public power, and this opposition has been

<sup>1</sup> For membership list of committee, see appendix.

consolidated since public development of this project was enunciated by Governor Roosevelt, of New York, in 1931.

These are the sources of opposition and they have succeeded in silencing favorable expressions in the East, as well as in the West. They have initiated hostile and false propaganda throughout the country from coast to coast, and, unfortunately, many well-meaning and public-spirited citizens have fallen for it.

When the western railroads are silenced against their better judgment, when the business voice of New England is made to change its tune within our own generation, when the Southwest is told through the representatives of eastern-controlled railroad and power companies that this project will ruin Texas or Arizona, or New Mexico, then it is plain that we are witnessing not only a willful instigation of insidious sectionalism but, what is even more disturbing, we are witnessing a financial colonialism that will ultimately lead this country into an economic straitjacket and commercial strangulation.

I do not believe this will succeed. I do not—I cannot—believe that your representatives in Congress will disregard the national interest and the local interest of the Northeast and turn down this project.

#### SPRIT OF PROGRESS

The spirit of liberalism, of progress, and of adventure is stirring throughout the land, and even more so in New England.

The leadership that was New England's, the spirit of John Paine and Samuel Adams, of Charles Sumner and Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis Brandeis is with us again.

I feel confident this spirit will find eloquent expression in the great public servants who represent this State in the United States Senate today.

With such statesmanship and love of public service as our allies, this time we shall win. It is time to return to the first principles of New England prosperity, low-cost power, and low-cost water transportation.

When the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is completed, we will all be proud of it, for it will contribute immeasurably to our economic welfare and to our national safety.

#### APPENDIX

##### MEMBERS OF THE JOINT NEW ENGLAND-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY COMMITTEE, 1923-25

Charles R. Gow, chairman.

Massachusetts committee: Charles R. Gow, Boston, former president, Associated Industries of Massachusetts; former president, Boston City Club; and former president, Boston Society of Civil Engineers; Dr. Arthur W. Gilbert, Boston, Commissioner of Agriculture, State of Massachusetts; Allen Hubbard, Boston, of Hollis, French & Allen Hubbard, consulting engineers, and former president, Affiliated Technical Societies of Boston; Alton D. Edes, Edes Manufacturing Co., Plymouth, representing Massachusetts State Chamber of Commerce; Bernard J. Rothwell, president, Bay State Milling Co., Boston, and former president, Boston Chamber of Commerce.

New Hampshire committee: Hon. Robert P. Bass, Concord, N. H., former Governor of New Hampshire and member of New England Council; Hon. Rolland H. Spaulding, Rochester, N. H., former Governor of New Hampshire, and president, Spaulding Fibre Co., Inc.; Hon. John G. Winant, Concord, N. H., former Governor of New Hampshire; Hon. Eaton D. Sargent, Nashua, N. H., mayor of Nashua; former president, New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association and treasurer of the White Mountain Freezer Co., Inc.; Hon. Raymond B. Stevens, Landaff, N. H., former Member of Congress and United States adviser in foreign affairs, Bangkok, Siam.

Rhode Island committee: Arthur Bliss Lisle, Providence, R. I., general manager,

Narragansett Electric Lighting Co., Providence; Albert J. Thornley, Providence, R. I., president, Narragansett Machine Co., Providence; Edwin C. Smith, Pawtucket, R. I., president, Rhode Island Stop Warp Equipment Co., Pawtucket; H. W. Gardiner, Providence, R. I., former president, Employers' Association of Rhode Island; Charles C. Remington, Providence, R. I., attorney-at-law.

Vermont committee: Willard B. Howe, Burlington, Vt., president, Howard National Bank, Burlington; Harrie C. White, North Bennington, Vt., president, H. C. White Co., former president, Toy Manufacturers, United States of America; James F. Dewey, Quechee, Vt., president, Associated Industries of Vermont, member of New England Council, and vice president, A. G. Dewey Co., Quechee; Dr. William H. Beardsley, Springfield, Vt., Jones & Lamson Machine Co., Springfield; Hon. Elbert S. Brigham, St. Albans, Vt., Member of Congress.

Maine committee: Judge Benjamin F. Cleaves, Portland, Maine, executive secretary, Associated Industries of Maine and former chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Maine; Hon. George C. Wing, Jr., Auburn, Maine, member, Maine Legislature, five terms; Hon. James Q. Guinac, Bangor, Maine, former president, Maine State Chamber of Commerce and Agricultural League; George F. West, Portland, Maine, president, Maine State Chamber of Commerce and Agricultural League; Elliot Rogers, Kennebunk, Maine, Rogers Fibre Co., Kennebunk.

Connecticut committee: Frederick S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn., president Chase Cos.; director, Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut, Inc.; Citizen, National National Bank, and of Waterbury Gas Light Co.; Samuel Ferguson, Hartford, Conn., president, Hartford Electric Light Co., vice president and director, Hartford Chamber of Commerce; Stanley H. Bullard, Bridgeport, Conn., vice president, Bullard Machine Tool Co., director, United States Chamber of Commerce, and of Connecticut Chamber of Commerce; B. H. Blood, Hartford, Conn., formerly general manager, Pratt & Whitney Co., and colonel of ordnance officers, United States Reserve Corps; Raymond L. French, Bridgeport, Conn., president, the R. L. French Co., and chairman, transportation committee, Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut, Inc.

#### PROGRAM CONCERNING RENT CONTROL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

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

Mr. CAIN. I desire to ask the acting floor leader, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], if it is the intention of the leadership to reestablish Senate bill 2182, the proposed Rent Control and Housing Act of 1948, as the pending order of business beginning when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the junior Senator from Washington that it is the intention of the acting floor leader to ask that the Senate return to the pending business as soon as the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has finished his remarks, so that the pending business, when we finish tonight, will be the rent-control legislation. I do not know whether the present occupant of the chair will be the one who will occupy the chair tomorrow when the Senate convenes, but I can say that, insofar as I am concerned, it will be my hope that the Senate will proceed with the rent-control legislation tomorrow without undue interruption.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to urge the Senator to continue to take that position because of the fact that the Rent Control and Housing Act under which we now operate will expire on the last day of this month. A presentation of the 1948 rent-control and housing bill has already been made at some length on Friday, and amendments to the proposed bill are now subject to action either for or against.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully recognize the importance of the proposed legislation, and I would personally say that if it shall be necessary that we hold night sessions in order to complete action on the measure prior to the expiration date, that that should definitely be done.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington, representing the Banking and Currency Committee, is very grateful for the position taken by the Senator from California in support of the measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am obliged to the Senator from Washington for bringing up the question.

#### DISMISSAL OF NATHANIEL DYKE, JR., FROM FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, with the continued indulgence of the Senator from Oregon for a few more minutes, I should like to say that because of the absence from the Senate of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I wish to read a short statement which he is most desirous to have appear in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement prepared by the senior Senator from Nebraska is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER

For some time we have been hearing from the present administration of the extreme difficulty in securing good men to fill important positions in the Government. Usually we are told that highly qualified men cannot be secured at present Government salary rates. Sometimes we are told that such men will not submit to the gauntlet of hearings by congressional committees which it is said they are forced to undergo before our congressional committees. In either case, the implication is that Congress is to blame.

In my opinion, these statements are untrue and unjust. If the present administration has had difficulty in securing men with superior business backgrounds as administrators, it is largely because such men are not wanted by the administration. They are not sought out. If, by accident, such men are secured in the Government service, they are frequently treated discourteously; their views are ignored; and at times, they may be dismissed with hardly a civil word of thanks. At least that has happened in some cases.

In the hullabaloo about the cases of Mr. Eccles and Mr. Landis, the case of Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., has not attracted the attention it should have. Let me say right here that I don't know Mr. Dyke. I understand he is a devout Democrat, which is beside the point. The point is that he is a responsible and highly competent American businessman, who for a number of years gave of his abilities freely to his Government in a spirit of public service. His reward for that service was an abrupt dismissal.

Mr. Dyke is an Arkansas businessman, who started in the lumber business and later branched out into other activities connected with construction. He is a director of several banks dealing in home financing. He



knows the housing field from beginning to end. During the war, he did a magnificent job in unravelling their many lumber problems for the War Production Board. Later, he was an adviser to the War Mobilization Board; a consultant to the Small War Plants Corporation; and a consultant to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. During all this period from 1942 to 1947, Mr. Dyke received no compensation from the Government.

Last August, Mr. Dyke was appointed a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which was sorely in need of a practical businessman who knew home financing. As a member of that Board, he had the courage to speak out bluntly on every issue that came before him. He called the shots as he saw them. When problems came before the Board requiring his knowledge and experience of home financing, he was not afraid to use that knowledge and experience. He thought that was what he was there for.

As a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, he lasted less than 6 months. I believe the charge was that Mr. Dyke did not cooperate with other members of the Board. I suppose that is another way of saying that he did not agree with many policies of the Board and that he was not afraid to say so. As a matter of fact, the very policies that Mr. Dyke has advocated have since been put into effect, for the most part.

An attempt has been made to leave with the public the impression that there must be something wrong with Mr. Dyke in view of the fact that he was dismissed. I suggest that there is something wrong with an administration that does not want good men and cannot stand honest criticism. If this administration is puzzled because it cannot secure the services of good men, it does not have to come all the way to Capitol Hill to find the reason. It can look within its own policies for the cause of its troubles.

I wish to say to the junior Senator from Oregon that I appreciate very much his courtesy, and I may safely say that the Senator from Nebraska will likewise appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon has yielded to me so I could read the statement into the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to have been able to accommodate the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is always accommodating.

#### THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate at very great length at this late hour. However, I should like to make a few brief remarks before we recess.

These remarks grow out of a paper which I read last Thursday night at Cornell University. The paper was read at the invitation of that institution, as the Frank Irwin lecture of the Cornell University Law School for this year. The subject of the paper was, "Will We Have Industrial War or Peace With the Taft-Hartley Law?" I ask unanimous consent to have my Cornell paper printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of this paper I discuss the position which is being taken by certain aspirants for the Republican nomination for the

Presidency in regard to the Taft-Hartley law. During the past few days my very good friend, Harold Stassen, has been campaigning in the State of Oregon in behalf of his candidacy for the Republican nomination for the Presidency.

I wish to make very clear that I am exceedingly fond of Harold Stassen. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, that friendship goes much deeper than any difference of opinion I may have with him on any political issue could possibly go. In fact, I would not find it a bit unwelcome if, in due course of time, Mr. Stassen might find it possible to take positions on certain vital public issues that were so close to mine that I could in all honesty say that I think he should be the one to receive the nod for the Republican nomination. Such is not true as of this hour, because of certain differences of opinion which I have with him on issues which I think are of vital concern to the welfare both of my party and of my country.

I know Harold Stassen, as a former student, to be one who always seeks to be guided by the facts and the merits of issues as he comes to study and find them. He has a brilliant mind and a sense of justice and social values which make him one of the outstanding leaders of the Nation. I am satisfied that there is ground for great hope on my part that in respect to the Taft-Hartley law he will reach some conclusions contrary to the conclusions which he has been expressing in the State of Oregon in recent days with regard to that law, once he gives it the more careful analysis of which his good mind is capable.

The people of the State of Oregon are well aware of the views of the junior Senator from Oregon on the Taft-Hartley law. The junior Senator from Oregon certainly has no objection to the distinguished former Governor of Minnesota expressing his views in the State of Oregon on the Taft-Hartley law. In fact, I welcome the expression of Governor Stassen's views on the Taft-Hartley law in my State, because I think Mr. Stassen's views have been so expressed that I will find it much easier to join issue in the State of Oregon with others who share Mr. Stassen's views on the Taft-Hartley law.

The junior Senator from Oregon has set out his views on the history and the operation of the Taft-Hartley law as well as certain weaknesses in that law as he sees them, in the paper which he read at Cornell University. As a former teacher of the former Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Stassen, in a class in argumentation, I take the liberty of recommending this paper to the distinguished Minnesotan, because I know that he will at least seek to find the answers to some of the premises which I lay down in this paper, if he thinks that evidence in rebuttal of them can be obtained. But I wish to say most respectfully that I think the distinguished former Governor of Minnesota is attempting to sell a non sequitur to the American people with regard to the Taft-Hartley law, because I am informed over the long-distance telephone today that he has been contending that the Taft-Hartley law is a great suc-

cess because there are fewer strikes today than there were in a corresponding period of time before the passage of the law.

If Harold were in my old argumentation class and made that argument, I am sure I would say, as I say in this paper, "Oh, Aristotle, what fallacies are spoken in thy memory." I am sure that this distinguished Republican knows that just because two phenomena occur in the same time period, it does not necessarily follow that there is any cause-and-effect relationship between the two phenomena.

I wish to suggest here this afternoon, in answer to the distinguished former Governor of Minnesota, who has been making that argument in my State in recent days—and Harold Stassen is not the only one who has been trying to sell this non sequitur—that he and the others ought to check the argument against the facts in connection with what has been happening under the Taft-Hartley law, in respect to three groups of employers.

First there is a group of many hundreds of employers—so many hundreds that it can be accurately said that they run into the thousands—who have entered into contracts with unions since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law whereby they have attempted to contract themselves out from under the terms and the provisions of the law.

In other words, a great number of employers have avoided drawing a contest with labor under the Taft-Hartley law since its passage. They have granted, for the most part, the major economic demands of unions. They have entered into what the junior Senator from Oregon in the past has referred to as "bootleg" contracts with labor unions—subterfuges, evasions, subrosa agreements in which they have attempted to get around the Taft-Hartley law so that no economic test would be drawn. Of course, there have been no strikes in those instances.

It is interesting to note that some such contracts have been drawn in the great publishing industry of America by publishers who during the historic debate on the Taft-Hartley bill wrote editorial after editorial in support of the bill. I say that for the most part they stand convicted today before the American people as employers who have entered into agreements in violation of the spirit and intent of the Taft-Hartley law. Nice business, Mr. President, if they can get by with it. However, time is going to show very clearly that these employers seek only to postpone the contest with labor, hoping for a more favorable time or hoping that the Congress will amend the law.

Not long ago I was called on a multi-party telephone conversation with a publisher and a labor-union president and a municipal official who were trying to work out an arrangement between the publisher and the union. They read to me a very interesting subterfuge clause which they proposed to put into the contract, a clause by way of a continuing negotiation provision. They asked me what I thought of it. I told them I did not think very much of it. They did not agree with what I told them, Mr. Presi-

dent, because I told them there was no question that the provision they were suggesting was contrary to the spirit and intent of the Congress when it passed the Taft-Hartley law. The history of that law shows that it is not a private law, Mr. President. It is a public act which sought as a matter of public policy to prevent certain types of union conduct. If it was sound public policy—and I hasten to add that in my opinion it was not such when it was passed by the Congress—but if it was sound public policy when the Congress passed it, then it is sound public policy today. Certainly I am not going to encourage anyone to enter into an evasive contract in an attempt to get around the law. I meant it when I said on the floor of the Senate, during the debate on the Taft-Hartley law, that if we put that type of legislation on the statute books I will stand for its complete enforcement as long as it is on the statute books, because we cannot have government by law in this country on any other basis.

So we have thousands of employers, Mr. President, who since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law have entered into the type of contract to which I have referred. They have not drawn any economic issue with the unions. They have not wanted to make the test.

So when Mr. Stassen argues that today there are fewer strikes in this country than there were before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, let him weigh in connection with those statistics, as he knows good statistical practice calls for such weighing—the fact that there are a great many employers who have attempted to contract out from under the terms of the law. If he wins the confidence of these employers they will tell him, as they have told me in large numbers in recent months, that since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, they have made concession after concession, which they would not have had to make had it not been for the law. They will tell him that they have done so because they did not want to draw a test with the unions.

There has been another group of employers that I suggest Mr. Stassen take into account in connection with his statistics. However, before I discuss that point let me digress for a moment in order to discuss some other time related statistics. I suggest to him, that he also take into account some other interesting statistics since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, namely, statistics based on the fact that the cost of living has kept rising ever since the passage of that law. The same source from which apparently he gets his statistics in regard to the Taft-Hartley law and strikes will give him these statistics showing that the cost of living has continued to go up ever since the Taft-Hartley law was passed. I am not arguing, Mr. President, that the Taft-Hartley law is responsible for that; but I am simply pointing out that the increase in cost of living is another phenomenon which has occurred during the same period of time covered by Mr. Stassen's statistics on strikes. He also can find out that employment has increased since the pas-

sage of the Taft-Hartley law because the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that to be a fact. Would he argue that the Taft-Hartley law is responsible for the increase in employment? That would be an interesting argument, but I should like to see his proof in support of it.

So I say that when Mr. Stassen seeks to support his claim that the Taft-Hartley law is a great success, let him explain to the American people the conduct of another group of employers, a group of employers who are making high profits, and who know that they can pass on to a long-suffering public any cost increases that may come from wage increases. When he looks into those arrangements, he will find that there is a very large group of employers who have met the economic demands of the unions, because they know we still have an inflated price structure. They know they can pass on any wage increases to an already overburdened public. Not only that, Mr. President, but I say without fear of successful contradiction here this afternoon that in the basic industries in the United States in which there have been wage increases since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, in a majority of those instances the price increases have been at least twice as much as necessary to take care of the increase in wages. That is nice business, too, if you can get away with it; but there is going to be a day of reckoning.

I wish to say that I think it is regrettable that we have had so many employers who have been so interested in making excessive profits by means of inflated prices that they have failed to see the importance of reducing prices. A reduction in prices would have given their workers a type of wage increase that would have amounted to an increase in real wages.

Then there is a third group of employers, a group which I am sure is in the minority. I do not know how many of them there are, but there are too many. They comprise the group that we classify as the union-busting employers, the group that has never reconciled itself to the fact that freemen always from now on are going to organize themselves in an attempt to better their economic status. There are still employers found within this third group who feel that through the Taft-Hartley law they can weaken unionism. They are following the advice of some great employer associations and manufacturers' associations and chambers of commerce and other employer groups who spent so much money to propagandize the people of this country in support of the Taft-Hartley bill during the weeks of the debate on that bill. What are the instructions which are going down the line at this time, Mr. President? They are these: "Now is not the time, boys, to make the fight. Now is not the time. Just let things sleep for awhile. Don't stir unions up. Take it easy. Oh, have a test here or there, but don't rock the boat right now. Give us a chance to spend a few more millions of dollars by way of propaganda opiates with which we hope to becloud public opinion into thinking that maybe, after all, the Taft-Hartley law is not as bad as it really is."

Mr. President, those antilabor forces know that the timing of a battle usually makes the difference between victory and defeat; and they know that the battle against labor, which they hope to win, offers better chances of success if they carry it on when recession begins, when we are on the way to depression, when this old inflationary cycle of boom and bust gets into the bust period and men unemployed start walking the streets. Then the legal weapons made available to them in the Taft-Hartley law will be used by that group of employers to weaken unions. So the employers in this third group too, are signing contracts these days.

Mr. President, I say it is easy for the politicians to tell the American people that the Taft-Hartley law is working because there have been fewer strikes since its passage than during the corresponding period immediately preceding its passage. But those politicians cannot support their case when they start to evaluate and analyze the statistics with which they seek to sell their non sequitur to the American people, be it Harold Stassen or anyone else.

That leads me to say, Mr. President, as one who is just as devoted to the future of the Republican Party as is Harold Stassen, that I think the 1948 election is over. All that remains now is the counting of the votes, which, in my opinion, will result in an overwhelming majority for the Republican Party, irrespective of who the Republican nominee may be. I think the party of the opposition is in complete collapse and rout. I should be perfectly willing to make the 1948 fight with that party, with an even start at the starting tape. We do not need the head start which the Democrats have given us.

One reason why the Democratic Party is in complete rout apparently is because a great revolt has developed within the party over putting into practice the civil-rights guarantees of the Constitution of the United States. My party does not need the advantage of that favorable handicap. We can beat the Democrats in the 1948 campaign without a handicap in our favor in the form of a democratic revolt over civil rights. I hope I shall always be nonpartisan enough to want to win my political fights without an advantage of that kind, but we cannot escape the political realities of the present situation.

As a Republican Party, we stand tonight in a great position of advantage, so far as the coming campaign is concerned. But the fact that the party of the opposition has collapsed, so that all the king's horses and all the king's men can never put the pieces together again, does not in my opinion justify a failure on the part of my party to proceed now to build a constructive platform and program for 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960, because I think it is going to require of us that period of time, by way of a Republican administration, to correct the terrible mess into which the Democratic Party has plunged the country.

Although I think we shall win in 1948, no matter whom we nominate for President, because I think the American people are going to vote the Democrats out



more than they are going to vote the Republicans in, nevertheless I think the question we ought to determine now is whether or not we can build a progressive, constructive Republican program that will make it possible for us to put into effect a sound program in the interest of the general welfare of our country, that will assure our victory in 1952, 1956, and 1960. That is the challenge that faces the Republican Party tonight.

There is no contest over the campaign of 1948. I repeat, that is all over. The real test is whether or not we shall go into the White House in November with a Republican platform and record so progressive and so constructive in nature that, putting it into effect, we shall be assured of the confidence and the support of the American people in the years to come. All the weeks between now and June are precious weeks, Mr. President. I think the leadership of my party on the floor of the Senate has the greatest opportunity of statesmanship that has been presented to my party in many a year.

Oh, good politics might suggest avoiding the civil-rights issue. Why fight about it? The party of the opposition is going to do plenty of the fighting about it. We do not have to make an issue of it.

Some might argue that way, Mr. President, and some Republican strategists undoubtedly will argue that way. However, as one who believes that democracy is only as strong as we put into practice the guaranties of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and as one who believes that whenever those principles are not put to practice then to the degree to which they are not put to practice, democracy dies a little, withers a little on the vine of state, I want to suggest to the leadership of my party here tonight that it proceed without delay to make perfectly clear to the American people that when they elect us in November 1948 they are electing a party which is not making promises about civil rights, but they are electing a party which, between the months of February and June 1948, passed some legislation in connection with civil rights. That is the great challenge of statesmanship in the field of civil rights which faces my party today.

Hence, as either author or as cosponsor of the set of bills pending before the Congress on antipoll tax, antidiscrimination in the field of economic opportunity, and antilynching, I say to the leadership of my party in the Senate of the United States that I think the eyes of millions of American people are upon our party; millions who believe that we must protect the rights of individuals by putting into practice the civil-rights sections of the Constitution. They have a right to ask for the passage of some civil-rights legislation as a sort of advance assurance that the sections of our Philadelphia platform, which will certainly be written into the platform on the subjects I am discussing, are no longer promises, but represent legislation already passed by the Republican Party in support of the civil rights of the individual citizens of this country.

Mr. President, that is the challenge which faces the Republican leadership. I am ready to participate in the fight to fulfill it. I serve notice now, I am ready to sign a cloture petition when the right time comes. I serve notice now that I am ready to meet a filibuster. I think I have demonstrated in the past that I know how to meet a filibuster on either side. However, Mr. President, let it not be forgotten that I shall do everything I can to guarantee to Senators from the South, on the other side of the aisle, adequate time to present their case on the merits on any of the proposals which may be made, because it was in support of that principle that I carried on my fight in support of the filibuster against the Taft-Hartley bill. At no time did I say in that fight that I sought to prevent a vote on the bill. Rather, as I testified before the Rules Committee of the Senate in February 1947—and it is a matter of printed record—my position on antifilibuster legislation was then and is now that there are two guaranties that are necessary to protect when an attempt is made to limit debate. First, the guaranty that adequate time will be allowed so that the minority on any bill shall have adequate time to present its case on the merits of the bill, and, in the second place, so that adequate time will be provided for the country to be heard from regarding such major legislation, as is always the subject of a filibuster, when a filibuster occurs. The protecting of those guaranties is vital to minority rights in the Senate.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in my opinion it is vital to the preservation of the political rights of the majority in the country, because, after all, unless we keep untrammelled the right of full and fair debate in the Senate, without danger of being trampled over by a dominant majority of the moment, then the rights of every American citizen to enjoy the benefits of a government by checks and balances will also suffer.

So, Mr. President, I shall join in protecting the rights of the members of the opposite party in the case of any of the civil-rights legislation which may be pending, insofar as assuring them adequate and full time to debate the merits of the issue. But I announce now, Mr. President, that the leadership of my party on the floor of the Senate can count on my shoulder-to-shoulder support of any program which they may outline to break a filibuster on any of the civil-rights legislation, if my party leadership will make that legislation the business of the Senate.

Why not fight the issue out now? Why soft-pedal the issue, Mr. President? Why take the attitude that we must not do anything until after the convention? Do not the American people see through that? Perhaps some people meet American citizens of a different brand from those whom I meet. In my travels around the country—and they are lengthy—I think I learn the point of view of a very good cross section of the American people.

I want to say to the Republican Party that the American people who will support us in November by such an overwhelming vote as to assure our election, so clearly that, as we sometimes say, we

can almost go fishing and still win the election, want us to make a record between now and next June on social legislation, demonstrating that we are entitled to their confidence. They want to do more than just vote the Democrats out. They want to vote the Republican Party in on the basis of deserved confidence in its program. I want to give them a Republican program which justifies their voting us into power next November. My party should pass between now and the time we adjourn in June several great pieces of social legislation.

I have one other suggestion to make, and I recommend it particularly to my good friend Harold Stassen. We also should recognize that the Taft-Hartley law needs many amendments over and above those which he has suggested in the State of Oregon in the past few days. If he will read and analyze the law more carefully, if he will look at the operation of it as it has functioned since its passage, in the matter of the undesirable procedural effects of it, I think he will join with the junior Senator from Oregon in the view that it needs many amendments over and above the amendments which he has suggested to date.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that I know—no one has to tell me—that there are many Republicans who do not particularly share my views or approve of such views as I have expressed this afternoon, but my party has always been big enough to recognize that its progress, after all, has rested upon honest differences of opinion among its leaders. I also know that we shall not make progress either within the Republican Party or within the country if we simply become advocates of the status quo, because time truly moves on, and Republicans must never let time pass them by.

So I recommend to my party now that its leadership in the Congress of the United States give the closest consideration and the most careful study to the legislative needs of the country in the field of social legislation, such as sorely needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley law and such as the passage of civil-rights legislation which will protect the dignity of the individual citizens of this country. I call attention to the pending legislation for which I have been fighting since I have been in the Senate. I think that at least a start should be made in passing legislation on civil rights and on amending the Taft-Hartley law which will give the American people some hope in the progressivism of the Republican Party. Even though we are now certain of victory in November let us not overlook our opportunity to become the party of all of the people.

#### EXHIBIT A

THE FRANK IRVINE LECTURE OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, 1948

WILL WE HAVE INDUSTRIAL WAR OR PEACE WITH THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW?

(By WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., February 19, 1948)

The question raised by the title of this paper—Will We Have Industrial War or Peace With the Taft-Hartley Law?—cannot be answered categorically.

Great sums of money are being spent by powerful economic forces in America in spreading propaganda seeking to convince the many millions of American people who have never read the Taft-Hartley law and who cannot be expected to understand in lawyer terms the implications of its multitudinous legal technicalities that the law has already reduced industrial strife. Much of this propaganda comes from the same anti-union sources that had so much to do with whipping up public opinion to such a state of hysteria as came to characterize the view of so many Americans before the Taft-Hartley law was passed.

Fortunately, a law of diminishing returns applies not only to the field of economics but to the field of human and mass psychology. It is becoming more and more difficult for the antilabor forces of the country to hold their Taft-Hartley law converts. American public opinion is steadily shifting to one of grave doubt as to the workability, feasibility, fairness, and, in some respects, constitutionality of the Taft-Hartley law.

Reflection upon the rights of labor is taking the place of resentment over the abuses of labor which came to dominate public opinion prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. The political pressures which were brought to bear upon the Congress during the weeks of the historic debate over the Taft-Hartley bill in the first session of the Eightieth Congress made it very difficult to direct the attention of many Members of Congress to an analytical consideration of the merits and demerits of various sections and provisions of the proposed labor legislation. There was a great tendency for many Members of Congress, responding to what they thought was a public demand to discipline labor, to align themselves behind certain leaders of Congress who had become the spokesmen for those few groups within American industry who saw an opportunity to pass very drastic labor legislation. Proponents of the legitimate rights of labor during that debate were somewhat on the defensive because intellectual honesty compelled us to admit that labor had, in some particulars, abused its privileges and exceeded its rights by infringing upon the liberties of others.

When the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947 organized labor in America was operating outside of the framework of a friendly public opinion. Those who were willing to read the handwriting on the wall could not fail to see that some restrictive labor legislation was needed and that some would be passed by the Eightieth Congress. Some of us in Congress warned labor in January 1947 and repeated our warnings in the weeks following, that there was a great danger that some of the legitimate rights of labor would be jeopardized by congressional action unless the labor leaders of the country came forward and cooperated with the Congress in preparing legislation which would satisfy the public demand for an end to the unfair labor practices of the unions but which legislation, at the same time, would not injure or destroy any of the legitimate rights of labor. Unfortunately, labor leaders, as a group, said "no" to any suggestion that they help prepare fair-labor legislation. They apparently, but mistakenly, thought that the legislative processes of our democracy could not and would not be applied to labor. Subsequent events proved how mistaken they were.

Although public opinion is rapidly shifting to a recognition that the Taft-Hartley law is too extreme in many of its provisions, labor needs to heed the caution that many people who were supporters of what they thought were good objectives of the Taft-Hartley bill, and which they now realize cannot be accomplished in many respects through the Taft-Hartley law are nevertheless hopeful that the passage of the law will at least demonstrate to American labor that it must work

within the framework of public opinion. It is public opinion which is the basic check upon the activities of all groups within our system of self-government. Labor must never forget that fact.

American workers also need to reflect as they never have before on the basic meanings of our system of political and economic democracy. They, as well as Americans in all walks of life, need to rededicate themselves in these trying days to the principles of our private-property economy. Labor needs to recognize that in spite of the provocations and propaganda of antilabor forces in this country which succeeded in whipping up public opinion, including that of the majority opinion of the Congress of the United States, to such an emotional state that the Taft-Hartley law was passed, we still have available to us the democratic procedures of self-government which can and must be used to correct such wrongs. There are not very many places in the world where labor is still free to participate in the rights of democratic self-government, including the freedom of the ballot box. Hence, American labor should remember that it can best strengthen its position with American public opinion if it will confine its program for a thorough overhauling of the Taft-Hartley law to the democratic procedures available to it through legal tests in the courtrooms of America and political tests at the voting booths of America.

We cannot condone a defiance or evasion of the law even though it may be an unpopular law. Once laws are put on the statute books, be they the Taft-Hartley law or any other, we cannot condone discriminatory practices in the enforcement of the law and still keep faith with government by law.

On the other hand it is proper and right for labor to select certain fact situations in the form of specific labor disputes in order to challenge and test the legality of some of the major sections of the Taft-Hartley law. Some sections of the law, in all probability, will be declared invalid by the courts but most lawyers agree that labor, as well as the public, soon will come to recognize that the injustices and unfair provisions of the Taft-Hartley law cannot be corrected by court decisions. Only those parts of the law which violate the Constitution, or which might be found to be so involved in a maze of ambiguities and inconsistencies as to be void, can be eliminated by court action.

One of the worst evils of the Taft-Hartley law is that most of its unjust provisions are so cleverly devised from a legalistic standpoint that no relief will be provided labor from most court tests of the law. The lawyers for antilabor employers will be able to delay and delay the consideration of labor's demands under this law for so long that they will accomplish their real intent which is to use costly court actions to harass and defeat unionism. The best way to protect the legitimate interest of labor under this bad law is not in the courts but at the ballot boxes, by electing men who will repeal it or rewrite it.

The American people fully understand that this law must and will be tested in the courts and they understand that to make these tests there will be instances in which a union will decide to violate some section of the law in order to test it. But that is quite a different thing from any concerted program on the part of labor generally to refuse to abide by the law.

The litigation and court tests which will flow from this law should remove any fear of economic insecurity from law-school students who plan to specialize in labor law as long as this full-employment bill for lawyers remains on the statute books. In a facetious vein it might be said that the legal profession operating as the tightest closed-shop union in America produced the Taft-Hartley law as part of its make-work program.

The Taft-Hartley law is subject to the criticism that it is a hodgepodge of legal technicalities so cleverly devised as to weaken the bargaining strength of unions. Throughout the debate on the Taft-Hartley law politician after politician in the Congress sought to make clear for the record that he was not opposed to unions. However, as one listened to the arguments of many of the self-confessed friends of unions who announced that they were voting for the Taft-Hartley bill the impression grew that these professed friends of unions were in many cases strong for weak unions.

Many, many people seem to forget this curious fact: Throughout the long history of the labor movement in this country every demand made by the Nation's workers has met with consistent and often violent opposition. Then, after each gain had been won, historians and people generally looked back and agreed that labor's so-called demands were just and necessary.

Go back as far as you like, the story is always the same. Even labor's long fight for free education was bitterly denounced. As for the right to organize and bargain collectively, there is still a powerful minority of union-hating employers who want no part of it. Unfortunately their attitude is reflected in some sections of the Taft-Hartley law.

It should be noted and not forgotten that collective bargaining now plays a vital part in our economy. Today some 50,000 union contracts protect the wages and living standards of 15,000,000 workers and their families. The arithmetic of these contracts is part of the arithmetic of democracy.

To understand the great differences that developed in the Congress of the United States over the many issues that are involved in the Taft-Hartley law would require a painstaking analysis of the voluminous record which was made during the weeks of committee hearings and the many days of carefully prepared debate on the bill. The debate was a historic one, particularly in the Senate where the privilege of full debate still prevails.

It should be mentioned that during the debate on the President's veto message handed down on the Taft-Hartley bill an attempt was made to stifle full debate on that veto message by the leaders of the majority who seemed to fear that there was a danger that they might lose their majority following, if the Members of the Senate and if the people of the country were given sufficient time to reflect upon the soundness of the President's veto message. Fortunately, there were enough Members of the Senate who dared to challenge the steam-roller tactics of the majority by exercising their right to hold the floor until ample time could be guaranteed to the minority to make its case in support of the veto. As the writer of this paper pointed out in that debate the Senate of the United States is the last great citadel of untrammelled free speech among the parliamentary bodies of the world and the interests of democratic government make it imperative that it remain such.

The congressional debates on the Taft-Hartley bill provide source material for several good doctorate theses in both law and political science including one on the subject *Parliamentary Strategy—Its Use and Abuse in the Senate of the United States*.

Time and space, as well as the endurance of the reader, do not permit this paper to cover within its subject matter even a broad outline of the many issues and points of view that were developed and expounded throughout the congressional history of the Taft-Hartley bill. However, a few of the high lights will be discussed briefly in presenting the writer's view that the Taft-Hartley law unless drastically revised will mean industrial war rather than industrial peace in the years to come.



It is true that some aspirants for the Presidency of the United States, who find themselves committed to the Taft-Hartley law, are attempting to save political face by selling a non sequitur to the American people. Such demagoguery is not new in American politics but follows the old tested formula that "partisanship often blinds the partisan to the truth."

Thus, the politicians who voted for the Taft-Hartley bill and who are now confronted with the task of proving to labor that they knew what was best for labor, ala the Taft-Hartley bill, are defending their vote by pointing out that there have been fewer strikes since the Taft-Hartley bill was passed than there were during a similar period before it was passed. Oh, Aristotle, what fallacies are committed in thy memory.

Official Government labor statistics show also that during the period following the passage of the Taft-Hartley law national employment has increased. Surely the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law must be able to find some cause to effect relationship between the law and increased employment. It is no less a non sequitur to argue that because there have been fewer strikes since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law than there were for a similar period before its passage the Taft-Hartley law is the cause of the decrease in strikes.

It also is to be noted that the level of the cost of living has risen considerably since the passage of the law in spite of the flurry of recession in recent days. Surely the fact that the two phenomena have occurred in a close time relationship to each other must establish and bear out a casual relationship if we are to follow the logic, or lack of it, of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law in respect to strike statistics.

Of course, when it is pointed out to the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law, who now are attempting to rationalize their votes on the basis of the decline in strikes since the passage of the law, that thousands upon thousands of American employers entered into evasive and subterfuge agreements with labor in order to get around the provisions of the law and avoid conflict with the workers over the act, their response is chiefly characterized by extra vocalization that doesn't even formulate itself into words.

When it is pointed out to these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law that there would have been strikes in major industries of this country, whose labor contracts terminated after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, if management in those industries had not yielded to the major economic demands of the unions in order to avoid a test under the Taft-Hartley law, these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law have a common reply; namely, "We just don't believe it." However, all they need to do is to talk to a cross section of employers who have signed labor agreements since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. They will find that employer after employer will tell them, if they win his confidence, that he made many concessions which he is sure he would not have needed to make if he had not considered it so very desirable that he avoid a test with his union over the Taft-Hartley law.

Until courts pass upon various provisions of the act it cannot be said within a certainty just how far the parties to a labor agreement can go in contracting out from under the provisions of the act. However, there is no doubt about the fact that thousands of labor contracts have been entered into since the passage of the act which cannot be reconciled with the spirit and intent of Congress in passing the act. It certainly is clear that in passing the act Congress had no intention of passing a so-called private act but rather the putting upon the statute books a public-policy act frequently referred to throughout the debate as a union-control law.

Prof. Edwin E. Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, and one of the top labor economists of the country, comments upon the doubtful legal status of the many labor agreements which seek to exclude by agreement of the parties the application of the Taft-Hartley law to the terms of the agreement as follows:

"An illustration of the present uncertainty surrounding the new law is afforded by the public statements which the two Members of Congress whose names this measure bears made concerning the agreement concluded recently between John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers and the bituminous coal operators of the country. Congressman HARTLEY denounced this agreement as 'a clear violation of the labor law' and warned the operators that they faced criminal prosecution and heavy penalties if they observed the provisions of the agreement. Senator TAFT thereafter gave it as his view that the coal agreement was not 'in any way a violation of the law,' and going beyond this, he cited the agreement as illustrating that under the new law 'employers and employees should be able to make any contract they want to.'"<sup>1</sup>

In the same article Professor Witte writes: "What has been most disturbing to managements sincerely desirous of maintaining or developing better relations with their unions has been the bitterness the new law has aroused among the leaders of union labor and the staunch union members. It has opened old sores of extreme distrust of business, which had been pretty well healed. It also has confronted managements with the prospect of having to find a solution before long for difficult problems of labor-management relations arising out of the new law. Looming large among these are the union insistence upon eliminating 'no-strike' clauses in contracts and the problem of what to do when union-security provisions expire. In this connection it is worthy of note that most of those management witnesses who in their testimony in the congressional hearings strongly condemned the closed shop, never had such a provision in their contracts."<sup>2</sup>

Then, too, there have been those employers who since the passage of the law have signed agreements without such collective bargaining controversy because they have been very anxious to grant substantial increases in wages for a variety of reasons such as their desire to maintain an inflated price structure out of which they are reaping, at the expense of a long-suffering public, excessive profits. Such employers have followed the course of avoiding any stoppage of work by going along with labor for the most part, even though it has meant substantial increases in wages because they know the pattern of American industry since the end of the war has been to increase prices, at least twice the amount necessary, to take care of any increase in wages.

In many instances the increase in prices has been several times the amount necessary to pay for increased cost of labor. However, by granting a wage increase they have been able to pass along to the consumer greater than necessary price increases under the half truth that increased labor costs require it.

Then there have been other employers who have followed the advice of certain employer and trade associations that now is not the time to challenge labor under the Taft-Hartley law. This antilabor group of employers, who fortunately, at least at present, represent a minority of American industry are adopting the strategy of acceding to the major demands of labor for the time being until they can feed public opinion with another prescription of propaganda opiates which will becloud the public into thinking

<sup>1</sup> Edwin E. Witte, *Labor Management Relations Under the Taft-Hartley Act*, Harvard Business Review, autumn, 1947, p. 554.

<sup>2</sup> Witte, op. cit., p. 573.

that maybe after all the Taft-Hartley law is good for labor.

This group of employers is well trained in industrial warfare and appreciates the fact that the timing of a battle often means the difference between victory and defeat. They know that their battle against strong unionism by use of the legal weapons provided in the Taft-Hartley law can more easily be won in time of declining employment rather than in a period of expanding employment such as still characterizes the American postwar economy. The truth is that it is going to take 2 or 3 years for the Taft-Hartley law to show its legal effects and it is to be expected as long as full employment exists and labor's economic demands are generally complied with there will be few strikes resulting from the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

However, when recession starts in with its inevitable resulting unemployment the labor-relations picture will change and then the opportunity will present itself under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law for those employers who wish to take advantage of organized labor to do so. Then industrial conflicts will move from the arena of a few court-test cases which are presently being carried on to the arena of economic industrial warfare. Labor will be at a disadvantage at first in that struggle, but as always it will learn the hard way and in due course of time another legislative record in defense of the legitimate rights of free workers will be written into the statute books of America as was the case when the battles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and of the Wagner Act were won. Be that as it may, the fact remains that statesmanship has a great opportunity to help avoid that potential industrial war by proceeding now to revise in many major respects the Taft-Hartley law.

Perhaps as clear a bird's-eye view as can be obtained of the great difference between the proponents and the opponents of the Taft-Hartley bill, both as to legal substance and parliamentary strategy, can be presented in this paper by calling attention to the differences which were brought out in some of the speeches in the closing hour of the historic debate in the Senate.

During that hour the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] summarized his position in support of the bill and in part he said:

"Mr. President, when the conference bill was before this body on the day on which it was finally passed by the Senate, I expressed myself rather thoroughly concerning it. It is not my purpose at this time to repeat to any great extent what I said then.

"However, the veto message accompanying the President's disapproval, as I see it, was utterly extreme, extreme in an uncalled-for manner, extreme in a sense which leaves no room by which there is a possibility to get together. Therefore, in the face of that veto message, I should like to make further comment.

"As I said at that time, and I repeat now, this is not a perfect bill. No one knows that better than I do. However, I want to point out one very important thing, and that is that in all probability this is as near perfection, insofar as legislation of this nature is concerned, as we can hope to reach at this particular time in the Congress of the United States. It probably reflects more completely the composite thinking of the Congress of the United States at this time than would any other piece of legislation dealing with this subject. \* \* \*

"So when the President comes forth and, as was pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], has nothing favorable to say about any part of the legislation, it causes one to pause, because I happen to know very definitely that most parts of this measure are very good indeed. It is not as bad as it has been pictured to be in the veto message. The message contains exaggera-

tion after exaggeration. The worst possible interpretation again and again is placed upon the bill's provisions. Then it is inferred it is to be subjected, finally, to the worst possible type of administration that any act of this nature could possibly have. Of course, if that were the case, we would have chaos; but that is not the case. The bill, with sympathetic sincere administration, can be made to work, and it can be made to work without any injury whatever to the legitimate objectives of organized labor. In fact, administered properly, the bill can strengthen organized labor, and I want to see organized labor strengthened.

"The attitude of the President, the attitude of the critics of the legislation causes me to wonder: Is there going to be a definite attempt to sabotage this legislation if it is enacted? I come to the point which I think is one of the three most important in connection with the bill, namely, Will the National Labor Relations Board, and the administration under that Board, seek to sabotage the legislation? I do not believe so. I have faith in the Chairman of that Board. He may not agree with the bill, he may not like it, but he is the type of man who will do his utmost to see that its provisions are carried out faithfully. \* \* \*

"Finally, and most important of all, is the question of the joint congressional committee which has been referred to in the discussion today. Too little attention has been paid to the importance of that joint committee. However, I think its significance is now beginning to be realized. The joint committee itself, through its own operations and activities, can pave the way for the removal of any undesirable situation which may develop as a result of this legislation. \* \* \*

"As I stated in my remarks 2 weeks ago, this bill is not an end product. This is not final legislation on this subject. That was the mistake which has been made in connection with the National Labor Relations Act, when it was first passed, and ever since. This type of legislation is subject to constant change and correction. If it were perfect today, 5 years from today many imperfections would very likely have shown up, in view of intervening circumstances. There can be no end product, no final legislation, in this field.

"With that understanding, the joint congressional committee can go forward, looking for corrections which must be made, and helping management and labor to get together and to work together. These things they can do, and I know it. The joint committee should act in part to help formulate administrative policy and procedure as well as to perform its functions as a strictly legislative agency at the inception of the new law. These things the committee can do, and I know it.

"If the committee will go forward with the idea of helping to get labor and management together, the idea of correcting the defects in the legislation, and, finally, the idea of having a law which is absolutely fair and as nearly perfect as possible, then I predict that the bill passed today—as I believe it will be—will prove to be of great benefit to the country."<sup>3</sup>

The junior Senator from New York summarized very well the opinion of a great majority of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill who made the same argument so common in the press at the time that the Taft-Hartley law should be passed, imperfect as it was, but with the hope and the promise that it might be amended later.

It is submitted that such an argument in justification of voting for legislation which admittedly is in need of amendment at the

very time it is passed is not a sound one on which to support a vote for the legislation. Thus the writer of this paper replied to the summary arguments of the proponents of the bill in part, as follows:

"Let me make a point or two with regard to the merits of the great issue now before us. I have just listened to two very interesting and able speeches—one by my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the other by my good friend from New York [Mr. IVES].

"I think these two distinguished Senators have overlooked one very fundamental point in drafting legislation, and that is that if legislation contains language which permits of abuse of power, it is bad legislation. To say that they believe that extreme interpretations have been placed on the legislation by the President and by some of us who have opposed the legislation on the floor of the Senate is to overlook the point that what the President has been pointing out, and what we have been pointing out, is that the language of the bill would permit abuse of power. It is subject to the interpretation we have put on it and party litigants under it will be entitled to those interpretations as a matter of legal right. This law will not and cannot, under its legal meaning, be interpreted and administered to please the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York. It must be given its legal meaning by the courts, and I say that the courts are bound to apply it quite differently from the way Senator Ives and Senator BALL talk about it.

"To try to alibi it, or rationalize it on the ground that if it is properly administered it will not be as bad as we think it will be, begs the whole question. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] cannot take away from the courts of this land their solemn obligation to give the legal meaning to the language used in this bill as the law requires. Employers will be entitled to decisions under it which, according to the language of the bill, will enable them to destroy many legitimate rights of labor. \* \* \*

"The courts are bound to apply the language of this bill in accordance with its legal meaning; and when they do, many hardships will be imposed not only upon organized labor in this country but upon employers as well. It is a legal monstrosity which will cause much litigation and resulting labor strife.

"The second point I would make on their speeches is that running through them is the tacit admission that before this bill is finally passed they recognize that it contains a great many imperfections. \* \* \* I say statesmanship calls upon us now to prevent the passage of legislation which even the sponsors themselves will admit contains many imperfections. These sponsors are engaging already in a confession and avoidance plea.

"The last point I want to make is one in regard to Senator Ives' talk about sabotaging the bill. I do not know what he meant by sabotage, but, as I said on Saturday, if this bill goes on the books the junior Senator from Oregon will take the position that the forces of government must be used to carry out and enforce the bill. There cannot be government by law in this country on any other basis. But our insistence upon enforcement of the law is not going to change human nature. I am very much of the opinion that labor, recognizing the tremendous injury that this bill will inflict upon its legitimate rights, will dig in along a united front and fight the administration of this bill to the extent that it visits upon labor gross injustices.

"Will that produce industrial harmony in America? Will that give us the peace in industry that we want? Not at all, Mr.

President. We shall not be able to escape the fact that before this bill is even dry on the statute books we shall have to proceed at once to work out substantial revisions of it. Why not do it now? Why not recognize the duty of statesmanship which rests upon each and every one of us and sustain this veto and then proceed, as was pointed out by another speaker this morning, the very able statesman from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to work on a bill that will meet the objections which have been raised to this bill? I think that is the solemn duty of each one of us in this session of Congress. I shall not vote, Mr. President, for a bill which the proponents already recognize is one which should be started down the road of revision.

"Mr. President, I do not believe that an issue more vital to the economic welfare and the over-all public interest of this country will be before the Members of this body for many a day. I am sure that at the hour of 3 o'clock this afternoon every man in this body will have an opportunity to make his record as to whether he will vote to protect the public interest or will vote for a bill so prejudiced in its terms that it will invite and invoke great industrial disharmony for years to come until the injustices of the bill are wiped once and for all off the statute books of America. I shall be glad to stand on my record of consistent opposition to this bill and in support of the President's excellent and unanswerable veto message."

Although the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law over the President's veto on June 23, 1947, serious doubts as to the wisdom of some effects of the bill were expressed in Senate speeches within a few days after the act became law, by Members of Congress who voted for the bill. Doubts were expressed as to whether or not the sections of the bill restricting political activity by unions were constitutional, or were so ambiguous in phraseology as to place unions in a position of acting at their peril in opposition to or in support of political candidates.

Some Members of Congress who voted for the bill found themselves in disagreement as to the legality of the Communist affidavit section of the bill, and as to the procedure which was required under the law in regard to union registration requirements and the public's right to inspect the information filed by the unions. The Secretary of Labor gave one interpretation to the effect that such information was to be treated as confidential, available only to the Secretary of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board; while on the other hand some of the leading proponents of the act made public comment to the effect that the ruling of the Secretary of Labor was in clear violation of the intent of Congress as expressed in the language of the act. To all this the Secretary of Labor replied it was for the courts to decide—all of which caused the lawyers to take note.

By July 14 the senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. HATCH, and the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, both proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill, had become convinced that the political expenditure section of the bill seeking to regulate the political activities of unions was unconstitutional. Therefore, on that day they made speeches in the Senate in explanation of an amendment which they had introduced several days previously, and which still is pending in the Senate, seeking to correct what they considered to be an unconstitutional section of the law.

Some of the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico on that occasion are as clear a rationale of the position taken by many of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law as

<sup>3</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93 part 6, p. 7531.

<sup>4</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, part 6, p. 7531.



is to be found in the entire debates. He said in part:

"Mr. President, because I have been asked several questions, I shall digress for a moment and shall discuss another subject. When the Taft-Hartley bill was before the Senate, I thought all of us knew it was not a perfect bill. The question of labor-management relations is too great, too involved, and too complex to be solved by one or even a series of legislative acts, if it is possible to solve those problems by legislation at all.

"Nevertheless, many of us believed that notwithstanding those apparent defects, the Taft-Hartley bill contained much worth-while legislation, sufficient to require its passage. Even when the conference report was discussed on the floor and when one of the more objectionable features was plainly pointed out, the thought continued with some of us that corrections could be made by subsequent legislation and that it would be better to pass that measure and let it become the law, notwithstanding the defects. I, myself, was of that mind, but I made it plain that whenever an injustice or wrong appeared I would sponsor legislation to correct it.

"Accordingly, last week I was glad to join with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] in submitting to the Taft-Hartley law an amendment which we believe will correct at least one wrong and error which was contained in the original act. The amendment we offer merely strikes out the word 'expenditures' from what was first section 304 of the House bill, and was later incorporated into the legislation finally drawn up by the conferees representing the two Houses. The bill which passed the Senate did not contain that provision. So far as the Senate is concerned, that provision appeared in the Senate only when the conference report was submitted to us.

"By including the word 'expenditures,' it was sought to place expenditures on the same basis as contributions, and to apply both of those terms to both corporations and labor organizations. At first glance, that provision would seem to be a fair one; it would seem to be fair to place corporations and labor organizations upon the same basis. However, it is this provision including the word 'expenditures' which caused considerable debate in the Senate, and it was claimed that the provision violates certain constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

"As I have said, there was some discussion of this provision at the time when the conference report was being considered, but it must be remembered that in the consideration of a conference report no opportunity for vote on separate provisions is given and the only vote possible is to either adopt or reject the conference report. Therefore, Senators never had an opportunity to express themselves on the inclusion of the word 'expenditures' in the general restrictions against political contributions.

"The amendment the Senator from Vermont and I have offered will give an opportunity to vote on the exact question and the precise issue. This is one of my reasons in offering the amendment. If at all possible, it should be reported by the committee and discussed and acted upon before the present session adjourns.

"I am not discussing the constitutional aspect of the situation. Regardless of that, it appeared to me at the time the conference report was being discussed that including the word 'expenditures' did unfairly discriminate against labor organizations. It was a defect, however, which I believed could be corrected by later legislation, and therefore, I am glad to sponsor an amendment which will give the opportunity to make what I concede to be a needed correction."

In the same vein the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Aiken, argued:

"I think it is entirely possible that the labor leaders may be inviting a test which they feel they are almost certain to win, because there is not the slightest shadow of a doubt that this rider on the labor bill, which was adopted in the conference committee, is a direct violation of the right of free speech, and the right of a free press.

"I wish to join the Senator from New Mexico at this time in urging that action be taken to correct, at the earliest possible date, this bit of foolish legislation on the part of Congress. I understand that if interpreted literally, as a law should be interpreted, most of the newspapers of the country would be violating the law if they commented on political issues during political campaigns. Certainly there are many organizations, some on one side of an issue and some on another, which are incorporated, which would be strictly prohibited from spending a single penny to distribute voting records of Members of Congress, or even commenting on issues in a political campaign."

To illustrate that good feeling and good humor prevailed at least most of the time in the Senate throughout the course of the debate over this labor legislation, even though the differences in opinion were chasm-wide and deep, the following colloquy on the Hatch-Aiken amendment will be of interest:

"Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I wish to commend him for the position which he has taken on the Taft-Hartley bill, and in regard to this particular amendment.

"Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator restricts his commendation to what I have said on this particular amendment.

"Mr. MORSE. I am about to do that by this sentence. I think it is commendable of the Senator. I am glad to hear him and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] support the amendment, because the points the Senator is now making were all made before a vote was taken on the bill. I think it would be much more beneficial if the Senator from New Mexico would join with us who have already offered a bill to repeal the entire act.

"Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Oregon has said, I made it clear in the beginning that at the time this particular question was discussed I was greatly disturbed about it. I decided that the best procedure would be to pass the bill and later correct its defects. I am still of that opinion. I am still of the opinion I entertained when I voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. I am not receding from or changing my position, but I do think this is a matter which ought to be corrected."

However, it is to be noted that no action yet has been taken on the Hatch-Aiken proposed amendment or any other proposal for revision of the Taft-Hartley law. In all probability none will be taken in this session of Congress.

It is more than likely that legislative changes will not be made in the act until after the courts have passed on the major provisions of the act, or until the inevitable labor difficulties which will be accentuated by the Taft-Hartley law in time of recession or depression produce another labor-legislation crisis. At least, that usually is the course of events whenever Congress in response to the political pressures of the moment adopts make-shift legislation which it knows at the time contains imperfections so serious in nature that amendments in the future are going to be needed.

However, the difficulty and the weakness with that approach is that it is always very difficult to amend and correct the imperfections of legislation once it is passed. The

time to perfect legislation is before the final vote on it is taken—and there was no good reason for the Congress to adjourn in July 1947 without first perfecting the Taft-Hartley law in the interest of industrial peace.

The ideal way to amend the Taft-Hartley law would be to repeal it and then consider new labor legislation based on the principles of the Senate committee bill, which in the committee stage was generally known as the Morse-Ives bill.

It is interesting to note that some of the members of the Senate committee who fought hard in committee for the Morse-Ives bill, and who helped vote down in committee some of the amendments which later were made a part of the Taft-Hartley law, joined in supporting the Taft-Hartley law on the floor of the Senate even though the Senate amendments and the more than 30 procedural changes introduced into the bill at the conference committee level produced fundamental changes in the theory of the bill.

The bill which was reported out of the Senate committee, and which during the committee stage was known as the Morse-Ives bill, placed its major procedural emphasis upon the administrative law approach to adjudicating labor disputes. For the most part it sought to make use of the unfair labor practice procedure of the Wagner Act by attempting to bring within the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board certain labor abuses which were defined as unfair labor practices by unions.

However, the amendments to the committee bill made on the floor of the Senate and by the Senate-House conference committee report changed the bill basically from an administrative law procedure bill into a predominantly common law court action bill. It is submitted that if those members of the Senate committee who stood shoulder to shoulder during the long weeks of committee hearings and discussions on the Morse-Ives bill had continued to stand together in support of the committee bill when it reached the floor of the Senate, the Taft-Hartley law would not be the law it is today. The entire course of the legislation on the floor of the Senate would have been changed.

The retreat of some Senators from the provisions of the committee bill naturally influenced other Members of the Senate and gave aid and comfort to those who sought to upset the committee bill. From the standpoint of parliamentary strategy it was important to maintain united support among those who fought so hard for the committee bill, in order to keep enough votes in the Senate to sustain a Presidential veto.

The very moment the group which was chiefly responsible for the committee bill split on the floor of the Senate, and some of them went along with Senate floor amendments to the committee bill—the principles of which amendments they had voted against in committee—it then became clear to the Taft forces that in all probability they would be able to secure enough votes to override a veto. It was at that point that all the good work which had been done in committee in developing the committee bill was in large measure sacrificed because without enough votes in the Senate to sustain a veto there was not much which could be done to stop the Taft-Hartley forces in conference from attaining the type of bill they started out at the beginning of the session of Congress to pass.

As Professor Witte points out in his excellent article in the Harvard Business Review:

"Of 40 main provisions in the Senate bill, no less than 25 were materially changed in conference. The public is under the impression that the bill agreed upon in conference (which was the measure passed over the President's veto) followed the milder Senate bill rather than the more drastic House version. With the exception of the

<sup>5</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, part 7, p. 8827.

<sup>6</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, part 7, p. 8828.

restrictions in the House bill on industry-wide and associational bargaining and a few other major provisions, however, the final act more closely resembles the House than the Senate version. As Representative HARTLEY put it, in presenting the conference report to the House, "there is more in this bill than may meet the eye."

It is the view of the writer of this paper that if the members of the Senate committee who had worked so close together and so hard over the weeks in putting through committee the committee bill in the form that it went to the floor of the Senate had remained united solidly behind that bill on the floor of the Senate, the final legislation would much more closely have conformed to the provisions of the Senate bill than does the present Taft-Hartley law.

Thus it is important to an understanding of the labor legislation of the Eightieth Congress to know that the bill which was reported to the floor of the Senate on April 17, S. 1126, was a merging of the legislative proposals of several Senators. During the weeks in which the bill was being developed and written within the Senate committee it was known as the Morse-Ives bill, because the major portions of the bill consisted of a consolidation of the separate bills which had been introduced in the Senate as independent pieces of legislation by Senator IRVING M. IVES (Republican, New York), and by the writer of this paper. In other words, the Ives bills and the Morse bills came to comprise a greater part of the committee bill, but when once adopted by the committee and introduced on the floor of the Senate by Senator TAFT, as chairman, became known as the Taft Senate bill, S. 1126.

It is interesting to note that in committee the major sections of the Morse-Ives bill were approved in committee by a vote of either 7 to 6 or 8 to 5. It was only after Senator Ives and the writer succeeded in holding a majority vote in committee on the major sections of our proposed legislation by the close margin of a 1-to-3 vote majority out of a 13-man committee that Senator TAFT and other committee members finally agreed to vote for the committee bill in its entirety, with announcement that they would seek to amend it on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, although the vote within the committee was very close on each one of the major sections of S. 1126, the final vote on the entire bill and the vote by which the bill was reported to the floor was a vote of 11 to 2.

It is reiterated at this point that the principal changes which were made in the Senate bill 1126 by the conference committee were very significant changes in legal procedure for the handling of employer-employee relations and disputes under the Taft-Hartley bill. Those changes created many legal technicalities which will permit of great delays in handling disputes and which will stir up much litigation and great controversy between employers and workers.

It is an elementary principle in the settling of labor disputes that time is of the essence. Delays in entering into a collective-bargaining agreement, in settling a worker's grievance, or in mediating or adjudicating a labor dispute always increase the danger of one or both parties resorting to economic action.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that the dominant remedy provided in so many sections of the Taft-Hartley bill is in the form of common-law court actions. The record of common-law courts in the field of labor relations has shown that those courts are not best suited for the settlement of labor issues. Common-law court rules, legal principles, and procedure have never worked well in America for adjudicating labor disputes, and in my judgment never will, because the issues involved are not basically

legal issues which can best be adjudicated in the ordinary common-law court.

The issue of whether or not the worker is getting a fair wage is not a legal issue. The issue of whether or not an employer is discriminating against his employee because of his membership in a union is not a legal issue. The question of whether or not a union should be certified for collective bargaining with an employer is not a legal question. The problem of determining whether a certain type of work falls within the jurisdiction of union X or Y is not a legal problem.

At least 90 percent, and probably more, of the multitude of questions, problems, and issues which are involved in a great complex variety of labor-relations problems are not even remotely connected with legal issues, but are basically social or economic issues growing out of the human relations existing between employer and workers.

There is even a great deal of loose thinking about the supposedly legal aspects of breaches of a labor contract by unions and by employers. Thus, for example, the Taft-Hartley Act provides only one remedy for a breach of a labor agreement by a union and that is a suit for damages in a common-law court. It also will be possible under some provisions of the act in certain circumstances to secure an injunction against certain types of breaches of contracts by unions. However, those who place such confidence in the contract violation remedies of the Taft-Hartley law are thinking in terms of the ordinary legal contract.

However, a collective-bargaining agreement is not an ordinary contract. Generally speaking, the commitments in the so-called labor contracts are highly conditional and of the if-when-as-and-maybe type. Thus, in such an agreement the usual promise of the employer is that if, when, and as he hires workers he will do so in accordance with certain promises and conditions which are set out in the agreement.

At the same time if one will study closely the ordinary and typical collective-bargaining agreement he will find that there are many so-called escape clauses in it for the employer and it leaves him with very little legal responsibility for any monetary liability if he decides not to continue to perform under the contract. Thus, the cases are rare in which American employers suffer any monetary damages because they do not carry out the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement.

Correspondingly, unions do not promise or commit themselves, in the last analysis, to very much under a collective-bargaining agreement. As far as the workers are concerned, they make the representations through their union that if, when, and as they work they will agree to work under such terms and conditions as are set forth in the agreement. Furthermore, they can no more be made to work under such agreements, if they do not want to, than the employer can be made to hire or continue to hire them if he does not want to.

Yet, in spite of the great difference between the legal status of an ordinary contract and that of a collective-bargaining agreement, many people, who are strong for the common-law court action procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act, are laboring under the false impression that differences which arise between employers and workers over a collective-bargaining agreement can be settled by judges in our common-law courts just as those judges settle a dispute which develops between a plaintiff and defendant over the terms of a contract involving a sale of a carload of potatoes.

The difficulty with people who have reduced their thinking on collective-bargaining agreements to such simple legal analogies is that collective-bargaining agreements do not involve primarily legal issues at all. One

cannot read the Taft-Hartley law without recognizing that the authors and proponents of that bill are seeking to place a burden on the courts of America involving a subject matter which basically is foreign to their jurisdiction.

Out of the attempt which is being made under the Taft-Hartley law to force social and economic dynamics of employer-employee relations into the strait-jacket of court procedures and legal technicalities must come amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. The history of the American labor movement shows that both free workers and free employers have always opposed attempts to destroy the basic principle of voluntarism which must and should characterize employer-employee relationships.

Government domination and control of those employer-employee relationships which should rest upon voluntarism restrict the operation of a free economy. Anything that tends to place the Government in a position of dictating the terms, the wages, the hours and conditions of employment destroys essential and legitimate rights of free workers. Likewise, Government dictation of labor relations is bound to lead to a dangerous control by Government of the methods of production, the quantity and quality of production, prices, and practically all of the inherent rights of management.

It is doubtful if any law has been placed on the statute books in a good many years in this country which has a greater potential danger of Government regimentation of our economy than is to be found in the basic principles of the Taft-Hartley law. Once a government starts to exercise the power to direct the relations which shall exist between supposedly free workers and free employers it is not many steps away from a regimented economy.

Thus, it should be said to those American employers and businessmen who in recent years have been crying out, and rightly so, about taking the Government out of business, the Taft-Hartley law places the Government into a meddling position, so far as American business is concerned, to a far greater degree than most of the laws against which businessmen and employers have been complaining so much.

The fact that temporarily American employers may think that the Taft-Hartley law will result in some benefits to them, because it is designed supposedly to check labor abuses, should not cause them to ignore that great danger to American business, to be found in the inherent principles of Government control and interference which characterize the Taft-Hartley law. It is suggested that American employers should recognize before it is too late that the Taft-Hartley law is a legislative wolf in sheep's clothing.

Week by week, more and more American employers apparently are recognizing that the procedures of the Taft-Hartley law will not be helpful to them in maintaining peaceful and profitable relations with free workers. Hence, as indicated heretofore in this paper, the American people are being treated to the spectacle of ordinarily law-abiding employers and workers entering into collusive, evasive, and sub rosa agreements designed to avoid the legal technicalities and legal liabilities of the Taft-Hartley law. This trend does not raise the level of business and labor ethics and morality.

At the same time it needs to be pointed out that no one can participate in any large number of labor cases without recognizing that labor, too, is frequently guilty of serious mistakes in policy and of unfair labor practices which, if continued, are bound to boomerang against the best interests of labor so far as public opinion is concerned. In large measure they have been caused by the unfortunate jurisdictional disputes within the house of labor and by the fact that in recent years so much of the effort and energy

<sup>1</sup> Edwin E. Witte, op. cit., p. 556.



of organized labor have been taken up with the organizing process itself that sufficient attention has not always been given to some of the economic practices of unions which do not advance the welfare of the individual worker or protect the public interest.

We did not need a Taft-Hartley law in order to correct some practices of labor which even most labor leaders will admit in private are not in the best interests of labor itself. When organized labor once again takes stock of both its accomplishments and unsolved problems which lie ahead it should not overlook the fact that labor divided against itself was one of the primary causes for the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Labor cannot afford or justify ignoring it.

Another great evil of the Taft-Hartley law is the extent to which it leads us backward to government by injunction. The writer joins in the view of one of the great jurists of his home State who said, in effect, "I do not know the answer to these vexatious and troublesome economic problems in the field of labor, but I do know that the answer is not government by injunction."

Government by injunction for the settlement of labor disputes will never be acceptable to free workers in America. The history of the American labor movement is too replete with examples of determined action on the part of American labor to free itself from the abuses of government by injunction to leave any doubt as to the unworkability or as to the acceptability of those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which seek to reestablish the practices of breaking strikes by unfair injunctions.

Likewise the provisions of the act which create a legal situation in which one law of agency is to be applicable to the employers and another law of agency, to the disadvantage of labor, applicable to unions cannot be reconciled with fair play or common justice. Thus, the bill has been loaded with provisions which make it a Pandora's box of vexatious litigation that can and will harass and weaken unions.

Under the bill as amended every organizational drive by unions, every effort to achieve collective bargaining, and every strike can be met and defeated by destructive lawsuits in the courts, and hundreds of unfair labor-practice charges by malcontent employees before the Board. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that any legislation that invites and encourages litigation over labor relations is not going to solve our problems of labor unrest or be conducive to harmonious relations between employers and employees.

Under the amended definition of the term "agent," a labor organization might be subject to civil suits and unfair labor-practice charges because of the misconduct of any steward or organizer in the plant, even though the union had not authorized or ratified the acts in question. The whole body of law built up around the Norris-LaGuardia Act to protect unions against such destructive lawsuits is threatened.

Because of the terrific abuses to which unscrupulous employers and courts, unfriendly to unions, subjected the rights of labor by virtue of such lawsuits, the Norris-LaGuardia Act specifically provides in section 6 that labor unions, their officers and members shall not be liable for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation, or upon a showing of actual authorization or ratification of such acts after actual knowledge.

One has only to refer to the LaFollette investigation to recognize the techniques that antilabor employers will use in order to accomplish what may develop again under this act.

The proclivities of this bill for endless, frustrating litigation are clearly shown by the registration requirements of the Taft-Hartley law. It should be agreed that unions should

be required to make public their financial statements. But the Taft-Hartley law goes far beyond a reasonable requirement for reporting union finances and union rules and regulations. It denies to any union its right to protection from unfair practices by employers if the union has failed in some technical respect in filing all the detailed information called for by this law. No Board proceeding can possibly be wholly immune from attack for failure to disclose some one of the many details required. Employers will be quick to make such allegations because full compliance is made a condition precedent to the Board's jurisdiction for all purposes.

The tendency of the law to invite and encourage destructive and delaying lawsuits and litigation in labor relations, instead of collective bargaining, is also shown by the provision making it an unfair labor practice and subject to civil damage suits to engage in strikes and boycotts which have as an object certain undesirable ends, such as assignment of particular work tasks. The Senate bill provided that strikes for such purposes were unfair labor practices. It must be agreed that such strikes are wholly indefensible and should be stopped.

But the effect of the provision is to resurrect, with a vengeance, one of the unhappiest chapters in American industrial life. The writer refers to the days when courts were quick to enter injunctions restricting every form of employee self-help because one objective, at least, of some leaders or participants was improper. Now employers will be encouraged to enter damaging lawsuits against every kind of action by labor unions based on the same grounds. Whether these suits have merit or not, they will inevitably weaken the union's treasury, divert its energies and resources, and delay organizational work and collective bargaining.

We talk so much about the right to strike. The right to strike is, after all, no better than the status of the union treasury; because, after all, laborers strike to win a strike, and they cannot win a strike with an empty treasury.

The law opens wide the doors of opportunity to employers to bring a multiplicity of suits for the antilabor purpose of emptying the treasuries of unions by the cost of litigation.

One of the worst features of the Taft-Hartley bill, from the procedural standpoint, is the dictatorial power it vests in the General Counsel of the Board. In opposing the Taft-Hartley bill the writer had this to say on that point: I believe that the provisions of the amended bill, insofar as they create a statutory office of General Counsel, who is to be appointed by the President for a fixed term of years, and confer upon him final authority in respect to investigation and prosecution of charges and issuance of complaints, in effect establish a separation of functions which does not differ in any substantial measure from the kind of separation which the Senate rejected in 1946 when it adopted the Administrative Procedure Act. I think it contains all the vices of dispersed authority for administration that impelled the majority of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, the sponsors of the Administrative Procedure Act, and both Houses of Congress, to reject it last year.

It is a tremendous power that has been given to the General Counsel. On page 37 of the conference report we find this language:

"The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by,

the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board."

The writer refused to vote and never will vote to vest in any single individual any such sweeping power over the handling of labor-relations cases in this country. He does not know whom we can appoint or to whom we should entrust the power to determine whether a complaint of an unfair labor practice shall be issued. One who controls the procedure of a body controls the substantive rights administered by that body. The General Counsel controls the procedural rights of every employer and every labor union in the country. Also, when it comes to the question of issuing complaints he can do it independently of the Board. The Board members can sit there and twiddle their thumbs but they cannot do anything about it, because the Congress has vested in the General Counsel that power.

Another one of the injuries to labor to be found in the Taft-Hartley law is its discriminatory provision in regard to delegating authority to the States over interstate commerce to the great disadvantage of labor in those States which pass antilabor laws. It should be remembered that the Federal Government's jurisdiction over industrial relations problems is limited to its constitutional authority over interstate commerce. When it exercises that jurisdiction then it should apply whatever rules it passes on a Federal basis to all workers and all employers all over the country.

It is grossly unfair of the Congress of the United States to do what it did in passing the Taft-Hartley Act, namely, permit the application of discriminatory rules in the field of interstate commerce by allowing individual States to apply State laws of a more drastic nature to the field of interstate commerce than is applied by the Federal Government.

Thus the Taft-Hartley law attempts to lay down a full and complete national policy as to closed- and union-shop agreements. At the same time the law provides that the national policy may be entirely disregarded and superseded by the States if they desire to impose a more restrictive policy on the same subject matter. A more pointed instance of antilabor bias could hardly be envisaged than this alleged minor change in the bill.

The jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board is limited to interstate-commerce cases and issues. But the law now provides that we except from the national policy, as it relates to interstate commerce, national jurisdiction over these matters as they involve the closed shops and union shops, in the case of any State which passes an anti-closed shop or antiunion shop bill. The bill provides in effect that we allow to employers in those State a State policy over interstate commerce contrary to a national policy that we would apply through the National Labor Relations Board in all other States which do not enact such State legislation.

It would be difficult to point out a more flagrant example of unfair discrimination than that. When it comes to interstate-commerce policies, they should be uniform throughout the Nation, and we should not have a national policy in regard to closed shops and union shops in States X, Y, and Z, but then permit of a policy quite contrary to that policy under State laws in States A, B, and C.

Many employers already are protesting because it has some interesting competitive implications connected with it, too. It will be rather interesting to hear from more and more employers as they discover that in their States they are bound by the national policy but their competitors in other States have the advantage of a union-busting State policy. In due course of time this section will prove that such discriminatory practices

will result in some unfair competitive factors for them in their competition with competitors in other States who are able to function under a different policy.

If we give that right to the States that are enacting legislation, much of which is highly antilabor and unfair to the legitimate rights of labor, we shall find the economic status of labor in those States gradually beaten down. The results of such discriminatory policies will affect wage scales and will play into the hands of employers who want cheaper and cheaper labor. Unorganized labor means cheap labor. It means low wages. Weak unions mean the same. State antilabor laws will return labor to the status of a commodity. Soon employers who are bound by the national policy as applied by the National Labor Relations Board will find themselves at a competitive disadvantage with employers operating in antilabor States which give to their employees the competitive advantage of antiunion legislation with its resulting low wages and cheap labor. Such a situation will result in nothing else but strife, friction, and increased labor trouble.

There are so many significant differences between the Senate committee bill and the final Taft-Hartley bill that neither time nor space will permit of a detailed comparative analysis in this paper. A few of the more salient differences will be listed in order to rebut the argument which has been made in some of the speeches and writings of some of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill to the effect that it differs in only minor particulars from the Senate committee bill.

One of the significant differences is to be found in the treatment given to the free-speech issue of the two bills.

The Senate committee bill provided that the National Labor Relations Board shall not "base any finding of unfair labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit." (No change was made in this provision by the Senate prior to conference.)

The conference bill and the Taft-Hartley Act as passed provided that "the expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, \* \* \* shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice \* \* \* if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit." The significant addition, in the view of those who opposed this provision, is contained in the words "shall not \* \* \* be evidence of." The criticism is that non-coercive statements, however revealing of motive, could not be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice.

As the writer said on the floor of the Senate during debate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 5, 1947, p. 6453), this is an astounding proposition. Even in the criminal law views, arguments, and opinions are received as competent evidence of motive. Under this amendment, however, the Board and the courts must close their eyes to the plain implications of speech; and they must disregard clear and probative evidence of motive, prejudice, or bias.

Another significant difference between the Senate committee bill and the Taft-Hartley Act is to be found in the treatment of jurisdictional disputes.

The Morse bill made it an unfair labor practice for a union or its agents to engage in or induce employees to engage in a strike or refusal "to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods \* \* \* or to perform any services \* \* \* because particular work tasks of such employer or any other employer are performed by employees who are or are not members of a particular labor organization." In addition, provision was made for the Na-

tional Labor Relations Board or an arbitrator appointed by it "to hear and determine" such disputes unless the parties voluntarily adjusted or arranged for the adjustment of the matter within 10 days.

In section 3 the Morse bill, S. 858, provided for compulsory arbitration of jurisdictional disputes if the unions involved resorted to strike action and failed to settle, without delay, the dispute without a continuation of the strike. This procedure was generally recognized as the most severe that can be imposed for the settling of jurisdictional disputes but is necessary if innocent employers and the public are to be protected from family quarrels within the house of labor to which neither the employer nor the public is a party.

The Senate committee bill provided that it was an unfair labor practice for a union or its agents to engage in or induce employees to engage in a strike or refusal "to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods \* \* \* or to perform any services \* \* \* for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to members of a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to members of some other labor organization" unless the employer were disregarding an order or certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the representative of the employees performing the tasks in question. The arbitration device was also adopted. (As the bill passed the Senate, a provision had been adopted, as urged by Senators TAFT and BALL, making such conduct illegal and subjecting unions to damage suits on account of it.)

The conference bill and the Taft-Hartley Act as passed adopted the provisions of the Senate bill with the following changes: (1) whereas the Senate bill stated that the action became an unfair practice if it were "for the purpose" of coercing the employer, the act as passed provided that the action became an unfair practice if "an object thereof" was to coerce the employer in the manner described. Also, jurisdictional disputes were made illegal and the occasion for damage suits.

It is submitted that declaring jurisdictional disputes illegal cannot possibly stop them because honest differences of opinion frequently develop between labor organizations as to which union is entitled to perform a certain work. Thus, they are bound to enter into good-faith quarrels over the respective rights of unions to perform a certain work which each union may claim on the basis of past practices and collective-bargaining rights to which it is entitled. There is nothing unlawful about such disputes, and attempting to make them illegal by legislative fiat isn't going to remove the causes. What is needed for their settlement is a decision as to the rights of the disputants based on the merits of the controversy. It would be just as sensible to pass a law declaring that it would be illegal for two property owners to quarrel over their boundary line and just about as successful in preventing such boundary line disputes as it is going to be declaring jurisdictional disputes illegal under the Taft-Hartley law.

What is needed is a decision in such matters and it should be rendered by experts in the field of labor relations who know a great deal about the history and practices of work assignments among labor crafts and unions in this country over the years and who are fairly familiar with the many facets of labor problems.

Thus, it is submitted that arbitration rather than court action is the most workable solution to the jurisdictional strike problem. For that reason, both the Morse bill and the Morse-Ives committee bill contemplated appointment of an arbitrator within 10 days after such a strike, whose award would be final and immediately en-

forceable in court, under a very narrow limitation as to scope of review, and thereby provided the speediest available procedure, consistent with due process, for the handling of the thorny problem of the jurisdictional strike.

These provisions were stricken out by the conferees on the bill, so that the act at present provides that "the Board is empowered to hear and determine the dispute." Since the Board itself cannot hear such cases, the new rules of the Board (secs. 203.74-203.78) now provided for (1) a hearing before a staff member of the Board on the merits of the jurisdictional dispute with (2) review of his recommendations by the Board followed by (3) efforts to obtain compliance with the determination of the Board, which if not forthcoming is followed by (4) a hearing on the unfair labor practice charge with (5) review by the Board and (6) judicial review of the entire proceeding on the wide basis now allowed by the statute. No such proceeding could be completed short of 2 years; the conferees by these procedural changes effectively removed an administrative remedy for the jurisdictional strike.

In the debate the writer vigorously protested these changes. He said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6452, June 5, 1947): "I do not have to tell the Presiding Officer that time is of the essence in the settling of labor disputes. The longer time is allowed to elapse, the more tempers and discontent are stirred up, resulting in discouragement on the part of workers and determination to resort to economic action. The procedure for settling jurisdictional disputes provided by this conference report bill will result in such delays and conflict that it will prove to be unworkable. Without a procedure that assures quick decisions little or no progress will be made in protecting employers from great losses caused by jurisdictional disputes."

Again in connection with the treatment of secondary boycotts, the final Taft-Hartley bill changed the basic procedure for handling such disputes.

The Morse bill made the following secondary boycotts unfair labor practices: those designed to force recognition of a union when another union had been certified as bargaining agent; those intended to force recognition; and those designed to force another employer to bargain with a union. In addition, the bill authorized the National Labor Relations Board to seek a court injunction upon the filing of any unfair labor practice charge, including boycotts.

The Senate bill adopted the provisions of the Morse bill on the subject, in substance. Specifically it defined the following boycotts as unfair labor practices: those intended to force any employer to cease using or handling the goods of any other producer or manufacturer, or to force any employer to cease doing business with any other person; those designed to force any other employer to bargain with an uncertified union; and those designed to force recognition of a union when another union had been certified as bargaining agent. The bill also made it mandatory on the National Labor Relations Board to seek an injunction whenever it believed that charges alleging the foregoing unfair practices were true. (As amended on the Senate floor, boycotts were made illegal and damage suits were authorized to be brought by anyone injured.)

The conference bill and the Taft-Hartley bill, as passed, in substance adopted the language of the Senate bill, as amended. However, the language used makes boycotts unfair labor practices and illegal if "an object of" the strike or boycott is to accomplish the ends prescribed, whereas the Senate bill made them unfair labor practices and illegal only if the purpose was to force an employer to do the enumerated things. Thus the recognized judicial test of primary objective is abandoned.

Here is another technical legal change in the Taft-Hartley Act which seeks to find a



common-law court solution for the secondary boycotts rather than primarily through the administrative law procedures of the National Labor Relations Board of treating them basically as unfair labor practices as proposed in the Morse bill, S. 858.

Another issue which is basic to peaceful procedures for the settling of labor disputes involves violation of contract cases. One only has to read the proposals of the original Morse bill and the final Senate committee bill in comparison with the Taft-Hartley Act to see very clearly how great are some of the differences between the Senate bill and the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Morse bill made it an unfair labor practice for a union "to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement or the terms of an agreement to submit a labor dispute to arbitration," provided the employer were not violating the contract or refusing to comply with an order of the National Labor Relations Board. A reciprocal provision was included in the section dealing with employer unfair labor practices.

The Senate bill, as reported and passed, adopted the exact language of the Morse bill on this point. In addition, it provided that suit could be brought in Federal courts for violation of contract, whether by unions or employers.

The conference bill and Taft-Hartley bill as passed deleted the provisions making contract violations unfair labor practices. Instead, the only provision remaining is that authorizing suit to be brought in Federal courts.

Here is another fundamental difference in the Taft-Hartley law and the original Morse bill, S. 858. This section of the Taft-Hartley law eliminates entirely violation of contracts by unions as an unfair labor practice under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. Instead it offers only one remedy for the handling of such violations, namely, suits for damages in Federal courts. Earlier in this article the weaknesses and shortcomings of the damage-suit remedy have been set out. It is submitted that a great majority of employers would much prefer the remedy of treating breaches of contracts by unions as an unfair labor practice as provided for under the original Morse bill, than the single remedy of a suit for damages as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Morse-Ives committee bill provided for both remedies as a compromise between Senator Ives and the writer. If the compromise had been retained in the Taft-Hartley Act, the large number of employers who see the weaknesses and unworkability of the damage-suit remedy would have been able to follow the remedy provided in the original Morse bill.

Perhaps one of the most far-reaching procedural changes contained in the final Taft-Hartley Act from that provided in the Senate committee bill is to be found in a comparison of the two bills on the issue of court review and separation of functions.

The Morse bill did not alter the existing provisions relating to court review, as set out in the Wagner Act and the Administrative Procedure Act (passed by the 79th Cong. and establishing uniform procedures for all Federal administrative agencies). The Procedure Act contains adequate provisions to insure that the prosecuting functions are separate from the judicial functions.

The Senate bill also preserved the court review scheme of the existing Wagner Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. The only change made was the addition of the requirement that National Labor Relations Board findings, to be conclusive on the court, must be supported "by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole." This change merely adopted the substance of language already in the Procedure Act. No additional provisions were added relating to separation of functions.

The conference bill and Taft-Hartley Act in material respects altered the scope of court

review. The Board is required to conduct its hearing "so far as practicable . . . in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States." Also, the Board's findings must be made "upon the preponderance of the testimony." With regard to functional separations, the conference bill vested the investigative and prosecuting functions in an autonomous general counsel, entirely independent of the Board.

This provision of the Taft-Hartley Act violates many principles of sound administrative law. It singles out the National Labor Relations Board, and with no justification, as an exception to the Administrative Procedures Act which was passed in 1946.

Thus in debate on the matter the writer pointed out that the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946, passed unanimously by both Houses of the Congress, had adequately protected the fairness of administrative procedures and the writer said on this point (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 5, 1947, p. 6455), that he simply would never vote to vest in any single individual any such sweeping power over the handling of labor relations cases in this country. No one knows where that superman is to be found. This person would control the procedural rights of every employer and every labor union in the country.

In addition the writer pointed out that the bill, as amended in conference, carries the very serious vice that it unfairly discriminates against the Board, among all Government agencies. With respect to certain requirements, we rejected (in committee) proposals to single out the Board for special treatment and we agreed that the procedures prescribed by the recently enacted Administrative Procedures Act should be left intact.

The conference bill, now the Taft-Hartley law, also singles out the Board, among all agencies, for special treatment as to subpoenas, the rules of evidence, and the promulgation of decisions. We cannot afford to single out in these unjustifiable ways and remove from the general law and scheme of procedures applicable to all other agencies, the one agency which is intended to protect the basic rights of labor to self-organization and collective bargaining.

Another great weakness of the Taft-Hartley Act is that it tends to place too many of our labor problems under our courts rather than in the hands of experts thoroughly trained in labor economics and the complex social and economic problems that characterize industrial relations. In the debate on this issue in the Senate the writer pointed out (p. 4841 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 9, 1947) that it has been his consistent endeavor while this legislation has been under discussion to vest the determination to labor problems so far as is humanly possible to do so in a single organization that is expert on labor problems. Labor problems are complex, as complex indeed, as our entire social structure since the great mass of our people are workers. Close day-to-day contact with these problems is necessary if able persons are to keep themselves even reasonably informed.

However, the writer pointed out also that he is confident that, despite the high regard in which he holds the district judges of the United States that they have neither the background, the desire, nor the time, to become experts in these matters. It is not sound legislation to disperse the authority over these problems; and to draw into the orbit of their handling a host of district attorneys or Federal judges—to make impossible the development of a uniform body of precedent and decisions, harmoniously integrated with each other over the entire economy.

Another great weakness of the act is that it is going to result in greater and greater delays. One of the most important requirements to the successful solution of labor problems which can be best attained through the administrative-law approach rather than

through the common-law-court approach, is promptness. As one of the outstanding authorities in the field of labor relations in this country, Gerhard Van Arkel, said in his speech on the Taft-Hartley Act before the Oregon State bar convention in Portland, Oreg., September 6:

"Unless the agency can act with expedition the anthrax or the foot-and-mouth disease or the diphtheria will have infected the community. Precisely because common-law courts cannot, except in most unusual circumstances, act of their own knowledge or on their own initiative, the administrative remedy has grown to protect the public interest.

"And it is again self-evident that this must be true in labor disputes. Unless a remedy is prompt, the damage is done. Whether action can be taken promptly will depend not alone upon the language of the statute; it will also depend upon appropriations, upon the alertness of those charged with public responsibilities, upon the adequacy of staff. But, clearly, the statutory scheme should be adequate to meet problems.

"In a variety of ways, the Taft-Hartley Act burdens, rather than assists, the administrators of the law in promptly adjusting labor disputes. . . . Let me cite, without discussing at length, other cumbersome procedures under this act. If a union wishes a union-security clause in a contract it must (1) file affidavits of all of its officers that they are not Communists and file a mass of material concerning its internal structure and activities; (2) if it has not already done so, be designated bargaining representatives for the employees in an appropriate bargaining unit which may entail a hearing before the Board—a process frequently consuming a year's time; (3) petition the Board for a union-security election and in such election procure the affirmative votes of a majority of eligible employees; (4) induce the employer to grant such a clause in the contract. Or, again, if a strike threatens the national health or welfare the President appoints a board of inquiry, which may make no recommendations but makes a report, which the President must make public; he may also ask the Attorney General to secure an injunction against striking for 60 days, during which time the Conciliation Service attempts to adjust the dispute, failing which the board of inquiry again reports the facts to the President, who reports them to the Congress, while the National Labor Relations Board conducts an election to determine whether a majority of the employees wish to accept the employer's last offer of settlement.

"Only in the case of certain injunction procedures against strikes, contained in section 10 (1) of the act, is there real expedition; elsewhere the act by overformalization, by novel procedural requirements, by limiting the discretion of the administrators, delays rather than expedites the handling of these important subjects."

Another limitation of the Taft-Hartley Act which I wish to mention is its technical requirements in regard to the application of the strict rules of evidence. On this point Mr. Van Arkel has stated: "One respect in which the discretion and flexibility of the Board has been materially narrowed by the Taft-Hartley Act is in the provision requiring that the 'rules of evidence of the Federal district courts shall, 'so far as practicable' be observed (sec. 10 (b)). As Professor Dickinson has said . . . 'the difference between administrative tribunals and law courts in the matter of admitting evidence, the one following the more or less rigid common-law rules, the other not, is an added instance of the contrast between rule and discretion.' Without examining at length the ambiguous legislative history of this provision in the new act, it seems designed to confine the Board to strict rules of evidence unless some good reason for departure from them appears."

In closing this paper, it is pointed out that there is a great political contest going on in this country, not so much between political parties as between political approaches to the solution of the critical domestic and international issues that confront us. To be specific the American people are going to have to decide in free elections during the next few years in this country the answer to the question, "Which way, America?"

We can go in the direction of a laissez-faire economy being advocated by the reactionaries in both the Democratic and Republican Parties and see our economy collapse again into another depression. In the last session of Congress we saw reactionaries in both parties advocate policies that would take us back to the economic patterns of the 1920's and repeat all over again the boom-and-bust business cycle. The American people must be awakened to the fact that the laissez-faire economy is to a large extent characterized not only by the boom-and-bust business cycle but by exploitation of the economic weak by the economic strong. Under the laissez-faire economy labor is treated as a commodity rather than as being made up of precious human beings entitled to all the dignities and human rights of free men and women. If the reactionaries have their way our economy will become a monopolistic one and our foreign policy will become one of economic isolationism. Their program will result in neither economic stability and prosperity at home nor peace abroad.

#### EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in line with the understanding earlier today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now revert to the consideration of Senate bill 2182, the rent-control bill. I will say for the information of the Senate that it is understood that this bill will be the order of business tomorrow, and, as I pointed out to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] earlier in the day, I hope we shall make considerable progress, if we do not complete action on the bill tomorrow.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2182) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, to provide for the termination of controls on maximum rents in areas and on housing accommodations where conditions justifying such controls no longer exist, and for other purposes.

#### RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose name is most excellent in all the earth, in Thy sacred presence we wait in prayer. We

praise Thee that Thou didst enable those immortal ones to lay the foundations of peace and liberty in this new world. Grant unto every citizen a devout sense of Thy signal providence.

In the sphere of duty to which we have been called, help us to hold our consciences higher than the praise of men. With ever-increasing gratitude may we look up the stairway where freedom refuses to be bound and where faith transcends these confused times. Today our thoughts go out in memory of one who was great in war and great in peace; grant that the story of his glorious achievements may be told in every school and around every fireside in every hamlet throughout our broad land, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. In our Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 19, 1948, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 204):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN M. ROBSON, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. COOPER] were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 402. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 590. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman.

#### WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1948, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. FLANNAGAN read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your

thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment



of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against

which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any

other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty

with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or

more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments



are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony

with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for

public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of

the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations; but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d

of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,

17th September, 1796.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include poems by Mr. Horace A. Carlisle.

#### PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include certain quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, again the House is met to receive a message from the Father of our Nation. With every passing year the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States becomes freighted with more meaning, and its wisdom is more apparent in the light of our history.

As the message was read today, every hearer must have been acutely impressed by those passages wherein is expressed his parental solicitude: "That your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetual"; and the primary injunction:

The unity of Government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity in every shape, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes, and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

The mighty mind of our first President, as he let it run down the long years of the future, saw clearly that from time to time there would be legislation proposed and administrative policies considered which would tend toward disintegration of the unity which he conceived to be and which we all must admit is essential to the preservation of our form of government.

There are now pending in this Congress more than a dozen so-called anti-lynching bills. It is not my intention to discuss today the demerits of any of these bills except that one so forcefully expressed in the immortal document just read. From the mountaintop of privilege which has just been ours, before we descend to the plain of less exalted



thought, let us ponder the plea for the unity which should constitute us a people, and respond to the challenge to discountenance "whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned" and that we indignantly frown "upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

Nothing could be clearer than that these lynching bills constitute a renewed attempt to alienate one portion of our country from the rest, or at least to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts of our Nation.

Ten years ago yesterday Hon. George W. Norris, then the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska, took the floor of the Senate, and, in speaking of such a bill, which was then about to be laid aside, said:

I am opposed to it because I think it would have a tendency to raise again that slumbering monster which came into being as the result of the Civil War. I am opposed to the bill because I believe it would do more harm than good even to the colored race. . . . The people of the South have done a wonderful job. I confess we could not have improved upon it. With all the hatred, the animosity, and the agony which came to the people, it is amazing to me that the crime of lynching has been gradually dying out. The people of the South have made a record of which they have a right to be proud.

We have forgotten the reconstruction days. The agonizing animosities which came about from the Civil War and the reconstruction period have been, thank God, largely forgotten. If enacted into law, this bill would revive them all. It would have a tendency, I think, to halt the progress which has been made during these eventful years.

We could not improve upon what has been done. Confronted by a condition which never before faced a people, the people of the South have now almost reached the time, in the few short years which have passed since the Civil War, when the crime of lynching is almost unknown. Why should we interfere now? Why should the Federal Government undertake to step in now? With their record, it would be a step backward in human progress, as I see it.

In the debate on that bill in the Senate on January 7, 1938, another great leader of American thought, Hon. William E. Borah, then senior Senator from Idaho, spoke, in part, as follows:

The same arguments are made in support of the pending measure, to wit: That the southern people are to be distrusted and are incapable of local self-government.

We know now what those measures in those days did. They retarded and frustrated the coming together of the people of the different States. They gave us the solid South. They separated us politically, which separation continues until this day. They implanted a sense of bitterness in the minds of those people, not because of what had happened upon the field but because of what happened in Congress.

It is not in the interest of national unity to stir old embers, to arouse old fears, to lacerate old wounds, to again, after all these years, brand the southern people as incapable or unwilling to deal with the question of human life. This bill is not in the interests of that good feeling between the two races so essential to the welfare of the colored people.

Nations are not held together merely by constitutions and laws. They are held together by mutual respect, by mutual confidence, by toleration for conditions in different parts of the country, by confidence that the people in the different parts of the country will solve their problems, and that is just as essential today as it was in 1865 and 1870.

In the beginning, Mr. President, I reject the pending measure as fundamentally not in the interest of the white people of the South, not in the interest of the black people of the South, not in the interest of national unity nor of national solidarity, not in the interest of eliminating crime. History has proven that it will be a failure, and those who suffer most will be the weaker race.

These two outstanding statesmen are neither from the South. They are looking at the problem dispassionately and objectively. They have the perspective which distance gives. Their words are weighted by these facts.

Reverting again to the Farewell Address, we hear our First President say:

You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts—of common dangers, suffering, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

No one can deny that the South has taken its rightful place and performed well its full part in every foreign war which this country has waged. In the war of the Revolution the blood of southern patriots reddened the soil of New England and wrote thereby a plea against sectionalism. The ragged heroes who followed Washington across the Delaware and to Valley Forge were Americans all. There was no sectional partisanship among the boys who fought at Chapultepec nor at San Jacinto. The forces of the Republic in our war with Spain were not clad in blue or gray, but in the uniform of the Nation. The boys who sleep on San Juan Hill or in the trenches around Santiago were from every part of the Union.

Those who "followed the gleam" to France and gave "the last full measure of devotion" before they threw the torch that they might rest in Flanders Fields, and their buddies who, thank God, came back home to live, were Americans—united.

The sons took up their "quarrel with the foe." They illumined our whole world with the light of the torch they held so high.

More than a year before the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia a similar declaration of independence was adopted by a convention which met in Charlotte, N. C. It is known as the Mecklenburg declaration of independence. From a pamphlet preserved in the Library of Congress we learn:

Therefore on the sd. 19th May 1775 the sd. committee met in Charlotte Town (2 men from each company) vested with all powers

these their constituents had or conceived they had.

After a short conference about their suffering brethren besieged and suffering every hardship in Boston and the American blood running in Lexington, the electrical fire flew into every breast.

These men of the South felt keenly the afflictions of their brethren in Boston, and the news of the American blood running in Lexington caused the electrical fire to fly into every breast. Would that we were so closely knit in bonds of brotherhood and sympathetic regard today. The ground that we have lost in this respect may be regained, but not without mutual respect and confidence.

Every one of those hardy pioneers loved his fellows engaged in the common struggle to build here "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have a rich, common heritage from these founding fathers. There is much to love in the citizens of every part of our great Nation. We may look on this and be drawn closer together. We may look on the divisive elements and become hostile camps. The future is in our hands today, to mar or to make. The South asks and will have no part in the local problems of other sections. We have full confidence in our brethren that they will work out their own difficulties wisely and well. We may consider the things that will make us one or the things which divide. My plea is not made as a southerner, nor as the Representative of a great district of Alabama, but as a humble citizen of this great Republic. I plead with you, my colleagues, and with all who have ears to hear, that we set ourselves against consideration of those things which tend to divide us and give our best thought to those things which unite. There are many measures challenging our best, united thought. Great domestic and foreign problems press for solution. Let us press forward toward our glorious destiny in unity, "discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

#### LEST WE FORGET

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include the oath of allegiance of George Washington at Valley Forge together with the Declaration of Independence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting under a unanimous-consent request the oath of allegiance of George Washington at Valley Forge, 1778:

I, George Washington, Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States of America, do acknowledge the United States of America to be free, independent, and sov-

foreign States, and declare that the people thereof owe no allegiance or obedience to George III, King of Great Britain; and I renounce, refuse, and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him; and I do swear that I will to the utmost of my power, support, maintain, and defend the said United States, against the said King George III, his heirs and successors, and his or their abettors, assistants, and adherents, and will serve the said United States in the office of Commander in Chief, which I now hold, with fidelity, according to the best of my skill and understanding.

G. WASHINGTON.

Sworn before me, camp at Valley Forge, May 12, 1778.

WORLING,  
Major General.

Are we, or are we not, Mr. Speaker, the guardians and defenders of the great heritage of liberty bequeathed to us as a result of the sacrifices of our heroic men of the past?

Are we to be true to our obligation as citizens of this great Republic or shall we betray our trust by surrendering our priceless inheritance of liberty to the acts of those who now seek in the name of internationalism and communism to barter these liberties away?

George Washington was true to the sacred trust placed in him by the men and women who sought freedom from foreign tyranny.

Benedict Arnold also took an oath of allegiance but instead of remaining true to his oath he yielded to foreign influence and became an internationalist.

The character and influence of George Washington will live throughout all time to bless mankind; the influence of Benedict Arnold will survive only as a hideous example of perfidy to those who in moments of weakness would betray the trust reposed in them to preserve, protect, and defend the hard-won liberties which we now enjoy.

I am further inserting under a unanimous-consent request the Declaration of Independence, which concludes with these words:

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

#### DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress, in Philadelphia, on July 4, 1776, and was signed by John Hancock as President and by Charles Thompson as Secretary. It was published first on July 6 in the Pennsylvania Evening Post. A copy of the Declaration, engrossed on parchment, was signed by Members of Congress on and after August 2, 1776:

"When, in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are in-

stituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

"He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

"He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained, and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

"He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

"He has called together legislative bodies at places, unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

"He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

"He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

"He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

"He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

"He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

"He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies, without the Consent of our legislatures.

"He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation: For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: For protecting them

by a mock Trial from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States: For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world: For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent: For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of Trial by Jury: For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses: For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies: For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments: For suspending our own Legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

"He has abdicated Government here by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

"He has plundered our seas, ravished our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

"He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

"He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

"He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions. In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people. Nor have We been wanting in attention to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

"WE, THEREFORE, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions do, in the Name, and by authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States: that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."



## Signers of the Declaration of Independence

| Name, Delegate from—                       | Vocation           | Birthplace                                   | Born                 | Died            |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Adams, John (Massachusetts)                | Lawyer             | Braintree (Quincy) Mass.                     | 1735, Oct. 30        | 1826, July 4.   |
| Adams, Samuel (Massachusetts)              | Brewer             | Boston, Mass.                                | 1722, Sept. 27       | 1803, Oct. 2.   |
| Bartlett, Josiah (New Hampshire)           | Physician, lawyer  | Amesbury, Mass.                              | 1729, Nov. 21        | 1795, May 19.   |
| Braxton, Carter (Virginia)                 | Farmer             | King and Queen Court House, Va.              | 1736, Sept. 10       | 1797, Oct. 10.  |
| Carroll, Charles, of Carrollton (Maryland) | Lawyer             | Annapolis, Md.                               | 1737, Sept. 20       | 1832, Nov. 14.  |
| Chase, Samuel (Maryland)                   | Jurist             | Princess Anne, Md.                           | 1741, Apr. 17        | 1811, June 19.  |
| Clark, Abraham (New Jersey)                | Lawyer, financier  | Elizabeth, N. J.                             | 1726, Feb. 15        | 1794, Sept. 15. |
| Clymer, George (Pennsylvania)              | Merchant           | Philadelphia, Pa.                            | 1739, Mar. 16        | 1813, Jan. 23.  |
| Ellery, William (Rhode Island)             | Jurist             | Newport, R. I.                               | 1727, Dec. 22        | 1820, Feb. 15.  |
| Floyd, William (New York)                  | Soldier            | Brookhaven, N. Y.                            | 1734, Dec. 17        | 1821, Aug. 4.   |
| Franklin, Benjamin (Pennsylvania)          | Printer, publisher | Boston, Mass.                                | 1706, Jan. 17        | 1790, Apr. 17.  |
| Gerry, Elbridge (Massachusetts)            | Merchant           | Marblehead, Mass.                            | 1744, July 17        | 1814, Nov. 23.  |
| Gwinnett, Button (Georgia)                 | do                 | Down Hatherly, Eng.                          | 1732                 | 1777, May 19.   |
| Hall, Lyman (Georgia)                      | Physician, jurist  | Wallingford, Conn.                           | 1724, Apr. 12        | 1790, Oct. 19.  |
| Hancock, John (Massachusetts)              | Merchant           | Braintree (Quincy) Mass.                     | 1737, Jan. 12        | 1793, Oct. 8.   |
| Harrison, Benjamin (Virginia)              | Farmer             | Berkeley, Va.                                | 1726, Apr. 5         | 1791, Apr. 24.  |
| Hart, John (New Jersey)                    | Farmer             | Stonington, Conn.                            | 1707                 | 1779, May 11.   |
| Hewes, Joseph (North Carolina)             | Merchant           | Kingston, N. J.                              | 1730, Jan. 23        | 1779, Nov. 10.  |
| Heyward, Thomas, Jr. (South Carolina)      | Lawyer, farmer     | St. Luke's Parish, S. C.                     | 1746, July 28        | 1809, March 6.  |
| Hooper, William (North Carolina)           | Lawyer             | Boston, Mass.                                | 1742, June 17        | 1790, October.  |
| Hopkins, Stephen (Rhode Island)            | Merchant, judge    | Providence, R. I.                            | 1707, March 7        | 1785, July 13.  |
| Hopkinson, Francis (New Jersey)            | Jurist, musician   | Philadelphia, Pa.                            | 1737, Sept. 21       | 1791, May 9.    |
| Huntington, Samuel (Connecticut)           | Jurist             | Windham County, Conn.                        | 1731, July 3         | 1796, Jan. 5.   |
| Jefferson, Thomas (Virginia)               | Lawyer             | Old Shadwell, Va.                            | 1743, April 13       | 1826, July 4.   |
| Lee, Richard Henry (Virginia)              | Farmer             | Stratford, Va.                               | 1732, Jan. 20        | 1794, June 19.  |
| Lee, Francis Lightfoot (Virginia)          | do                 | do                                           | 1734, Oct. 14        | 1797, Jan. 11.  |
| Lewis, Francis (New York)                  | Merchant           | Landaff, Wales                               | 1713, March          | 1803, Dec. 30.  |
| Livingston, Philip (New York)              | do                 | Albany, N. Y.                                | 1716, Jan. 15        | 1778, June 12.  |
| Lynch, Thomas, Jr. (South Carolina)        | Farmer             | Winyah, S. C.                                | 1749, Aug. 5         | 1779 (at sea).  |
| McKean, Thomas (Delaware)                  | Lawyer, soldier    | New London, Pa.                              | 1734, o. s. Mar. 19. | 1817, June 24.  |
| Middleton, Arthur (South Carolina)         | Farmer             | Middleton Place, S. C. (Charleston)          | 1742, June 26        | 1787, Jan. 1.   |
| Morris, Lewis (New York)                   | do                 | Morrisania, N. Y. (The Bronx, New York City) | 1726, Apr. 8         | 1798, Jan. 22.  |
| Morris, Robert (Pennsylvania)              | Merchant           | Liverpool, England                           | 1734, Jan. 20        | 1806, May 8.    |
| Morton, John (Pennsylvania)                | Jurist             | Ridley, Pa.                                  | 1724                 | 1777, April.    |
| Nelson, Thos., Jr. (Virginia)              | Soldier            | Yorktown, Va.                                | 1738, Dec. 26        | 1789, Jan. 4.   |
| Paca, William (Maryland)                   | Jurist             | Abingdon, Md.                                | 1740, Oct. 31        | 1799, Oct. 23.  |
| Paine, Rob't Treat (Massachusetts)         | Reverend, jurist   | Boston, Mass.                                | 1731, March 11       | 1814, May 12.   |
| Penn, John (North Carolina)                | Lawyer             | Near Port Royal, Va.                         | 1741, May 17         | 1788, Sept. 14. |
| Read, George (Delaware)                    | Jurist             | Near Northeast, Md.                          | 1733, Sept. 18       | 1798, Sept. 21. |
| Rodney, Caesar (Delaware)                  | do                 | Dover, Del.                                  | 1728, Oct. 7         | 1784, June 29.  |
| Ross, George (Pennsylvania)                | do                 | New Castle, Del.                             | 1730, May 10         | 1779, July 14.  |
| Rush, Benjamin (Pennsylvania)              | Physician          | Byberry, Pa. (Philadelphia)                  | 1745, Dec. 24        | 1813, April 19. |
| Rutledge, Edward (South Carolina)          | Lawyer, soldier    | Christ Church Parish, S. C.                  | 1749, Nov. 23        | 1800, Jan. 23.  |
| Sherman, Roger (Connecticut)               | Lawyer             | Newton, Mass.                                | 1721, Apr. 19        | 1793, July 23.  |
| Smith, James (Pennsylvania)                | do                 | Ireland                                      | 1713                 | 1806, July 11.  |
| Stockton, Richard (New Jersey)             | do                 | Near Princeton, N. J.                        | 1730, Oct. 1         | 1781, Feb. 28.  |
| Stone, Thomas (Maryland)                   | do                 | Charles City, Md.                            | 1743                 | 1787, Oct. 5.   |
| Taylor, George (Pennsylvania)              | Iron manufacturer  | Ireland                                      | 1716                 | 1781, Feb. 23.  |
| Thornton, Matthew (New Hampshire)          | Physician, jurist  | do                                           | 1714                 | 1803, June 24.  |
| Walton, George (Georgia)                   | Jurist, soldier    | Prince Edward County, Va.                    | 1741                 | 1804, Feb. 2.   |
| Whipple, William (New Hampshire)           | Merchant, jurist   | Kittery, Maine                               | 1730, Jan. 14        | 1785, Nov. 28.  |
| Williams, William (Connecticut)            | do                 | Lebanon, Conn.                               | 1731, Apr. 23        | 1811, Aug. 2.   |
| Wilson, James (Pennsylvania)               | Jurist             | Carskerdo, Scotland                          | 1742, Sept. 14       | 1798, Aug. 28.  |
| Witherspoon, John (New Jersey)             | College president  | Gifford Scotland                             | 1723, Feb. 5         | 1794, Nov. 15.  |
| Wolcott, Oliver (Connecticut)              | Jurist, soldier    | Windsor, Conn.                               | 1726, Dec. 1         | 1797, Dec. 1.   |
| Wythe, George (Virginia)                   | Lawyer             | Elizabeth City, Va. (Back River)             | 1726                 | 1806, June 8.   |

The Declaration, drawn by Jefferson and slightly amended by Adams and Franklin, had been presented to Congress June 28, 1776. Prior to this (June 7) Richard Henry Lee had introduced in the Congress a resolution declaring that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved.

The resolution, seconded by John Adams on behalf of the Massachusetts delegation, came up again June 10 when a committee of five, headed by Thomas Jefferson, was appointed with instructions to embody the spirit and purpose of the resolution in a Dec-

laration of Independence. The others on the committee were John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Robert R. Livingston, and Roger Sherman.

The Declaration was adopted substantially as prepared by Jefferson, the two most significant and important changes being the elimination of Jefferson's arraignment of the British people and of King George in his encouraging and fostering the slave trade which Jefferson called an execrable commerce.

McKean voted for the resolution of independence but was with Washington's Army when it was engrossed and was not a Member of Congress from December 1776 to January 30, 1778. He signed, he said later, in 1781. Wythe signed about August 27; R. H.

Lee, Elbridge Gerry, and Oliver Wolcott in September. Thornton first attended Congress on November 4.

Five Pennsylvania signers of the engrossed Declaration—Rush, Clymer, Smith, Taylor, and Ross—were not appointed to Congress until July 20, when they succeeded three Pennsylvania Members who were in Congress on July 4 but did not support the Declaration.

Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, William Williams, of Connecticut, and Samuel Chase, of Maryland were absent on July 4, but signed the engrossed Declaration on August 2.

Oliver Wolcott, of Connecticut, and George Wythe and Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, were absent on July 4 and August 2.

Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, was also absent on August 2, and likewise signed on return to Congress.

Charles Carroll of Carrollton, was appointed a delegate by Maryland July 4, 1776, presented his credentials on July 18, and signed the engrossed copy of the Declaration on August 2.

The New York State convention did not, until July 9, authorize its delegates to approve the Declaration, and Congress was so notified on July 15. Four of the New York Members who refrained from voting for lack of authority on July 4 signed the engrossed Declaration on August 2.

Congress, January 18, 1777, ordered that an authenticated copy of the Declaration and signers, attested by Hancock and Thompson, be sent to each of the United States for them to put on record. This was printed, broadside, by Mary K. Goddard, in Baltimore, where Congress was then in session. A copy of the broadside, authenticated January 31, 1777, was distributed to the States.

The Declaration of Independence is silent on the right to own property, although the majority of the signers of the document were men of substance in real and personal property, and at least half a dozen were slave owners.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy which this Nation followed for more than a hundred years, and to which we must return if this Republic is to survive, was laid down in Washington's Farewell Address to which you have just listened, and in Thomas Jefferson's First Inaugural Address:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert that immortal message of Jefferson's at this point.

It was delivered on the east front of this Capitol on March 4, 1801.

That address follows:

Friends and fellow citizens: Called upon to undertake the duties of the first Executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising Nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contempla-

tion, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the Nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measure of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans—we are Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own Federal and republican principles—our attachment to our Union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one-quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descend-

ants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concern and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolutions where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened, the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preemi-

nent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe, lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 461), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That a special committee of five members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1949, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.
2. The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1948 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.
3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.
4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.
5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:
  - (a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.
  - (b) Title 18, sections 61 to 62b, inclusive, United States Code, 1940 edition, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.
  - (c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, referred to as the "Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."



(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1948, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

8. The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

9. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes any default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1949, as hereinabove provided.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition presented to him by L. B. Weisensell, of La Crosse, Wis., with regard to universal military training.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address delivered by Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, at Muncie, Ind., on February 11, 1948.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEYER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Russell B. Brown, of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, on a proposal for regulation of the petroleum industry.

#### FLOOD WALLS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, another disastrous flood has visited the Ohio Valley and will no doubt visit the Mississippi Valley. I am glad to say that the flood is moving out and is not as disastrous as we feared it would be.

I rise also to say at this time to the Members of Congress who live in cities along our rivers that these flood walls built by the Government with the help and participation of the municipalities have proved to be well worth while. My own home town of Ironton, Ohio, was the first town in the United States to be completely surrounded by a flood wall, constructed under the legislation passed soon after the great flood of 1937. It is really a glorious feeling when we, the residents of my home city, can see Old Man River moving along and doing us no damage. Our rivers are very valuable natural resources. The genius of the Army engineers has in many cases held these mighty rivers under control. Already our flood wall has paid for itself three or four times within the last 7 or 8 years.

I shall always feel proud of my part in the securing of the passage of the legislation which provided for the construction of these protective flood walls. And I shall always feel proud of my part in securing the construction of the flood walls at Ironton. This is the most important event in the history of that city. The efforts of the city manager and the members of the city council and the people in voting the bonds with which they provided the city's part of the cost were all very effective and very necessary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

#### JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of calling the at-

tention of the Congress and the country to the fact that this day on which we commemorate the birthday of the Father of Our Country also marks the one hundredth anniversary of the death, here in this House, of the sixth President of the United States, the only ex-President to ever serve as a Member of this body, President John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts.

Having served as United States Senator, as Minister to England, as Secretary of State, and, like his father before him, as President of the United States, he was subsequently elected in 1830 from the district which I have today the honor to represent as a Member of the National House of Representatives.

He served in that capacity until the day of his death on February 23, 1848, contributing greatly to the welfare and progress of the Nation.

Stricken on the floor of this House, at that time in the auditorium immediately to the north of this Chamber, he was carried to the then office of the Speaker, now serving as the office of the Clerk of the House, where he died on the lounge which can still be found in that office, just 100 years ago today.

Mr. Speaker, the example and inspiration of his devotion to the Nation has lived throughout the century.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], because in paying our respects to the memory of John Quincy Adams we pay them to one of the greatest statesmen ever produced by any country in the world.

One hundred years ago today, one of America's great men and one of the world's great statesmen died, having been stricken on the floor of the House of Representatives. He was a venerable gentleman who had been the President of the United States. He died as he wished to die—serving his beloved country, and at his work. He had answered the yeas and nays in a voice unusually clear for his nearly 81 years of age when he was stricken. He was removed to the Speaker's rooms where at a quarter past 7 o'clock on the evening of February 23, a hundred years ago today, he passed out of this life. The House Chamber at that time was in what is now Statutory Hall, and the Speaker's rooms were what now are the offices of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. A plaque marks the spot in the Clerk's office where the great statesman breathed his last on a couch.

John Quincy Adams was one of the greatest statesmen ever produced by any country in the world. Born on the 11th day of July 1767 in that part of Braintree, Mass., subsequently incorporated into the town of Quincy, he had served in various capacities with ability, integrity, and distinction given to but few men. When he was but 11 years of age, he went abroad with his father, John Adams, to

France, whither the elder Adams had been sent with Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee as Commissioners to the Court of Versailles.

Being an assiduous student, young John Quincy Adams, under the guidance of his father took full advantage of his unusual opportunities for education.

It is a singular fact that John Quincy Adams when 14 years of age became the private secretary of Francis Dana, who had been appointed Minister Plenipotentiary to Russia.

At the age of 18, young John Quincy Adams became fearful that by remaining longer in Europe he might imbibe monarchial sentiments and returned to Massachusetts. There he entered Harvard University, being graduated in 1787 with distinguished honors.

Soon after leaving college he entered the law office of the celebrated Theophilus Parsons, afterward chief justice of Massachusetts, where he studied for the usual 3 years and then entered the profession of law, establishing himself in Boston.

This remarkable man was destined not to be a private professional attorney.

In 1794 Gen. George Washington appointed him Resident Minister to the United Netherlands. From then on until 1801 he was engaged in diplomatic missions for his country as a Minister to Holland, England, and Prussia. As General Washington was retiring from office, he appointed Mr. Adams Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Portugal. Before he could reach the point of his mission, his destination was changed to Berlin.

In 1802 he was chosen by the Boston district to the Senate of Massachusetts. Soon afterward he was elected by the State legislature a Senator in the National Congress for 6 years from March 3, 1803. He resigned in 1808 from the Senate and accepted a chair of rhetoric at Harvard University. He filled this post with distinguished ability. In 1809 he was appointed by President Madison Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Russia. There he again rendered important service to his country. He induced Russia to offer her mediation services between Great Britain and the United States in the War of 1812. He was placed by President Madison at the head of five distinguished commissioners to conclude a treaty of peace at Ghent in 1814. Later he became Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James's.

While in Europe he received appointment as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, which he declined. Remaining in England until the close of President Madison's administration, he was called home to become the head of the Department of State under President Monroe. There, he served his country with great ability and distinction for 8 years.

In 1825 he was chosen by the House of Representatives President of the United States for a term of 4 years. On leaving the Presidency in 1829, he returned to his home in Massachusetts. In 1831 he was elected a Member of this

House and was continued in that office by his people until the day of his death.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen of Massachusetts remembers with great pride this distinguished and able statesman who stands so high in the list of able statesmen produced by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He was distinguished by his character and his services to his country, by his high integrity and his profound faith in God among men who were themselves distinguished as statesmen, as men of integrity and faith.

To the life and works of John Quincy Adams the people of our generation in our own Nation owe much indeed.

It is not as a public servant and statesman alone we contemplate the life and example of John Quincy Adams. As was well said at the time of his death:

In the private walks of life where tired dissimulation drops the mask and man appears as he really is, we find in him all those silent and social virtues which adorn the character. His ardent love of justice, his inflexible regard for truth, his stern devotion to the cause of civil and religious liberty, were blended with meekness, sobriety, and charity.

Mr. Speaker, well may we pause on this day in which there is delivered a eulogy to the memory of the immortal George Washington and from these two great Americans draw strength, firmness of purpose, added faith in our God, and confidence in ourselves to meet the problems and the responsibilities which confront us in this day as we are preparing to lead a great international cooperative movement back to peace and progress for the human race.

May God give us the strength of purpose and the clearness of perception these two great men had.

#### SUBSISTENCE PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time this morning to call the attention of Members of Congress to the plight of our old folks—those who are forced to live on old-age assistance as now provided for under the Social Security Act.

We are now in the second session of the Eightieth Congress and nothing has been done about the serious situation in which some 10,000,000 of our elderly citizens find themselves. They are getting on an average of about \$36 a month, and how anyone can exist on that amount, in this day of high prices, is a matter about which the Congress should be concerned.

The argument that we do not have the money or cannot afford it falls flat in the face of the billions we have given and the billions more we are about to appropriate for the people of other countries. Week after week and month after month we come in here and spend our time discussing the wants and needs of every other country in the world except our

own, but up until this time—14 months after the beginning of this Congress—we have not had one bill or resolution reported to this floor in consideration of our own elderly folks who in the declining years of their lives need our help.

Have we become so world-minded and so concerned with the poverty of other countries that we forget to recognize or do anything about the utterly dire conditions under which a large segment of our own people live? Is there a Member of this House who would say that a human being could live in decency and health on \$35, \$45, or even \$50 a month? Yet that is the way we are providing for our old folks—those who made possible our country—the most prosperous nation in the world—but who now are dependent on their Government for assistance.

I understand there are 14 pension bills of one kind or another in committee now. Perhaps every phase of the pension issue is covered in this array of proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the committee having such bills in charge to investigate, hear the facts, and then bring before the Congress a bill that will correct the injustice in our social-security set-up.

Let us not delay longer in the performance of our duty. Yes; let us set an example to the rest of the world of honest reward for a lifetime of service and humane treatment to our own citizens who, through no fault of their own, can no longer support themselves.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Daily News.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include excerpts from an article appearing in the Farm Journal entitled "Death Walks on Four Feet," and in the other to include an article entitled "Federal Aid to States."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

#### OUR GOVERNMENT—THE ANSWERS TO 1,001 QUESTIONS ON HOW IT WORKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I wish to call attention to a new book just published by the Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., of Chicago, entitled "Our American Government—the Answers to 1,001 Questions on How It Works." Here are the facts on the operation of our Government all lined up in terms that every American will understand and enjoy.



This ABC of democracy in action does for government what Webster did for words, and it should take an important place in every American home. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman PATMAN, who is the author of this study of our Government has written a book that will encourage many a pleasant and profitable family evening spent in the fascinating exploration of what makes liberty work.

In this book which utilizes the popular, easy-to-follow appeal of the question and answer quiz, the Congressman guides the reader through all the various divisions of the Government—legislative, executive, judicial. Moreover, in authoritative, nonpartisan terms, he provides the answers to questions that every American who deserves the name should know—"Who coined the word 'Americanize'?" "What President never exercised his veto power?" "What is the difference between an act and a bill?" and 998 other delightful excursions into government and Americana.

During his 20 years as a Representative from Texas, the Congressman has answered thousands of letters from citizens all over the country who sought to know more about their Government and how it worked. In the early forties, when he compiled a public document of 284 questions and answers—now out of date because of substantial changes in our Government—more than 1,000,000 copies were sold. As an up-to-date and expanded version, Our American Government—the Answers to 1,001 Questions on How It Works, is an important work that merits a place in every American home.

This book can help every American play an active role in his Government—for the responsibility of making democracy work rests with the American people.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight is the year of decision. It is an election year. Many tremendous issues of the day are before Congress, not only our world leadership, but far-reaching domestic issues such as housing, Federal aid to education, further reorganization of Congress, aid to veterans, and many others.

Therefore the working processes of our Government and functional politics must be understood by all Americans if we are to solve the terrifying problems of our time and strengthen both democracy and liberty. Unquestionably the extent of constructive courses set in motion by our Government in 1948 will largely depend on action taken by our citizens. Such interest will result in the strengthening of Congress and its utility. Today's problems demands a strong Congress.

No doubt about it, our citizens can no longer afford to isolate themselves from government and let Congress do it. Good government is better when it is an expression of public opinion.

There is a bang-up time for every American who turns to Our American Government to learn all the facts that he, as a citizen, should know about his Government. It is nonpartisan, practical, and complete; designed for the millions and written in a straightforward,

down-to-earth style. Small wonder, that this book is not only on the recommended list of the Book-of-the-Month Club but has been acclaimed by President Truman, Senator Robert A. Taft, Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Bernard M. Baruch, and many other outstanding Americans.

Congressman PATMAN's book fulfills a major need of 140,000,000 Americans. In these crucial times when basic freedoms and the democratic way of life are under constant surveillance, when the American heritage is questioned and threatened as never before, it becomes doubly important for citizens to understand their responsibility to their Government. Our American Government is the best weapon Mr. and Mrs. America can take up in defense against totalitarianism.

I hope this book will encourage Americans to take a more active interest in governmental affairs and politics and help fire the native political aspirations of young people.

Also, every American, to his valuable delight, will find that it can be fun to be informed on his Government.

#### PALESTINE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of February 17.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we are today closer to war than most people in this country realize. I have addressed the following telegram to the President of the United States:

FEBRUARY 23, 1948.

Mr. HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
President, White House,  
Washington, D. C.:

Assumptions underlying Palestine partition action are now proved false. If Security Council implements assembly recommendation for use of military force it will mean war. Respectfully suggest (1) that Council suspend all efforts for implementation, (2) appeal to Jews and Arabs for cessation of hostilities, (3) seek solution by negotiation, mediation, and conciliation in accordance with article 33 of the Charter, and (4) in the event of failure above recommendations refer matter to International Court of Justice. The responsibility is yours, the American people do not want war over this situation.

Respectfully,  
Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, I also include as part of my remarks the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

#### PARTITION PREDICAMENT

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON  
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—The difficulties which result when both domestic politics and inherited emotionalism are permitted to determine foreign policy are illustrated painfully by the current predicament of Washington over the matter of Palestine.

The American support of Palestine partition was originally compounded principally from two impulses. First, the Democratic National Committee has been worried, acutely, about New York State's big bloc of elec-

toral votes. Beginning before the 1946 midterm elections, it has constantly pressed the White House to take a strong propartition line as a device to bolster Democratic chances for those New York votes.

Second, American public opinion has for generations been emotionally anti-British Empire; a feeling which has expressed itself in constant editorial sniping whenever a separatist movement within that Empire could command a vocal support inside the United States.

The net result is that United States policy on Palestine has succeeded in goading the British into a decision to relinquish their mandate over Palestine, but without ever having prepared in advance an American alternative to British rule which is adequate to the needs of the present dangerous situation in Palestine.

Washington is not prepared to replace British troops with American troops.

And it is equally unhappy over any device yet proposed for establishing a United Nations police force, since it sees no way of getting a UN police force adequate to the requirements which would not bring Russian-American rivalry deeper into the Palestine morass. The United States cannot very well contribute to that police force without allowing the Russians to contribute at least equally. And a UN police force which did not include strength from one or more of the big powers is not conceived to enjoy much chance of being able to maintain the peace between Jews and Arabs in Palestine.

The result is that the crisis over Palestine has been precipitated largely on American initiative, but finds Washington without an answer.

The extent of the embarrassment in Washington is illustrated by the position to which American policy has currently retreated. It is stated in Secretary of State George C. Marshall's letter of last week to 30 Congressmen. Mr. Marshall wrote:

"We regard the solution of this immensely difficult problem as a United Nations solution and our contribution to that end will be as a member and steadfast supporter of the United Nations."

The phrasing of that statement prepares a possible line of retreat. American policy, on orders from the White House, originally drove the partition of Palestine through a reluctant United Nations. But support of partition is no longer official policy on the subject. Official policy has come to be "steadfast" support of the UN.

Thus, by implication, if the UN should decide to abandon partition, Washington will go along with the abandonment on the new theory that American policy is solely to support the UN.

What is carefully avoided in all current official and unofficial State Department comment on the subject is any statement that Washington will continue to support partition within the UN.

The last hope of the partition policy advocates is that Britain can now be persuaded to reconsider its firm decision to withdraw its troops from Palestine. Washington is, in fact, now in the humble and embarrassing predicament of having to petition London to reverse a decision which was taken largely on American prompting.

But London is not inclined to listen to the pleas. It has smarted for a long time under American criticism of its handling of the Palestine mandate. It wants out, and Washington would have to bid very high, indeed, to induce the Cabinet in London to reverse a withdrawal decision which has been generally approved by British public opinion.

The moral is a simple one. It is all very well to criticize another country's handling of a ticklish problem. But before basing foreign policy on such criticism it is well to be prepared to meet the situation likely to arise if the criticism is heeded. There is nothing

Washington would love more than to have London agree now to resume its Palestine mandate.

**THE UNITED STATES STEEL, REPUBLIC STEEL, AND BETHLEHEM STEEL COS.**

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is a plea for enlightened industrial statesmanship. It is addressed not to the Congress but the leaders of three giant corporations, Messrs. Olds and Fairless, of United States Steel; Messrs. Grace and Homer, of Bethlehem Steel; and Messrs. Girdler and White, of Republic Steel, and their respective boards of directors.

Many of you have often demonstrated in the past far-seeing leadership of a constructive character. Never in its history did the welfare of our Nation more acutely need the help of such business leaders as yourselves than it does today. The forces of inflation and deflation have been battling for ascendancy. Just as prices have seemed to be reaching a more moderate level you have struck a body blow at this salutary trend by your announcement simultaneously of approximately the same increase in the price of semifinished steel.

Furthermore, it is reported in the magazine Steel that you contemplate still further advance in steel prices.

Yet the net profits of United States Steel for the year 1947 were 43 percent above 1946. Bethlehem Steel earned 24 percent more in 1947 than in 1946; Republic Steel, 94 percent more. Your stockholders certainly have not suffered.

We in the Congress do not begrudge your or your stockholders these earnings. The great majority of the American people, in our opinion, still agree with the words of the immortal Lincoln:

Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

Yet your powerful position of industrial leadership imposes upon you a corresponding obligation and responsibility to assist governmental representatives of the people in assuring that, not alone the investors in your great enterprise, not alone those who labor to produce the wealth of your far-flung empire, but also the consuming public, who must buy and use the thousands of products containing your essential steel, shall receive fair and just consideration.

The large majority in Congress of both parties is reluctant to reassert the authority of government to dictate to all business, large and small, the prices which it shall charge for its merchandise. It must be admitted, however, that such action as you have now taken in the face of mounting profits and affecting such a basic and necessary commodity as steel, lends powerful emphasis to the argument of those who charge business with a complete lack of responsibility or regard for the public welfare.

You have made a mistake. I say this with the utmost charity, for we all make mistakes, most of all, no doubt, legislative bodies.

You have done big things before. Your stature now will be enhanced as never before by a public acknowledgment that the step you have announced was taken inadvisedly. A return to your previous price schedule will be hailed throughout this great country, not as an exhibition of weakness, but of greatness.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent, and in the other a memorandum of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. BUCK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the chairman of the New York Stock Exchange.

**GEORGE WASHINGTON'S ADVICE**

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the words of our immortal George Washington, the first President of the United States, in his Farewell Address, I hesitate to add anything thereto. But I do not desire to have this day pass without stating what I believe the words of Washington mean to us. To me they are words of revelation, a virtual American Bible, and which constitute a charter of guidance for the members of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our country. I believe they are words which all of those persons should peruse every day of the year, at least one or two paragraphs of the address each day, in order that they may be guided in their deliberations and actions throughout the entire year. While this might be somewhat of a task, it certainly would be really worth while.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, whenever, on these annual occasions, Washington's Farewell Address

is read I never fail to get a new angle. I am always impressed by some different phase of this immortal message.

I suppose the Nation would be better off today if our leaders and statesmen down through the years had taken Washington's advice more to heart. A lot of decisions made since might have been changed for the wiser, if his parting fatherly words had been contemplated oftener.

The public knows George Washington as the Father of his Country. He is looked upon as the foremost military man of his generation. He won the War of American Independence and as our greatest Revolutionary hero, was the logical man to become our first President.

Washington's record as head of the new America was unimpeachable. Under his administration, the country emerged as a strong Nation, young as she was.

While all of us know Washington for his amazing public accomplishments, few realize that he was as hard-working in private affairs. No matter how great the cares of his military or Executive office, he always seemed to find the time to develop his farmlands in Virginia.

History tells us he was an authority on agriculture. He burned the midnight oil studying about ways to improve the soil and develop new programs of fertility and farm development.

George Washington knew more about farming than some of the so-called experts down in the Department of Agriculture. If he came back today, he could probably teach a lot of the specialists things they never heard of about the soil.

Each Member of Congress has in his office a set of volumes containing Washington's letters. If you peruse them you will find how versatile this great man was and what a wealth of knowledge he possessed.

So, in addition, Washington can be looked upon as first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of American farmers.

**MARGARINE**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 I pointed out to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] that a Wisconsin newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, had editorially advocated the removal of margarine taxes. He replied that this is a Democratic newspaper and asked me if I could find any similar expression in Republican newspapers. I can now oblige the gentleman. The Racine Journal-Times, independent Republican; the Janesville Gazette, independent Republican; and the Oshkosh Northwestern, Republican; have all published recent editorials in criticism of the inequitable margarine tax.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include those editorials.



The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I rather think that our friend from New York should know that Wisconsin does not yet use oleomargarine in our public institutions. If we have to hold down prices, we will do it some other way.

It is not surprising that two or three newspapers out of the hundreds of them in Wisconsin should be misled by all this oleo propaganda. Prominent men like the distinguished gentleman from New York, and several more on both sides of the aisle who have introduced bills regarding oleomargarine, have misled these gentlemen. Let me suggest for the record right now that we should be interested in the kind of editorial any one of those papers will write after the oleo bill has had the hearings. Then let us see how many of them will write editorials for this oleo legislation.

If anyone wishes to destroy the fundamental business of the State of Wisconsin, the dairy industry, that is their responsibility. If they want to tell the farmers out there to reduce their herds by a quarter of a million cows, that is a responsibility they must assume. I say that they may have been misled by a lot of this propaganda that the oleo trust has been able to peddle out. They may yet change their position. They may be writing about the State tax rather than the 1/4-cent-per-pound Federal tax. Remember, the oleo crowd have already taken a third of the spread business of the country and they are now out trying to get the other two-thirds, but we will wait and see whether or not they do it. No doubt the possibility of 7 cents per quart oleo milk may change the attitude of some of our fluid-milk friends.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was granted unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Jack Beall. I am informed by the Public Printer that this exceeds the legal limit by one-third of a page and that the total cost will be \$165.67, about \$18 more than the legal limit. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that excessive cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an editorial from the Boston Sunday Post in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway proposal.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, so far while this oleo battle has raged around here I have just listened, but from today on I am in the fight up to the gills to maintain the tax on oleomargarine and defend the dairy industry. I am not surprised that a few papers in the West are advocating having the tax removed. They are in communities where soybeans are raised for sale. It is just the bean interests, together with the cotton-oil interests of the South, who are back of this proposal, so I am not alarmed about that. That crowd in Wisconsin will soon have a red face for what they are doing now. If the people down South, instead of using oleomargarine or no spread at all, would use dairy products, they would have the will to live, the will to build schools and educate their children, without trying to draw on States like New York and Wisconsin. They will want to do things and they will look like people who can do things when they begin using dairy products in the South. They should have milk bars and ice-cream parlors instead of soda fountains and drinking Coca-Cola. They should be using dairy products three times a day and should be producing it in their own community.

On the other hand, if dairy products carry the dangers that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] talks about, then they should buy them from Pennsylvania. Our dairy products are safe.

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is very distressing to me to learn from the press that action has been deferred on the bill for universal military training and that it continues to be bottled up.

How such a conclusion can be reached at this critical period is beyond my ability to understand.

It seems to me to be entirely within the realm of simple logic that such a program is necessary and essential if we are to man our forces of defense. I doubt if there is in this Congress or in this country anyone who questions the

wisdom of making our defenses so strong as to defy aggression from any quarter.

Yet, in the face of this overwhelming sentiment, the leadership of the Republican Party has seen fit to close the door to the strongest single action which would assure the adequate safety of this Nation.

This arbitrary action, in my opinion, places this House in the regrettable position of being unable to perform the functions for which it was elected. How else, save through their elected representatives, can the American people direct this Government? How but through the functions of this Congress can this country be defended?

The people have spoken on this issue. Public-opinion polls show that the feeling in this country is strongly in favor of universal military training. These polls reflect the overwhelming sentiment of this Nation that we cannot be safe unless we are strong; that we cannot be strong unless we have trained manpower to fly the planes and fire the guns.

By assuming such omnipotent powers, the Republican leadership is blandly ignoring the very peculiar powers that only Congress can exercise. Only Congress can make this Nation safe. Only Congress can give every citizen of this country the reassurance that he needs that he is safe from aggression and invasion.

With such powers in our possession, we stand convicted of irresponsibility if we deny the will of the people to be heard on the issue of universal military training.

Members of the House, therefore, must exercise their privilege of petition and demand that this bill be sent to the floor for debate and vote. It is my earnest hope that sufficient numbers will sign the petition to discharge the rules committee and permit this vital matter to be brought to the floor for early action.

Our budget for military purposes is high, but that is all a part of our determination to keep this Nation abreast of any and all scientific developments which may be needed for defense. We are paying a high cost for the occupation of defeated areas. Both of these situations require more than paper work and mathematical formulas. They require men, trained men.

We have been told by President Truman's special air policy commission that we must build an air force of more than 25,000 modern planes if we are to be safe after 1952. And this armada, the gentlemen on this commission warn us, should be only a beginning.

I also want to point out that only the other day, General Eisenhower declared that no type of weapon and no defense has yet been devised which eliminates the need for ground forces and a Navy.

We have no defense in this country until we have trained personnel of sufficient strength to protect every mile of our shoreline.

Let me remind you that the President's Advisory Commission has said this of universal military training:

We do not believe there is any other way of guaranteeing that the armed forces will be able to count on sufficiently speedy flow

of trained men to win a war if large-scale fighting for bases or invasion of the enemy homeland are needed. But, even more immediately, and even more certainly, these pretrained young men will be ready to cope with the unprecedented problems of internal security which atomic warfare will bring—problems of such magnitude that our failure to meet them at once, wherever they develop, might lose us the war overnight.

I should also like to recall to this House just three sentences from the final report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Eisenhower:

At this writing, the United States has taken no steps to assure itself the necessary numbers of trained forces who must be immediately available for the armed forces and civil defense in a future war. This dangerous condition persists although a practical solution—universal military training—has been discussed on a Nation-wide scale for several years and apparently has the endorsement of an overwhelming majority of Americans. \* \* \* universal military training is an essential measure under the present circumstances.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will heed the warning of the man to whom it entrusted so much of the task of directing the war. This bill for universal military training should not be bottled up. The will of the people whom we represent here must be allowed expression.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### FLOOD CONTROL IN FLORIDA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill authorizing the construction of a comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida.

Under the rules of the House, all of the members of the Florida delegation cannot join in the introduction of this bill, and I would like to say, therefore, that I am introducing this bill in behalf of the entire Florida delegation—each and every member thereof. The same bill is being introduced in the other body today by Senators HOLLAND and PEPPER.

I would like to make a short statement to the membership of this House with reference to the merits of this bill: This area is the vegetable food basket of America where we grow the winter crops of beans, potatoes, okra, peppers, eggplants, and so forth, which help to feed the area of our country which is blanketed in snow during the winter months; the land in this area is as fertile as the valley of the Nile. The farmers of this area were awarded by the Army the agriculture award E for the production of crops and foodstuffs during the war.

The farmers of the Everglades contribute a great amount of income taxes to the Government, and, as a concrete

example, I could name you one farmer in this area whose farm was completely covered by the floodwaters in the last disaster who paid an income tax in one year of \$800,000. The citizens of this Nation can ill afford to lose the foods produced here, nor can the Nation afford to lose income payments to it on products raised and sold in this area.

I think this territory is worth saving; therefore, I trust this bill will get the sympathetic cooperation and active support of the Members of the House so that our folks will get future protection from another flood disaster.

Let us give some relief to the home folks and not send all of our dollars across the ocean.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANN PAMELA CUNNINGHAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include an excerpt from a newspaper.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on this the birth date of our country's first President we should have his Farewell Address read in our hearing. George Washington was indeed a great man, "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Few individuals in all history have left greater and more lasting impressions than did President Washington. Other Presidents succeeding in office would do well to read and follow the admonitions of this great man. All honor to General Washington on this occasion. Without detracting one iota of glory from our great benefactor, I desire to make mention of another character.

From the fertile red lands of Laurens County in South Carolina, my own district, came Ann Pamela Cunningham, a frail little woman destined to be the moving spirit in acquiring, preserving, and transmitting to generations to come the historic home of George Washington—Mount Vernon. Miss Cunningham called some of her Laurens County, S. C., neighbors to her home on the 22d day of February 1854, advising them that it would be necessary to raise \$200,000

with which to buy the Mount Vernon property. Since the National Government and the State of Virginia had either neglected or refused to make the purchase, the only way to finance the undertaking was through the efforts of these ladies.

An organization was formed known as the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union. Miss Cunningham was the founder and first regent. She served in this capacity all through the trying years from 1853 to 1874. At the first meeting held in Laurens the sum of \$293.75 was raised. Finally the needed sum for the purchase was obtained and the deal was closed. Upon retiring from office Miss Cunningham left this message:

Ladies, the home of Washington is in your charge; see to it that you keep it the home of Washington. Let no irreverent hand change it; no vandal hands desecrate it with the finger of progress. Those who go to the home in which he lived and died, wish to see in what he lived and died. Let one spot in this grand country of ours be saved from change. Upon you rests this duty.

This is but an example of the courage and fortitude of women. The poet Joaquin Miller penned these appropriate lines:

The bravest battle that ever was fought;  
Shall I tell you where and when?  
On the maps of the world you will find it  
not;

It was fought by the mothers of men.

From the press of yesterday, I took the following article written by Jack Rutledge which I include as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Post of February 22, 1948]

#### MISS CUNNINGHAM SAVED MOUNT VERNON— GEORGE WASHINGTON'S CAROLINA FRIEND (By Jack Rutledge)

Somebody ought to put in a word for Miss Ann Pamela Cunningham.

Today, Washington's Birthday, Mount Vernon will be jammed with visitors, but very few will have heard of Miss Cunningham. Yet if it hadn't been for her, George Washington's historic home might not be there.

As it is, the 500-acre estate is one of America's swankiest historic spots. And it doesn't cost the Government a cent. Millions of people, including all the Presidents, have visited Mount Vernon in the past 90 years.

The estate was placed on the market in the 1850's for \$200,000. The Government turned it down. So did the State of Virginia.

Miss Ann Pamela Cunningham, of South Carolina, was determined to save the home for posterity. She organized the Mount Vernon Ladies Association and called on women of the Nation to help her. They did. They raised the money, bought Mount Vernon, and have maintained it ever since.

#### HEAVY OVERHEAD

Miss Cunningham served as the association's first regent, from 1853 to 1874. The association has restored Mount Vernon and maintains it at a cost unofficially estimated at about \$250,000 a year.

Admission fees of 40 cents (including tax) pay for much of this overhead. Sale of literature and rooted plants helps.

In the early days about 25,000 persons a year visited the estate. Today almost that many see it on a holiday weekend. Peak year was 1941, with 856,000 persons. In 1947 the total was 790,000.

The war years were hard because of gasoline rationing. Fewer than 150,000 were counted each year, but the association dipped into its reserve funds and carried on.



Charles C. Wall, superintendent for the past 18 years, lives on the estate. He says it takes 75 permanent employees, including 16 guards (more on big days) to keep Mount Vernon in shape.

"We get a mass audience," he says, "but it's amazing how well-behaved and reverent most of the people are. There is little or no attempt to steal.

"We try to emphasize the significant things, but it's the down-to-earth subjects that interest many. How Washington lived, what kind of lights they had, the heat, the food."

#### PRESIDENTIAL FAVORITE

Wall says American Presidents are usually very interested in Mount Vernon. Franklin D. Roosevelt visited while he was Assistant Secretary of Navy and Governor of New York and many times while he was President.

"One very somber, solemn visit was a few days after Pearl Harbor," Wall recalls. "He and Prime Minister Churchill came out here."

President Truman has seen Mount Vernon many times, bringing his family and friends.

President Theodore Roosevelt, Wall says, rode out on horseback. (When Mount Vernon first opened, boats were the only means of access. In 1890, trolley lines were laid. Later a highway was built.)

President Wilson usually visited on Sundays. In those days the shrine was closed to the public on Sundays. Now it is open every day.

Eighty percent visit between April and October. Crowds of 25,000 daily can see the estate, but only between 8,000 and 9,000 can pass through the mansion.

"The mansion is a bottleneck," Wall says. Guards prefer large crowds. "No one tries anything when a lot of people are looking on," they say. "It's the small crowds that bother us."

No one may smoke on the grounds. In the fall, when the leaves are heavy on the ground, the association's own fire truck remains on the bowling green, ready for action.

No one writes his name on buildings. No one may take even leaves for souvenirs.

"If we let one person take a leaf from a hedge, in 24 hours the thing would look like it had been hit by locusts," Wall says. "And if one initial cropped up, the place would be covered before the week end was over."

People take pictures by the thousands. "The favorite shot is to back up and take a picture of Aunt Emma on the front porch," Wall says. "They have to back so far off, to get the whole building, you usually can't tell if it's Aunt Emma or Martha Washington."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a publication.

Mr. DEANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Budget Director James E. Webb.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a deficiency appropriation for rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and to include therewith Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address, in which he laid down the foreign policy that this country should follow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

#### HOOR 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.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of the legislative business and matters on the Speaker's desk, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] with respect to the bill known as the Towe bill, H. R. 4278, commonly known as the universal military training bill. I agree with the remarks of my colleague with respect to the situation with regard to this legislation. I desire at this time to again call the attention of the House to the fact that about 2 weeks ago I filed a discharge petition directed against the Rules Committee, which petition has been placed on the Speaker's desk. It is Resolution No. 13. All Members who desire to have this legislation considered at this session should sign this discharge petition in order that the legislation may be considered at this time. I think it is well, while we are commemorating the birthday of the Father of Our Country, that we should bear in mind his admonition that to be prepared for war is one

of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has expired.

#### THE PALESTINE FARCE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all listened to the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] about the attempts now being made to plunge this country into a race war in Palestine.

That is exactly what is going on. The information that comes to us of the tactics used, the pressure brought, and the corruption practiced to get the resolution partitioning Palestine through the United Nations will shock the American people for a hundred years, if and when they know the truth.

It is time the Congress woke up. We are supposed to represent the American people. Several Americans went to get employment with this United Nations, and were ordered to take an oath to support the United Nations over and above the United States.

Are we to become a subordinate of this Tower of Babel that assuredly is to collapse in a confusion of tongues?

I appeal to the Congress to investigate these charges. I say it is time for the Congress to wake up and protect the American people from being plunged into another useless war, to sacrifice American boys and to drag our country down to bankruptcy and destruction.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

#### MR. TRUMAN'S PROGRESSIVE LIBERALISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in his already famous Jackson-Jefferson day dinner at a minimum charge of \$100 per plate, President Truman declared himself to be a "progressive liberal." He presented his position as the viewpoint of "Jefferson, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Theodore Roosevelt." Entirely apart from the incredible slip of the tongue by which the President confused the great Republican President for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there must have been some rumblings in the graves of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and T. R., at any identification of Mr. Truman's program with their publicly stated positions.

Certainly, it is difficult to reconcile the White House description of rationing and price control as the methods of a

"police state" with anything resembling "progressive liberalism." Nor is it in keeping with anything even remotely approximating "liberalism" to lump the modern-day approach of the Democratic Party to foreign affairs with the traditions of Tom Jefferson who regarded the presence of French troops on the American Continent as something to be avoided at all costs, or of Andrew Jackson, who battled for the city of New Orleans. Woodrow Wilson would have stopped, looked, and listened before departing for Puerto Rico immediately after proposing \$570,000,000 for China and hearing talk of more than financial aid to Greece.

What we think of as "progressive liberalism" in our country is depicted more properly by such men as the late Senator Norris, the first Senator La Follette, and Teddy Roosevelt, who believed in freedom from governmental restraints for the common man of the Nation, and who found themselves at home in the Republican Party, rather than in the party based upon the social, political, and economic medievalism of the South.

Mr. Truman urged the voters to avoid turning over their Government to "a bunch of reactionaries," and the implication was clear that he meant those who disagree with him. It is certainly not in keeping with the high office of the President to indulge in this type of injudicious name calling. If the President calls Republicans "reactionaries," what then is he to call the members of his own party who are in violent opposition to his views on legislation outlawing the poll-tax, lynching, and discrimination in employment. Presumably, if he is to be at all consistent, Mr. Truman must include these Democrats as "reactionaries" and his condemnation amounts to a repudiation of their place within his own party.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article from the Washington Star and in the other, in which I think the gentleman from New York will be interested, I show how to make 7-cents-a-quart milk.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

#### PERSONAL PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House. I send to the desk a subpoena which has been served on me and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
CRIMINAL DIVISION.

To JOHN S. WOOD,  
Room 319, Old House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court No. 1, at United States District Court House, Indiana Avenue, between Fourth and Fifth

Streets NW., in the city of Washington, on the 24th day of February 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of the *United States v. Richard Morford*, Criminal 366-47.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.  
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the district court of the United States to give testimony tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the case of United States against Morford, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I find I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved, and I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpoena from the district court of the United States which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
CRIMINAL DIVISION.

To J. HARDIN PETERSON,  
Room 1226, New House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court No. 1, at United States District Court House, Indiana Avenue, between Fourth and Fifth Streets NW., in the city of Washington, on the 24th day of February 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of the *United States v. Richard Morford*.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.  
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been summoned under subpoena that has just been read to appear as a defendant's witness tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the case of United States against Richard Morford. This is a prosecution by reason of a citation for contempt arising out of proceedings of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this involves the privileges of the House and under the precedents of the House I am unable to respond to the subpoena without the consent of the House. I therefore submit the subpoena and this statement to the House for its consideration and action.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege and ask that a subpoena I have been served with be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
CRIMINAL DIVISION.

To JOHN R. MURDOCK,  
Room 540, Old House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court

No. 1, at United States District Courthouse, Indiana Avenue, between Fourth and Fifth Streets NW., in the city of Washington, on the 24th day of February 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify in the case of *United States v. Richard Morford*.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.  
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have been summoned to appear before the district court to give testimony tomorrow at 10 o'clock at a time when a committee of which I am a member is in session. The subpoena has just been read by the Clerk. Under the precedents of the House, I find that I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privilege of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege and send to the desk a subpoena served on me which I ask the Clerk to read:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY  
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
CRIMINAL DIVISION.

To GERALD W. LANDIS,  
Room 1113, New House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at Criminal Court No. 1, at United States District Courthouse, Indiana Avenue, between Fourth and Fifth Streets NW., in the city of Washington, on the 24th day of February 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify in the case of *United States v. Richard Morford*.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.  
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,  
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the district court of the United States to give testimony tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the case of United States against Morford, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I find I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved, and I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 477).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representatives JOHN S. WOOD, J. HARDIN PETERSON, JOHN R. MURDOCK, and GERALD W. LANDIS, Members of this House, have been subpoenaed to appear as witnesses before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m. on the 24th day of February 1948, in the case of the *United States v. Richard Morford*, Criminal No. 366-47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representatives JOHN S. WOOD, J. HARDIN PETERSON, JOHN R. MURDOCK, and GERALD W. LANDIS are authorized to appear in response to the subpoenas of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Richard Morford* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further



*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoenas of the said court.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Would that make appearance discretionary with these Members?

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, no; the discretion is lodged in the House. If the gentleman will let me proceed just a little, probably I can answer his question.

The Constitution of the United States, article I, section 6, provides in part:

They—

The Senators and Representatives—

shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they—

The Senators and Representatives—

shall not be questioned in any other place.

The question as to the duty of Members to respond to a court subpoena is an old question. First, the precedents in the House in this particular follow the procedure and the precedents laid down by the Parliament in England. I wish to read a paragraph, section 290, from Jefferson's Manual:

This privilege from arrest, privileges, of course, against all process the disobedience to which is punishable by an attachment of the person; as a subpoena ad respondendum or testificandum or a summons on a jury; and with reason, because a Member has superior duties to perform in another place. When a Representative is withdrawn from his seat by summons, the 40,000—

That is the number a Member represented at the time this was written—

people whom he represents lose their voice in debate and vote, as they do on his voluntary absence; when a Senator is withdrawn by summons, his State loses half its voice in debate and vote, as it does on his voluntary absence. The enormous disparity of evil admits no comparison.

This question was last raised in the House, so far as my memory serves me, on November 17, 1941. A Member of Congress was subpoenaed to appear before a court in the District of Columbia. At that time the House desired a clarification of the constitutional provision, and section 290, which I have just read. The House, by resolution, referred the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, directing that committee to report back to the House the legal interpretation of that committee as to the exact meaning of the constitutional provision and of section 290, which I have just read.

As a result of careful study by the Committee on the Judiciary, on November 17, 1941, Chairman Sumners, of Texas, made a unanimous report to the House, the conclusion of which report I ask the Clerk to now read.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is the judgment of your committee that the service of this summons does invade the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives.

We respectfully suggest, however, that in each case the House of Representatives may waive its privileges, attaching such conditions to its waiver as it may determine.

The language in the summons "to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney" removes any necessity to examine the question as to whether a summons merely to appear and testify is a violation of the privileges of the House of Representatives. This particular summons commands that Representative Hamilton Fish shall "not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney," regardless of his legislative duties as a Member of the House.

It is recognized that this privilege of the House of Representatives referred to is a valuable privilege insuring the opportunity of its Members against outside interference with their attendance upon the discharge of their constitutional duties.

At the same time it is appreciated that there is attached to that privilege the very high duty and responsibility on the part of the House of Representatives to see to it that the privilege is so controlled in its exercise that it not unnecessarily interferes with the discharge of the obligations and responsibilities of the Members of the House as citizens to give testimony before the inquisitorial agencies of government as to facts within their possession.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the House by adopting that report has made the Committee on the Judiciary finding the official action of the House, and that is the precedent by which the House is guided today. This was not only a decision of the Speaker; it was the decision of the House. It is in keeping with that precedent that this resolution is offered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me some time? I should like to be heard for a few minutes. I think the House ought to be informed as to what is behind this proposition.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield for the purpose of discussing the resolution. The privilege of the House is the matter before the House, not the merits of the contempt charges.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that. That is just exactly what I am going to discuss.

Mr. Speaker, the proposition as it applies to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] is entirely different from what it is as applied to the other members of the committee who are subpoenaed by the defense. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood], who was chairman of the committee at that time, is subpoenaed to testify on behalf of the Government. They did not have to subpoena him, for he would have gone at any rate. However, the opposition is attempting to harass Congress. A year or two ago the defense summoned the members of the committee and undertook to put them under the rule and keep them down there at a time when they were needed in Congress. They have even brazenly attempted to issue subpoenas duces tecum, to make our investigators bring the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities and turn them over to the defense.

The only questions involved here are, was this man properly summoned before the committee? And did he refuse to testify? All this attempt to drag Members of Congress down there ostensibly to

testify for the defense is in my opinion nothing but an attempt to harass the Congress of the United States and harass and try to discredit the Committee on Un-American Activities, a committee that as I have said time and time again, is doing more to protect this country against the enemies within our gates than any other agency of this Government. It has the full support, I will say, of the FBI, and it has the full cooperation of J. Edgar Hoover.

They called me about this matter. I said, "You need not summon me. If the court wants me down, tell the court to have a call put in for me; but I cannot go down there and sit there morning after morning after morning just to satisfy a defendant who has shown so much contempt for the Congress of the United States that he would not even answer questions propounded to him under oath."

I doubt the wisdom of subjecting these other Members of the Congress to that kind of treatment, unless they are willing to volunteer for that purpose. If they do volunteer they do not need this kind of resolution. So far as Mr. Wood is concerned, I think he ought to have that permission to go, but so far as the other Members are concerned if they desire to go I have no objection, but it seems to me that this is an attempt to try to embarrass the Congress of the United States.

Read the papers of this morning. Read O'Donnell's column, where they are reaching out all over the country trying to raise money to defend these Communists who are here plotting the overthrow of this Government. It seems to me that this is an attempt, not of the prosecution, but of the defense, to try to embarrass and discredit not only the Committee on Un-American Activities, but the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the suggestion just made by the gentleman from Mississippi, I might say to him and to the House that this matter was discussed by the leaders on both sides with the Members involved. I think it should also be pointed out that the action involved here was one initiated by the House of Representatives.

As to the admissibility of evidence or as to what might be admitted in the trial, that is a matter for the court to determine. I think the court will make such rulings as will properly bring about a fair prosecution of the case and, at the same time, protect the rights and interests of everyone involved. And I think it is also fair to say that subpoenas for witnesses, whether they come from the prosecution or the defense should be treated alike. Certainly there should be no disposition here in the House of Representatives by a refusal to permit a Member to go down and testify to deny to the defendant any defense or any presentation that might properly be made in his behalf. Of course, as I said, the matter of the admissibility of evidence is for the court to determine. So far as I am concerned I have no doubt

but that the court will properly protect any witnesses for either side.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. No member of the committee objects to appearing before a court and testifying on this proposition, but I do object to them taking these Members of Congress down there and taking them away from their offices under the rules of the court when it is not necessary merely to embarrass them or embarrass the committee or embarrass the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly would not indulge in assumption that a court is going to require Members of Congress, who are busy and have official duties to perform here in the House, to sit around in a court when they are not needed. I take it, so far as my experience with courts are concerned, that when to be present in court can be worked out to the satisfaction of the people who will be called upon to testify and that they will not be required to be there except at such times as they are really needed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Mississippi does not get the real purpose of this resolution.

First, the Constitution lodges a discretion in the House. This resolution simply exercises that discretionary power. This privilege can only be waived by the House, and not by the individual Member. It seems that members of some committees have been voluntarily appearing in response to subpoenas to appear in court. No question was raised. The right of the House to function and the right of Members to be present and vote must not be interfered with. The right of subpoena is inherent in both sides to the lawsuit. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has said, there is the prosecution and the defense. The prosecution is entitled to bring to court all the evidence of which it has knowledge that is material to the issue. Then the defense is entitled to have all the material evidence of which it is apprised brought before the court. The court determines whether or not the evidence is material.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. WOOD. Is it not true that the court has within its power to use this testimony at some future time by a mere continuance of the case until the Congress adjourns, in any event?

Mr. MICHENER. Certainly. The point I am making is that the House has a constitutional privilege. The court's subpoena cannot interfere with the functioning of the House. If this were not true, then for a good reason or a bad reason subpoenas issued by the several courts in the land might interfere with quorums and sessions of the House. For instance, if an important vote on legislation was set for a given day, an inferior court subpoena might prevent a Member of Congress from being present. This might prevent the presence of a quorum. Then again a Member's constituency would be denied the right to vote on that

particular legislation. Be it remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this very question arose many, many years ago and before we had a Congress in the United States. In the Parliament in England they adopted a precedent which this resolution follows. After mature discussion and deliberation and on numerous occasions as evidenced by the parliamentary precedence in the House the English rule has been adhered to. It is sound and sensible and to hold otherwise would be doing violence to our legislative concepts.

This resolution grants a privilege which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said should be granted to those Members who desire to testify in the pending contempt case.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. But it does not make it compulsory?

Mr. MICHENER. It exercises the congressional discretion. The Congress grants the permission. It waives the privilege of denying the Member the privilege of responding to the court subpoena. It might be construed that the Congress was of the opinion that those Members should honor the subpoenas.

Mr. RANKIN. Should? I have no objection to giving them the right to go, but if we are going to start out on this kind of policy of saying that they shall, there is no telling how many invasions of the rights of Congress will be perpetrated from now on by those defending the very ones who are here charged with and being convicted of attempting to overthrow this Government.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. This resolution reasserts that Members cannot be taken from the House without the consent of the House. So the House will be giving its consent or not.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. That is all there is to it. Under the Constitution the Congress has a higher priority as to the Members' presence than the court has while the Congress is in session.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 548)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (sec. 4, Public Law

264, 79th Cong., 59 Stat. 620), my second annual report on the activities of the United Nations and the participation of the United States therein covering the calendar year 1947.

The problems of international relations arising this past year in the meetings of the United Nations were met neither by evasion nor by meaningless compromises. The decisions and recommendations on the large number of problems noted in this report are straightforward expressions of the judgment held by the overwhelming majority of the members on the right and effective course to follow. The small minority holding opposing views on certain important problems, however, have presented to the Organization a new question of disturbing character through their nonparticipation in carrying out the recommendations with which these members have disagreed.

By its recommendations, the United Nations is acting to maintain the independence and integrity of Greece, to bring independence to Korea, and to place the question of Palestine on the way to settlement on the basis of two independent states, one Arab and one Jewish. The General Assembly has been equipped to bring its full weight to bear on the maintenance of good relations between states during this next year, through the new Interim Committee. As decided upon by the General Assembly, remedies will be sought, through consultation among the great powers and by study among all members, to improve the functioning of the voting provisions of the Charter and hence to strengthen the Organization by increasing the effectiveness of the Security Council.

Every principal organ of the United Nations is at work, and most of the necessary committees, commissions, and subcommittees have been established. In its handling of fundamental international problems during the past year, the United Nations has felt the profound changes in world relationships and the difficulties which we still face in all aspects of international relations. Naturally, therefore, its work is not free from disappointments. This is especially true in regard to the establishment of international control of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and to various political, economic, and other problems that directly or indirectly affect progress toward attaining international security. But, whatever the disappointments, the United Nations is making headway.

The United States will continue as heretofore to carry its full share of responsibility and of leadership in the United Nations. We hope this will encourage every member, in the same spirit, to help the United Nations to achieve the purposes that gave it birth and to give its principles realistic effect in the problems that come before it. Our faith in the United Nations is ever-constant. We shall seek to demonstrate that faith both by energetic support and by the spirit of our participation.

The accompanying report describes the efforts made by this Government to contribute to constructive achievement in the United Nations during the past year



through the policies stated by United States representatives and through important proposals initiated in the various organs. These efforts were directed above all to assuring that the principles of the United Nations would be given full effect. The aim of our policy in matters not falling within the United Nations, but rather within direct United States relations with other governments, was to uphold the same basic principles. These principles are fundamentally those to which we have traditionally given allegiance.

It continues to be the intention of the United States to foster throughout our relations with other nations the fulfillment of the Charter in its entirety. We realize that nothing less than fidelity to the principles and faithful effort to achieve the purposes of the Charter will meet the genuine needs of any nation, whether large or small. Accordingly, the strengthening of the United Nations continues to be a cornerstone of the foreign policy of the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 20, 1948.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement by Mr. Joseph Scott.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record on the subject of service activities of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a poem by James Patrick McGovern.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a short article.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LOW-COST-HOUSING PROGRAM (H. DOC. NO. 547)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In the next few weeks legislation authorizing rent control and emergency financial aids for housing construction will expire. The Congress should extend and improve this essential legislation and, at the same time, should enact urgently needed new housing legislation. The objective should be an integrated program to assist in obtaining more housing at lower cost, both in the immediate future and for the long run.

This program should be based on the needs of all our people for housing, the ability of the housing industry to meet

those needs, the most practical and effective method of giving Federal assistance, and the urgent necessity for reducing costs and prices in the housing field. I am glad that the Congress through several of its committees has been making an extensive study of these matters.

Today far too many of our families are living in substandard housing, in painfully cramped quarters, or doubled up with friends or relatives. Over five million of our present homes are below minimum standards. About two and one-half million married couples live with other families, a 50-percent increase since 1940. Large numbers of families do not have enough space to give their children decent accommodations. These conditions cannot help but be reflected in unsatisfactory home life and lowered standards of health. Their impact is greatest on our low-income families, minority groups, and new families started by veterans.

These are some of the symptoms of our long-range housing problem. To provide better homes for families now in substandard or cramped housing, to meet the increased needs of a growing population, and to replace our supply of housing as it wears out, we must look ahead to a long period of high-volume construction. It will be necessary to produce an annual average of more than one million new houses and apartments in urban areas during the next ten years, and, in addition, a substantial amount of housing in rural areas, if we are to have the housing this Nation needs and can afford. This will require the joint strength and effort of management and labor in the building industry, of private financial institutions, and of Federal, State, and local governments.

As we make progress toward this goal, we will overcome the critical housing shortage by providing enough dwellings at prices which families who need them can afford. At the same time, we can also stabilize the housing industry and thus make a contribution toward preventing the violent fluctuations of the business cycle in general.

The expansion of housing production is necessary in this inflationary period, just as it is necessary to expand the production of other articles in short supply which are vitally needed by our people. The critical housing shortage is contributing to the upward pressure on the selling price and rental price of housing. While we need rent control until this shortage can be overcome, the basic problem is to increase housing production to eliminate the shortage.

The long-range and immediate aspects of the housing problem are intermingled. We must now take steps both to increase the immediate volume of housing construction and to achieve progressively better housing at lower cost over the years ahead. Without measures to achieve both these objectives we shall be in danger of a serious drop in housing production. Such a drop in production, whether now or later, would affect and injure the stability of our whole economy. This happened when housing production declined after 1925—and it would happen again. We must take steps now to assure stable housing production at high levels,

as an essential part of our determination to maintain an economy of maximum employment and production.

During 1947 nearly one million housing units were added to our housing supply. About 835 thousand of these were new houses or apartments and an additional 150 thousand were obtained by conversion or temporary construction. This volume of construction was an excellent accomplishment.

In other respects the 1947 achievement was not so satisfactory. Not enough of the housing produced was for rent. Too much of it was priced beyond the means of those who needed it most.

Less than 15 percent of the new housing built in 1947 was rental housing. This was well below the average for the past thirty years, and falls far short of present needs. The evidence is clear that the shortage of housing for rent is far more acute than that of housing for sale.

The housing made available in 1947 was too high-priced for millions of our people to buy or rent. Some progress was made toward building houses which the middle-income groups could afford. But almost no housing at all was built for low-income families.

These facts should guide us as we lay out our program for this year and the years ahead.

I recommend that the Congress enact at the present session legislation directed toward five objectives.

1. To continue and strengthen rent control.
2. To stimulate a higher volume of house building on a sustained basis, with special emphasis on rental housing, and with proper safeguards against possible inflationary effects.
3. To reduce building costs.
4. To assist communities in providing low-rent housing for families in the lowest-income groups.
5. To aid cities in rebuilding and modernizing run-down areas.

This program will help to combat those elements of the inflation which stem from the housing shortage. By concentrating more upon the housing needs of middle-income and low-income families, it will broaden the market for housing and thus safeguard us against a serious drop in housing production in the years ahead. And it will advance us far toward the goal of a decent home for every American family.

#### RENT CONTROL

The acute shortage of rental housing makes it imperative to continue emergency rent control.

The want-ad sections of metropolitan newspapers still contain desperate pleas by families seeking apartments. On the average those rents which were eliminated from control by the present law have risen more than 60 percent. Tenants in many parts of the country have been receiving notices from landlords that their rents will be substantially raised if rent-control legislation is allowed to expire on February 29th.

On numerous occasions, I have pointed out the serious effect that large increases in rents would have upon the excessively high cost of living for millions of our families. Rent accounts for nearly one-fourth of the budget of low-income fami-

lies—the families most seriously affected by the high cost of living.

The recent declines in certain prices in the commodity markets cannot be regarded as a valid reason for failing to continue and strengthen rent control. The cost of living is still so much higher than it should be that we cannot allow price reductions that may be achieved in some elements of the cost of living to be canceled out by increases in rents.

I recommend, therefore, that rent-control legislation be extended at least through April 30, 1949.

In extending this legislation it is essential that the Congress provide vitally needed enforcement authority which is now lacking. The enforcement provisions of the present law are so inadequate that it is virtually impossible for the Government to enforce rent ceilings or for most tenants to protect themselves.

The Office of the Housing Expediter estimates that in twelve cities surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the period from June 15 through November 15, 1947, rents were raised illegally on from 6 to 21 percent of the units. In the city of Boston, for example, 14 percent of the rental units had illegal rent increases.

The large number of over-ceiling violations under the present law is due primarily to the elimination of the authority which the Housing Expediter previously had to bring treble-damage suits and to protect tenants from being evicted for refusing to pay over-ceiling rents.

Most tenants do not have the knowledge or funds to bring effective legal action in their own defense. Even those who could bring suit hesitate to do so for fear of blacklisting or other forms of retaliation by landlords.

The new legislation, therefore, should provide adequate authority to enable the Government to enforce the law, and appropriations should be sufficient for an adequate enforcement staff.

The legislation also should protect those tenants—more than a million and a half in number—who have agreed to the so-called voluntary 15-percent increases provided for under the present law. These families have no protection beyond December 31, 1948. They should be given protection at their present rents for the duration of the new law.

Provisions should, of course, be continued for adjusting rents to correct inequities and to compensate for increased operating costs. It is important also to continue to provide for the orderly decontrol of rents in individual communities as local shortages are relieved. During the past year a number of areas have been decontrolled as conditions permitted. This orderly transition should be continued as rapidly as feasible.

#### HIGHER VOLUME HOUSING CONSTRUCTION WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON RENTAL HOUSING

To achieve an increased volume of construction in 1948, and a higher proportion of rental housing, the Government should continue its financial aids, with appropriate modifications, and should assist in the expansion and proper distribution of the supply of building materials.

For the last fourteen years the Federal Government has given incentive and support to the construction of housing through assistance to private loans for home building. These credit aids have been temporarily modified and liberalized in recent years to fit the housing needs of the war and postwar periods, and especially to aid veterans.

These aids have been signally successful in stimulating a high volume of home building. They should be continued and modified to assist in meeting current needs and at the same time to move toward a sound long-run system of Government assistance to housing credit. In particular they should be revised to provide relatively more incentive during the next year for the construction of rental housing than for the construction of housing for sale. In addition, careful safeguards should be provided against inflationary impacts.

My recommendations with respect to credit aids fall into three groups. First, I recommend the extension and revision on a transitional basis of title VI of the National Housing Act, containing the principal emergency credit provisions.

Title VI should be extended, with modifications, for one year to March 31, 1949, with an increase of \$2 billion of insurance authorization. Half of this amount should be specifically allocated for insuring loans for rental housing. To increase the proportion of rental housing, the statutory basis for insuring loans should be made less liberal on housing built for sale while the present basis for rental housing projects should be retained subject to provisions which would prevent giving support to further cost increases.

Second, I recommend that Federal support for home mortgage loans in the form of a secondary market be continued, but modified to introduce adequate safeguards against inflationary effects.

For this purpose I recommend the further consolidation of Government housing activities in the Housing and Home Finance Agency by placing the secondary market authority in that Agency. The Housing and Home Finance Agency would continue the present secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration and would reestablish a secondary market for those guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

The purchases of mortgages by the Government should be limited to local situations where the absence of sufficient credit is endangering home production or availability of houses to veterans and where Government support will not result in higher costs and prices or unsound credit standards.

This stand-by secondary mortgage market will give assurance to lenders of a source of liquidity in time of need and thereby contribute substantially to the stability of interest rates and the supply of necessary credit.

Third, I recommend that the Congress provide a sound incentive for the construction of rental housing in the form of Government insurance of an adequate return on direct investment in large-scale rental projects with supervised rent

schedules. Such a yield-insurance plan should encourage substantial investment of private capital in well-planned rental housing.

The long-range housing legislation which has been before the Congress for some time contains additional proposals for stimulating large-scale rental housing which should be enacted.

In addition to these various forms of credit assistance, the Government can encourage a high volume of home building by improving the distribution of scarce raw materials to building-materials manufacturers.

As part of the anti-inflation program, I recommended last November that the Congress enact legislation to permit the allocation of important materials, including housing materials, in extremely short supply. In the absence of such legislation the Secretary of Commerce is attempting to develop voluntary industry-wide agreements to channel more raw materials into the production of scarce housing items, such as nails and cast-iron soil pipe. I am still convinced that allocation authority to supplement these voluntary measures would make an essential contribution to the rapid and effective expansion of the supply of building materials.

In addition, it is clear that the supply of many building materials must be permanently expanded to make possible a continuous high volume of construction at lower costs. As a practical measure toward this end the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with other Government agencies, will regularly prepare long-range estimates of building-materials requirements.

All these measures are designed to assure a high volume of housing construction. But this high volume cannot be maintained, nor can we produce housing that the bulk of our families can afford, unless building costs are lowered.

#### LOWER BUILDING COSTS

To obtain good housing at reasonable prices requires broad-scale efforts to reduce building costs. The basic problem facing the housing industry in this regard is to achieve the constant improvements in productive efficiency characteristic of other great industries of our country.

Considerable progress has been made in the last few years, as labor and management alike have begun to realize the possibilities for long-run efficiency inherent in stabilized housing production at high levels. Large-scale operations, both on the building site and in factories, have demonstrated possibilities for significant reductions in cost. In addition, some coordination has been achieved in the sizes of materials and household equipment. This permits small-scale builders as well as large to lower costs through simplified assembling of houses.

We can expect further progress as these advances are more widely adopted and as further innovations are developed. The Government can assist in a number of ways.

The vigorous program of research to develop new building materials and more efficient building methods, on which the



building industry has made an encouraging start, can be aided by the Government, particularly through such research agencies as the Bureau of Standards and the Forest Products Laboratory. In addition the Government can assist the industry through a sound program of research concerning the housing market and related community development problems. I recommend that the Congress provide authority and funds for an integrated program of building research, recognizing the paramount interest of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the housing field and related interest of the Department of Commerce and other agencies in the more general field of construction, and using the best research facilities available throughout the Government.

The use of modern methods and materials, large-scale operations, and improved working techniques are hampered in some communities by obsolete and restrictive requirements embodied in local building codes. These codes should be rapidly modernized to permit the prompt use of proved and safe technical advances.

Many communities have already made substantial improvements in their codes. The Federal Government's research program should assist further improvement by testing building materials and methods and determining proper performance standards. Agencies of the Government will also continue to promote better building codes by working with State and local officials and with representatives of labor and management.

The full development of large-scale operations, both on-site construction and prefabrication, has been delayed by serious gaps in financing methods. In the case of on-site construction I recommend that the Government be authorized to guarantee loans for working capital during the period before regular mortgage loan financing is available. In the case of prefabrication I recommend that the Government's present power to guarantee production loans should be extended to cover the entire period between the time the house is started in the plant and its erection on the site.

Cooperatives have been effective in lowering costs in many parts of our economy. Farm cooperatives are a notable example. I recommend that special provision be made by the Congress for insuring loans to housing cooperatives.

Another promising means for reducing costs of construction is to improve the marketing system for building materials, which in many respects is now unduly complicated and costly. This problem presents a challenge to the industry to establish a system adequate to distribute at low cost the large volume of materials required to meet our housing needs.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has been attacking unlawful obstacles to free competition in the housing industry. Restraints on channels of distribution, price fixing, and other practices in violation of the antitrust laws add to the cost of housing. More vigorous enforcement of these laws depends upon the appropriation by the

Congress of additional funds that have been requested for the Antitrust Division.

There are also possibilities for cost reduction through higher labor productivity as the skill of building workers is increased and efficient methods are more rapidly adopted. As in other industries, labor costs per unit can be reduced by these means without lowering the annual earnings of workers. I am sure that labor and management understand and accept these principles and recognize that their effectiveness depends upon uninterrupted high volume production of housing. I am confident that they will cooperate fully with each other to achieve these ends.

A complete housing program must deal with rural housing. Financial aids should be developed for rural housing as well as city housing. In addition, the technical building services provided by the Department of Agriculture to farmers should be expanded. This will enable farmers to do more of their own building, and reduce the high costs necessarily incurred when city builders are asked to do the relatively small-scale work involved in building or remodeling farmhouses. I again recommend the enactment of the provisions for rural housing contained in the comprehensive housing legislation which has long been before the Congress.

All of these measures will result in progressively lower cost and higher quality housing. Some should be effective in the near future, such as the standardization of design, dimensions, and methods of assembly of home-building materials and equipment. Others will take longer to be fully developed. All should be strongly encouraged by the Government.

#### LOW-RENT HOUSING FOR FAMILIES IN THE LOWEST-INCOME GROUPS

The measures for cost reduction which I have recommended—even when they become fully effective—will not provide adequate housing within the reach of our lowest-income families. The private-housing industry cannot in the foreseeable future provide decent housing for these families. Their incomes are far too low to cover the cost of new housing of any adequate standard. They are too low to cover even the cost of decent second-hand housing.

We have a national responsibility to assure that decent housing is available to all our people. We should replace present housing which is a menace to health and safety with simple but adequate housing at rents which low-income families can afford. To do this we must resume the program of public aid to low-rent housing, first authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Under this program, tested by experience, local public agencies construct and operate the housing and the Federal Government contributes funds necessary to permit low rents. Communities also contribute by providing exemption from local taxes. The costs to the Federal and local governments have been modest in comparison with the benefits achieved, not only for low-income families but also for the community as a whole.

I recommend that the Congress authorize sufficient Federal funds to permit con-

struction by local housing authorities of 100,000 public-housing units each year for the next five years.

The limits on the cost of construction per unit set by present law would not permit the development of low-rent housing projects under any cost level likely to be achieved in the postwar period. The law should be amended to adjust these cost limitations to postwar conditions, and also to strengthen the provisions of the law which restrict the use of the housing to low-income families, to encourage the construction of units for families of larger size, and to extend certain preferences to veterans.

Public housing is an essential element in our total program. Even when these 500,000 units have been built, we will still have far to go to rehouse our lowest income groups.

#### URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

The redevelopment of the central areas of our cities, now too often blighted and decaying, is of primary importance for our housing program. Housing does not exist in a vacuum. In planning residential areas, consideration must be given to such items as transportation, shopping centers, schools, and playgrounds. Some sections of our cities must be replanned and rebuilt to be fit places for modern living.

To make it possible for the cities to start this work and to encourage participation by private capital, we should now make adequate provision for a program to assist in the elimination of slums and blighted areas. The task of assembling and clearing land in these areas and making it ready for rebuilding is great and the need is urgent. The costs will be beyond the financial means of most cities. I recommend the enactment of legislation to give Federal assistance, to be combined with local resources, to permit the assembly and clearance of land in such areas. Federal aid for this purpose is one of the features of the comprehensive housing legislation which I have previously recommended.

While major expenditures of this type should be deferred at present, I recommend that the Congress now authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to enter into the necessary financial arrangements so that cities may proceed with their plans and be ready to undertake their projects as rapidly as economic conditions and local situations permit.

#### CONCLUSION

The program of action I have recommended is designed to meet the immediate housing needs of the Nation and at the same time to lay a sound basis for the years ahead. It is a comprehensive program, each part of which is necessary.

Many of the proposals which I have recommended are contained in housing legislation which has long been before the Congress. These proposals have received long study by many committees of the Congress. In recent months the other proposals that I have here made, as well, have been carefully studied and their need demonstrated. The way has therefore been paved for speedy action

on the entire housing program that I here recommend and most of which I have recommended before.

Unfortunately, some of the elements of this comprehensive housing program which are most urgently needed—such as the provision of publicly aided low-rent housing—have been subject to opposition based upon unfounded fears and upon errors about the facts. These elements of the program should not be put aside. Such action would result in a fragmentary housing program which would not meet the needs of the American people.

In the past, we have proceeded separately on short-range and long-range proposals. Now we must recognize the need for shaping the long- and short-range legislation with reference to each other. We must adopt them together so that they may work together. We must make orderly progress, not a staggering uncertain series of starts and halts.

We have learned much in the last decade about the ways to meet the housing needs of our great Nation. We should now act on this knowledge through farsighted legislation by the Government and farsighted planning by all who work in the building industry.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 23, 1948.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LESINSKI (at the request of Mr. SADOWSKI), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. SADOWSKI), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert therein a copy of an address that I made before the Lincoln Republican Club, of Haverhill, Mass., on Wednesday evening, February 11, 1948. Because of the world-wide interest in the question of rehabilitation of the countries of western Europe, I believe that the remarks I made will be of interest to those who are now considering the advisability of the adoption of the principles of the so-called Marshall plan.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING before the Connecticut Sheriffs Association on February 18.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE OIL QUOTA REVISION FIASCO

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, there are certain things I want to call to the attention of the Members of the Congress. First, I glanced through the committee print on the appropriation bill for the civil functions of the Department of the Army, which is available today. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the bill with the chairman and members of the subcommittee. It may well be that the justifications and evidence presented to the subcommittee indicated that there were no buildings where heating is being converted from oil to coal in that particular field, or where new installations are planned of oil-burning units. However, I do not find any limitation such as was written into the independent offices appropriation bill. Because I feel very strongly that we should consider the propriety of preventing this type of conversion if it is contemplated and, further, of making it impossible that during the fiscal year 1949 any money should be spent anywhere for such purposes, whether it be in connection with our cemeteries or communication systems or any buildings that are or may be erected or maintained under the rivers and harbors and flood-control work of the Corps of Engineers, or the United States Soldiers' Home, or the Panama Canal, or any other Government agency, I shall prepare for submission to the subcommittee a limitation similar to the one which the House accepted in connection with the independent offices appropriation committee bill, and to which I am sure the committee itself will give sympathetic consideration and treatment in our efforts to promote fuel-oil conservation, and first and foremost by the Federal Government itself.

The motion I expect to offer when the bill is read, and which I shall submit to the chairman and to the committee, will be a restriction. It will be at page 20 of the bill, line 5, and will add a new paragraph, to read as follows:

No part of the foregoing appropriations to the Department of the Army shall be used for the purpose of converting any coal-heating units to oil or natural gas in any federally owned or rented buildings in or outside the District of Columbia.

Members of the House will recall that I struck out the words "natural gas" and added the words "when there is a fuel shortage" to my original motion on February 4, when we were considering the independent offices appropriation bill. However, thereafter the House reinserted the words "or natural gas", and, consequently, I am inclined to submit the amendment in the form I have just indicated, subject to any request on the part of those who feel natural gas should not be included. If there is such a feeling, I shall be inclined to strike the language and leave it to those who are directly concerned with natural gas shortages to present a specific amendment and discuss it with the House.

As I have previously indicated, I do not think that the words "when there is a fuel shortage" are particularly helpful. It raises a question of construction. I have no doubt that it is intended to limit the prohibition to areas where there is

actually a fuel-oil shortage. However, since we have been told repeatedly that we will have a gasoline shortage this summer and then a fuel-oil shortage next winter, and then that cycle for an indefinite period of time, I feel that we should prohibit, without any exception, the conversion by the Federal Government in any of its buildings from coal to oil heating until we know, with complete certainty, that there is enough oil available to take care of any security emergency and the demands of our industries and our individual citizens. It seems to me that is the least the Federal Government can make as a contribution to both the immediate and the long-range problem. For your further reference, may I call attention to the data I submitted on February 3, beginning at page 1049, and again on February 4 at page 1119, with reference to shocking and flagrant cases of conversions in the midst of the crisis in Boston and even here in the District. A hasty reading of the hearings clearly shows that items are included for the purchase of fuel oil. Some may be for such oil in new installations. Too, there are millions of dollars for new construction. I urge that you consider whether we should not flatly prohibit the Federal Government competing with our industries and our homes for the admittedly scarce stocks of fuel oil. I am sure that nothing short of a legislative prohibition will stop this practice. We have seen instance after instance of agencies of the Federal Government ignoring not only the spirit but the letter of the President's conservation order. I have not yet been able to obtain all the facts but there is not the slightest doubt but that the Federal Government, because of lack of foresight, good judgment and common sense, in some quarters, has wasted enough fuel oil throughout this Nation this winter to have actually been responsible for many of the reported shortages.

As I have said repeatedly, I believe we would be acting wisely by appropriating sufficient funds to force every Government agency to convert to coal. But, at the very least, I submit we should take this one simple step to stop these agencies in their tracks for fiscal 1949 in carrying out any conversion or new construction plans.

I want to bring up to date briefly what has happened over the week end as far as this announcement of Thursday afternoon is concerned, of a reduction of 599,000 barrels of petroleum products for the first quarter. As I said then, it is quite obvious that this was nothing but a mathematical reduction of one-half the amount, if no regard is paid to the odd amount of 36 barrels, from what the several countries reported to us as the result of Secretary Marshall's cable that they could and would give up gladly for the balance of this quarter. It is completely inadequate. No one has attempted to explain it for the obvious reason that it cannot be explained. The Department was derelict in its clear duty to the American people in not acting fully to protect their comfort, their safety, and their welfare. That dereliction becomes more serious with the passage of each hour and with the sailing of each tanker



loaded with any of this vitally needed fuel destined for use in countries which offered the other 599,000 barrels to us through replies to Secretary Marshall's cable of February 6.

I will have more, much more, to report when I can see the minutes of that meeting of the review committee. I was promised a copy Friday to reach me tomorrow, but it is unfortunate in the extreme that, with this 3-day holiday when about the only people working here are Members of Congress and their staffs, the Office of International Trade would not grant the reasonable request of at least a week-end embargo.

I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD of February 20, at page A1005, the text of the press release from the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce with reference to the announcement of the third reduction in 34 days of country export quotas for the first quarter of petroleum and petroleum products.

In making an analysis of the country quotas in comparison with the previous announcements several facts stand out.

Each fact establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt the inconsistent, illogical handling of these export controls. Each demonstrates the reliance upon theories as a basis for decision. Each adds to the overwhelming mass of evidence that the program cannot be explained.

The Departments of Commerce and State have stubbornly opposed any kind of an embargo on shipments overseas of petroleum and petroleum products and their representatives have insisted that such an embargo would wreck the economics of friendly nations dependent upon us for these exports.

Fact No. 1. On February 10 the Office of International Trade stated:

In order further to ensure that no petroleum products in critically short supply are shipped from the area of greatest shortage in the United States, the Department of Commerce has prohibited the use of its petroleum export licenses to clear shipments from east-coast ports, the Office of International Trade announced today.

\* \* \* This ruling is effective immediately, and will be in force until March 31, OIT officials said. If the critical shortages continue, it may be necessary to extend the restriction beyond that date, it was announced.

But the press release also stated:

Shipments from Gulf and west coast ports are not affected.

Fact No. 2. Although the door was left open to shipment of petroleum and petroleum products from the Gulf and west coasts, by the allocations announced on that date, 100 percent embargoes were placed on any shipment from this country to Denmark and Eire so far as kerosene is concerned, to Panama and Iceland so far as gas oil and distillate fuel oil is concerned, and to New Zealand and the United Kingdom so far as residual fuel oil is concerned. The analysis of this latest announcement of last Thursday shows that three more 100 percent embargoes have been added, of any shipment of kerosene to Australia and Honduras and of any residual fuel oil to Australia.

Fact No. 3. In the fact of these nine 100-percent embargoes, the Office of International Trade had issued between January 1 and February 11 export licenses covering the shipment of 4,500 barrels of kerosene to Denmark and 5,225 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil to Iceland, to which any shipments of those types were prohibited.

Fact No. 4. Although these licenses can be used to authorize the exports covered from either the Gulf or west coast, the Office of International Trade has stubbornly refused to order the same kind of effective embargo on the shipment of these oils as is in effect on the east coast to March 31, even though requested to do so by 9 Senators and 75 Representatives for the limited period of 48 hours until we could be certain that the program was not draining fuel oils in excess of the revised quotas.

Fact No. 5. The requests for a temporary embargo were made on the morning of February 17 and were first denied that afternoon. On the previous day the *Esso Manchester* and the *British Fidelity* left Corpus Christi with approximately 160,000 barrels of gasoline for England and on February 21 the *Esso Cadillac* was loading 75,000 barrels of gasoline for a voyage to the United Kingdom. I do not know at this moment whether this was aviation motor fuel or other motor fuel. But, if it was aviation motor fuel, it must be considered in the light of the quota of that type of gasoline of 120,000 barrels, of the issuance of licenses up to February 11 to export only 56,000 barrels of that type and of the fact that there are only two Gulf coast ports. Beyond that I am informed that the *Comanche* is scheduled for loading some type of petroleum or petroleum products in the Gulf coast this month for delivery to the United Kingdom in March. This tanker is listed as being owned by the Anglo-American Oil Co., Ltd., and as having a capacity of 72,120 barrels. The *Robert F. Hand*, owned by the same company, with a capacity of 140,740 barrels is scheduled to load at Beaumont next Friday for delivery in the United Kingdom March 19. All this information is as readily available to the Office of International Trade as to myself. I submit it should be assembled at once and weighed in terms of existing quotas, licenses, and scheduled shipments before denying finally the requests of these Members of Congress for this form of sensible review of conditions.

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

Mr. HESELTON. Yes; gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman; and as I have pointed out to him time and time again I want to do anything I can to help out this situation in his section of the country. But it is a long-range proposition, it will probably last for years; and if you gentlemen in New England and the Great Lakes States will join us in our efforts to build a slack-water route which can easily be done, from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, this problem can be alleviated in the future.

Mr. HESELTON. I hope the gentleman will not try to divert me further on

that; he knows that I am looking at the Tombigbee program with new thought about its over-all value.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. HESELTON. But I do not guarantee that I will follow the gentleman. I do, however, want to keep concentrated on this immediate temporary emergency we still have to solve.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand the emergency is immediate. I am for you. I will help out in any way I can to alleviate it.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his assistance.

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about the long-range problem.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have only one other fact I want to present at this time. I want to advise the Members that I have sent a great many requests for information on Saturday and again today, and if that material comes in before night, I will add it for your benefit to the revision of these remarks.

This further fact has to do with another shipment. There are similar reports coming in of shipments to other countries which, in comparison with existing licenses and revised quotas, demonstrate some startling developments. The tanker *Rincon Hill* was loaded February 20 with 111,481 barrels of Diesel destined for the East Indies. I can find no quota for the East Indies in any of the three announcements unless it comes under the 60,000 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil allotted to the Netherlands. Or it may come from the allocated reserve of 353,500 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil or 151,000 barrels of residual fuel oil. If so, it indicates on the list of export licenses issued to February 11, none covers shipments to the East Indies specifically. There is one license of 80,000 barrels of distillate fuel oil for the Netherlands. Perhaps this is being handled as the shipments of kerosene to Tahiti and the Fiji Islands were. If so, someone in this office should locate the full facts and explain them now. A clearer case of confusion compounded could hardly be imagined. But the magic part of it all is to find so many instances of accomplished facts with tankers half way on their voyages to other countries and probably several having passed within a hundred or so miles of east-coast ports.

As to crude, which has just been placed under control, since Monday the *Libscomb Lykes* left Baytown, Tex., with 5,285 barrels of crude for Naples and the *Agiosgeorgius* from the same port with 110,018 barrels for Le Havre.

All of these facts, Mr. Speaker, are facts we have a full right to ask this Department to consider before it is too late. I want to assure my colleagues that as fast as I can develop information I will present it to them. I know that the New England delegation in the House is grateful for the cooperation of the Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Montana, New Jersey, South Dakota, and Utah delegations and of the other individuals who have joined us in this request for a temporary emergency embargo. I hope other delegations and Members will join us tomorrow.

If we can demonstrate to the Office of International Trade that we are united in this request, that we are acting in the interest of our people, that we are going to insist that if we can locate four tankers or so that they go up the east coast, the balance going to the Midwest, we may still succeed in the face of the present refusal. Representatives of the oil industry have testified Thursday and Friday of this last week that if we get them this 559,000 barrels of oil these other countries say they do not want and do not need, they guarantee we will not have any more shortage in the North or Midwest or along the Atlantic coast. This being true, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the attitude taken by the Office of International Trade and I hope that each of you will assist us in our effort to try to make them see that this is simply common sense.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. As one who joined with the Members of Congress from the New England States in this request to the Office of International Trade, I think I speak for all of us who represent areas where this great fuel shortage has existed in expressing to the gentleman our profound thanks for the great diligence, perservance, and intelligence he has displayed on this problem. All of us are deeply indebted to him for the ceaseless efforts which he has expended.

May I ask the gentleman one question? Do I understand from his remarks that the Office of International Trade completely ignored in certain instances the embargo which had been placed on certain oil shipments?

Mr. HESELTON. No. I misled the gentleman if he understood that from my remarks. You see this embargo on the east coast is a flat embargo enforced by the customs officials. They will not honor any license for the shipment of oil out of east-coast ports. Parenthetically, I may say that that has had a major effect in turning a deficit of about 2,000,000 barrels to a surplus of approximately 3,000,000 barrels in that particular area. The Office of International Trade has refused to apply the same method of control over the Gulf-coast ports and the west-coast ports. Consequently the door is open to draining off any amount up to the quota amount or to any other point up to the total amount of the existing licenses. They are going over the amount of the quotas in some instances, apparently, and shipping without reference to the revised amount. We may find too late that several tankers have gone out with crude to an amount of twice the crude that has already been allotted or licensed.

Mr. KEATING. Who determines the existence and the extent of the embargo that will be placed on these shipments?

Mr. HESELTON. The Office of International Trade has in the first instance complete responsibility for issuing the license and also establishing shipping quotas, but they in turn are checked by what is known as a review committee.

However, that review committee is composed of a representative of the De-

partment of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the armed services, plus four members of the Department of Commerce, so obviously there is no possibility of carrying out anything but the wishes of the Department of Commerce as translated by these representatives. I placed in the RECORD Friday certain minutes of the review committee proceedings, and it is interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture felt that there should be a substantial reduction in the residuals. The Department of the Interior agreed. The department of the armed services did not express any opinion; at least, it was not recorded. But, when the vote was cast, they did not cut the residuals materially. Now, that is something you and I cannot explain to our constituents. We know that tankers can go by Ambrose Light and go up along Cape Cod and unload their cargoes at east-coast ports, but the orders are "Take it to the United Kingdom" or "Italy" or "France" or somewhere else.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Department requested of these various foreign countries, which are sharing in our oil supply, a statement as to their minimum requirements?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely.

Mr. KEATING. And that they furnished those minimum requirements?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely.

Mr. KEATING. And that in the face of that and in the face of the shortage in this country the Department allowed the shipment of 599,000 barrels above what the countries had said they needed?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes. Unless they change that decision, that will be the result of it. That cable went out on February 6 over the signature of Secretary Marshall, outlining very effectively what we are up against, asking them to review their requirements. I have seen the returning cables. They came back from the 11th to the 17th of February. The saving would have been 1,198,036 barrels of heating oil, residuals, and gasoline. The Department last Friday arbitrarily cut 50 percent of that and said, "You in this country can have that, but they, overseas, will get the rest, even though they assert they would give it to you and do not need it." Unless we do something about it, that is the result. They do not need it, and we do.

Mr. KEATING. They have stated that they do not need it?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. That seems to me to present an inexcusable state of affairs.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with the gentleman completely.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### PALESTINE—LIFE OR DEATH TEST FOR UNITED NATIONS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, all the hopes of mankind for survival in this atomic age rest upon the successful development of the United Nations organization.

If it grows up, in time it will outlaw the hell of war and usher in a period of peace and happiness and prosperity the like of which we cannot fully imagine.

If it fails, which God forbid, the giant forces which science has harnessed, let loose by irresponsible men, may bring civilization crashing down in ruins and bury all men beneath the dust and in the silence of atomic annihilation.

The first test which may well decide whether the United Nations shall survive or perish is the manner in which it handles the problem of Palestine.

The United Nations has already gone through the preliminaries.

After a thorough investigation, an open discussion, and a democratic vote, it has decided to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states with an international zone at Jerusalem.

Was this merely the airy conclusion of a debating society without substance or application? Or was it a mature and purposeful decision of the family of nations, fairly arrived at, in justice to all, backed by moral sanctions and enforced by law?

Will the United Nations follow through on its commitments?

That is the critical question.

The supreme test.

Determining whether we shall have permanent peace or catastrophic war.

In the past, nations could indulge in the expedient evasions and deceptions called diplomacy without wrecking the world beyond recovery.

That day is gone.

Wars are no longer local and the man behind the weapon does not have to see his target in order to hit it. The terrible destructive power of the first A-bomb is a sickening fact known to all of us. What about those technical improvements since made to increase the area of its devastating power which have already made the first A-bomb obsolete? Add to this the frightful possibilities of bacteriological warfare, and we realize that there is no longer a distinction between warrior and civilian. The next war cannot be isolated. It will involve everyone and will reduce the survivors—mistakenly called victors—to a primitive level of existence, living precariously in a burned-out wasteland.

But many nations enslaved by habit cannot adjust themselves to the imperative need for changing their outlooks and their techniques to forestall the danger which threatens the world.

They think they can fiddle diplomatically in the good old discredited way



and escape the consequences of their pathetic immaturity.

They pay lip-service to the United Nations before the forum of world opinion, even while they try to scuttle it in the secrecy of their national policies.

They think that they can still juggle with realities.

And Palestine is the problem upon which they will make or break the United Nations and any decent hopes for anyone anywhere.

Russia supports the partition hoping that trouble between Jews and Arabs will give her the pretext for stepping in to maintain "order" and under the cloak extend her controls to the Mediterranean and to the Indian Ocean.

Great Britain gives up the mandate over Palestine but deviously encourages the Arabs at the expense of the Jews to protect her oil interests and her lifelines in neighboring Arab countries.

The United States, whose people overwhelmingly supported the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and whose Government swung the balance in favor of partition, now finds itself caught in a contradiction.

The realistic fact is that we, too, have vital oil interests in Arabia which, in the name of our national security, we must not lose. The State Department and our Secretary of National Defense feel that we cannot go all-out to implement the partition of Palestine and thereby antagonize the rebellious Arabs.

And so the policy of the United States in this area has become one of muddling indecision. We are sitting on the fence hoping that the problem will work itself out without requiring any forthright leadership on our part.

Palestine is still the pawn in the chess game of power politics among the big nations.

Britain in her home government has long followed the practice of accepting majority decisions, but when it comes to the UN decision to partition Palestine, she says that she will not assist or cooperate in any way to enforce the partition. This flouts the action taken by a majority of the members of the United Nations Assembly. And then she complains about the Soviet's abuse of the veto power when, in effect, she is doing everything in her power to hamstring the United Nations and to appease the Arabs.

Furthermore, she does not want the commission created by the United Nations to visit Palestine for the purpose of drawing up a partition plan and program, to enter that area before she gives up her mandate in the spring.

In spite of this the British position has some consistency because she opposed the partition plan from the beginning.

But the United States has carried the torch for a Jewish homeland for many years. With high-sounding phrases we chastised the British for their vacillating conduct and represented ourselves as the shining white knight fighting with moral fervor to win a refuge for displaced Jews in Palestine.

Suddenly and inexplicably when the United Nations General Assembly on No-

vember 29, 1947, voted 33 to 13 to make this promise become a reality, we dropped our championship of the Jewish cause.

Why did we encourage the Jews and then forsake them?

Many outside the United States explain our reversal of form by saying that we have been playing domestic politics with the Palestine question, never thinking that we might be called upon to back up our stand with anything but lofty words.

The Arabs have been quick to seize upon this contradiction and to exploit it fully through the medium of propaganda. Arab leaders are telling their people that the United States does not really believe in the partition of the Holy Land. They are being informed that it was merely a necessary political gesture on the part of the Americans to sound off in behalf of the Jewish cause.

Now the Arabs are putting this explanation to the proof with disturbing success. Daily they send armed bands across the border to attack Jewish settlements. The UN takes no action on this flagrant repudiation of its decision because the United States, which was chiefly responsible for the UN approval of partition is so strangely silent.

And Americans are humiliated by the suspicion that their State Department is not aboveboard in this matter.

We have placed an embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine so that the Jewish people are denied the weapons with which to defend themselves from aggression. We are doing this on the technicality that the Jewish state has not been officially established. Meanwhile, every day Jews are dying in defense of their homes in Palestine and hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees in displaced-persons camps in Europe are finally giving in to despair.

For their last, best hope the United States is apparently ignoring its solemn commitments to them in favor of the double-dealing game of diplomacy.

This emboldens the Arab leaders.

They are openly training and equipping an expeditionary force to invade Palestine when the British pull out.

The situation is tragically reminiscent of the Japanese aggression in Manchuria which the old League of Nations failed to halt, thereby hastening its own doom and encouraging the rise of other aggressors which led to the butchery of World War II.

Already Arab apologists are making it easier for our State Department to gloss over our abandonment of the responsibility we owe to the Jewish people. After all the Arab leaders say we could go over the side of Soviet Russia. But would they? Hardly, Arab leaders enjoy feudal powers and comfortable incomes which they would lose under Soviet domination. But Americans are businessmen who put profits before anything else the Arabs counter. Surely they would not jeopardize their oil investments in Arab countries. To which the American people reply: American finance and initiative are also making it possible for Arab leaders to collect impressive royalties which

they could never earn by their present efforts.

No, the Arab "line" will not fool the American public.

Out of the present appeasement in the policy of the State Department will come a firm and clear-cut implementation of our obligations. The American people will demand it.

The small Arab states are defying the United Nations. If they get away with their aggressive designs, the UN will have failed on its first major test, and the seeds of world war III, with its harvest of hate and misery and extermination, will have been planted for the children of earth.

It is time to remind the Arab states that they won their freedom as a result of the Allied victory in World War I. In spite of this, during World War II, Iraq, one of the Arab states, was prevented with considerable difficulty from joining up with the Axis. Not one Arab division fought on our side during the recent conflict. Furthermore, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who is the moving spirit behind the aggression of Arab leaders, was an intimate friend and follower of one Adolf Hitler.

The Arab states already possess vast and underpopulated territories which they can never have need for or develop. Their case in Palestine has no basis in historical fact, on the grounds of economic necessity, or before the judgment of world opinion as decided by the United Nations. Clearly, they must be stopped in their senseless aggression before they too suffer.

It is late but not too late for the United States to enforce its decision. In that the United States is legally and morally bound to assume its share of the responsibility.

We should make clear to the world that the partition which we advocated and supported is still the policy of the United States. Following closely on this we can propose to the Security Council a resolution asking the member states to supply arms to the Jews and thus enable the United States to lift its own embargo.

It is our duty to call upon the Security Council for an international military force supplied by the small nations to implement partition.

The plain fact is that the peace of the world is threatened by Arab aggression in Palestine.

Definite action is needed to stop this madness. It is the inescapable obligation of the United States to take an affirmative stand in order to protect the in-fact Jewish state in order to redeem its own honor and in order to uphold the authority of the United Nations upon which the peoples of this world rely for peace and survival.

#### ATTEMPTS TO PUT NEGRO DOCTORS IN GALLINGER HOSPITAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to decent treatment at the hands of the Congress and at the hands of the executive department.

They are today threatened with a situation out at Gallinger Hospital that is likely to bring race trouble. It is already stirring resentment, and cannot possibly do any good. I refer to the order issued to put Negro doctors in that hospital and give them the same supervision over white patients the white doctors have.

The District of Columbia is the seat of government of the United States. The people here have a right to be protected. I submit that when this attempt is made thus to humiliate the doctors and the white patients who are bound to patronize Gallinger Hospital, it is about time that Members of Congress and the President got off this cheap scheme of playing politics in order to get a few votes in Harlem and in certain other portions of New York City.

I for one protest with all my strength, and the people of the District of Columbia have a right to protest with all their strength, against such treatment, and to make themselves heard.

It is about time we get back to fundamental principles and put a stop to the attempts that are being pushed by certain communistic elements to stir race trouble all over the country.

I resent this attempt to impose these Negro doctors upon the white people of Washington. The people of the District of Columbia resent it, and they have a right to resent it.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H. R. 4938, making certain furs dutiable; H. R. 4739, relating to the free entry of X-ray apparatus; H. R. 5275, relating to the free entry of limestone; and H. R. 5328, relating to the free entry of wood waste.

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

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 402. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 500. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; and

S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 1948, 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:

1313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$1,600,000 for the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1314. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$716,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1315. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$1,350,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 539); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1316. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$50,000 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 540); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1317. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$1,500,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 541); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1318. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision of language for the fiscal year 1948 pertaining to the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 542); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1319. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase in the amount of \$150,000 and a decrease in contract authorization for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 543); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1320. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages, judgments rendered against the United States, and audited claims, as provided by various laws, in the amount of \$14,221,369.83, together with an indefinite amount as may be necessary to pay interest and costs (H. Doc. No. 544); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1321. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a revision of the national airport plan for 1948, which was submitted under date of February 9; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1322. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1323. A letter from the national headquarters, Navy Club of the United States of America, through the chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, transmitting reports of proceedings and activities and statements of receipts and expenditures submitted by the Navy Club of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1324. A letter from the chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Twelfth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board, for the year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1325. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 15, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 545); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1326. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of and review of reports on Traverse Bay (Grand Traverse Bay), Mich. (H. Doc. No. 546); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

#### 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. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCOBLOCK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5112. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5315. A bill to ratify the administrative promotions of employees on military furlough from the field postal service, in certain cases, and for related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4739. A bill to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4938. A bill to amend the



Tariff Act of 1930 with reference to platinum foxes and platinum fox furs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLMES: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5328. A bill to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 332. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the temporary authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 5489. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5490. A bill authorizing the construction of a comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5491. A bill relating to the tribal and individual affairs of the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5492. A bill to provide additional options with respect to Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5493. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a migratory game bird advisory committee; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5494. A bill to provide dental treatment for dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5495. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors' insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5496. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 5497. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5498. A bill to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5499. A bill to amend section 321A of the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit certain citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines not of races indigenous to the Philippines to qualify for naturalization without certificates of arrival or declarations of intention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5500. A bill relating to the effective date of awards of death compensation and death pension under veterans' laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (by request):

H. R. 5501. A bill to extend certain provisions of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 5502. A bill to assist the States in the payment of adequate compensation to public-school teachers, to include such teachers within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Orange, Calif., a perpetual easement for the maintenance and operation of a public highway, and to grant to the Irvine Co., a corporation, a perpetual easement for the maintenance, operation, and use of a water pipe line, in the vicinity of the naval air base, Santa Ana, Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5504. A bill making an additional deficiency appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 5505. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5506. A bill to authorize restocking, propagation, and conservation of game in the Eglin Field Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5507. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide priorities for veterans in the purchase of surplus residential real property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5508. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5509. A bill to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the termination of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 476. Resolution extending the time for final report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid until May 1, 1948; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. Res. 478. Resolution to provide additional funds to carry on investigations of surplus property under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 479. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the death of the late Hon. John M. Robson, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the use of the mail to advertise and dramatize the use of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such necessary legislation as to provide funds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies for the purchase of notes and mortgages of veterans, so as to facilitate the operations of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended; title 38, U. S. Code); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kang Sung Hark Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5511. A bill for the relief of Thomas Yoichi Sakai, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5512. A bill for the relief of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5513. A bill to provide for the admission to citizenship of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 5514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5515. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Anthony Olivari and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:  
H. R. 5518. A bill for the relief of Carney E. Heard; 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:

1391. By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Valdez, Alaska, on universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1392. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Ethel Atkinson, Cedar Falls, Iowa, and others, re S. 285, the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1393. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of the American Legion, of Danforth, Ill., bearing the signatures of 20 persons, submitted by Conrad A. Scharp, commander, Post No. 367, the American Legion, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1394. By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of the New York State Senate, which was concurred in by the Assembly, requesting the Congress and the President to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1395. By Mr. KILDAY: Petitions of Guy C. Sharer and 45 other citizens of San Antonio, Tex.; Mrs. Richard M. Hennessy and 18 other citizens of San Antonio, Tex.; Mrs. Eda W. Vettors and 11 other citizens of San Antonio, Tex.; Bonnie Brae Post, No. 431, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., with 116 signatures; and Bonnie Brae Post, No. 431, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., with 136 signatures, all urging the passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1396. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Miss Phyllis Grendal and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, advocating that the question of independence for Lithuania be raised officially before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1397. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 50 residents of Salisbury, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1398. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of women representing various clubs and organizations in and around Footville, Wis., asking for legislation to improve the movies and radio programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1399. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Marie A. Wood and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1400. Also, petition of Mrs. Mabel Kelly, Port Orange, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1401. Also, petition of C. L. Lampp, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1402. Also, petition of Miss Alice M. Myers, Cassadaga, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend Plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1403. Also, petition of Mrs. John L. Storck, Daytona Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1404. Also, petition of Mrs. Olivia Overstreet, Miami, Fla., and others petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1405. Also, petition of the Townsend clubs from the Fifth Congressional District in the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1406. Also, petition of Arthur Kinchhoff, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1407. Also, petition of the residents of Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the transfer of a dormitory known as the Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1408. Also, petition of Lucile Davidson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1409. Also, petition of the city government of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the extension of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1410. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Arthur E. Burrell and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, advocating enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose resources are abundantly adequate for the needs of each new day, we are again approaching Thy throne of grace and blessing through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open to those who come with the humble spirit and the contrite heart.

We pray that these Thy servants, unto whom Thou hast given the high vocation of leadership in the affairs of government, may be endowed with wisdom and courage as they seek to find a just and righteous solution for our national and international problems.

Grant that we may be faithful stewards of God whom Thou art using to build the kingdom of brotherhood. May we have a large part in bringing in that glorious day of prediction when men everywhere shall live together in the fellowship of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 23, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 166 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce an impressive petition signed by about 135 citizens of Wellington, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

#### REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter signed by several employees of the International Derrick & Equipment Co., of Great Bend, Kans. In my opinion, they make an impressive appeal for a reduction in income-tax payments and also a reduction in cost of government, and I should like to have it brought to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL DERRICK &  
EQUIPMENT CO.,  
Great Bend, Kans., January 27, 1948.  
The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a citizen and a taxpayer, I am deeply concerned with current individual income-tax rates. With the realization that Congress will undoubtedly give careful attention to the tax structure at the next regular session, I am most anxious to present my own views.